

# RECONSTRUCTING ANCIENT LANDSCAPE

S. PESCARIN

Preface by A. Addison  
Introduction by M. Forte

Cover by Matteo Pescarin

Appendix by Ivana Cerato, Augusto Palombini, Eva Pietroni and Valentina Vassallo

## **Summary**

Preface (A. Addison)

Introduction (M. Forte)

Ch. 1 – Reconstructing Ancient Landscape

Ch. 2 – Interpretation and Reconstruction

Ch. 3 – Archaeological Landscape Reconstruction: mapping the space

Ch. 4 – Potential Landscape Reconstruction

Ch. 5 – Communicating the landscape

Ch. 6 – OpenLand: Open Source for landscape archaeology

Ch. 7 – Webscapes

Ch. 8 – A step into the future

Appendix:

A – Case Studies

(I. Cerato, A. Palombini, S. Pescarin,  
E. Pietroni, V. Vassallo)

B – Sources and Resources

(A. Palombini, V. Vassallo)

C – References

(S. Pescarin)

*Sentence*

*Dedication*

This book wouldn't never be published without

## **Preface**

(Alonzo C. Addison)



# **Introduction**

(Maurizio Forte)





# Chapter 1

## Reconstructing ancient landscape

*“Primum, Agricultura non modo est ars,  
sed etiam necessaria ac magna;  
eaque est scientia, quae sint  
in quoque agro serenda ac facienda,  
quo terra maximos perpetuo reddat fructus”.*

*(Varro, De Re Rustica I.4)*

How and where did man use to live in antiquity? What relationship did he have with his neighbours? How did he use, organize or modify his landscape? These are some of the questions that landscape reconstruction tries to answer.

But is it possible to reconstruct ancient landscape in a reliable way? Are there methods, tools, or other indications applicable to this activity?

Although it's impossible to know what *real* landscape was like in the past, nevertheless its reconstruction remains a fundamental process, that cannot be relegated to a “dissemination phase”. Vice-versa it regards the entire archaeological process, from data acquisition to interpretation, to knowledge acquisition *and* dissemination. Communication is a part of it. And archaeology isn't the only discipline involved.

Recently, interest in environmental aspects has also reached those fields of archaeology traditionally more focused on “material culture”. We are slowly moving towards an *archaeology of everyday life*, where research, adopting a more ecological perspective, is finally dealing with aspects until now considered superfluous or unimportant.

### 1.1 Ancient Landscapes

In recent decades, the word “landscape” has become increasingly used in many contexts, and on various occasions. As the environment and environmental issues have assumed a central role in worldwide debates about future development, attention to *landscape* has also gained in importance. Even in the archaeological field, the traditional approach, mainly directed at excavation and identification of anthropic remains, has been changing, substituted by greater attention to the surrounding context: the natural environment, traces of agriculture, land use, etc.

This new approach has evolved into *Landscape Archaeology*, a relatively new field ('90s), commonly associated with British studies (D'AGOSTINO 1992: 19),

although its origins may be traced as far back as the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with Metzer's research (ROBERTS 1987: 78-79).

This discipline has several definitions (BARKER 1992, BERNARDI 1992, LOCK and STANCIC 1995, ASHMORE and KNAPP 1999, GILLINGS MATTINGLY and VAN DALEN 1999), also because it has been approached in different ways by British and European, and American scholars. The former have concentrated their studies more on visual and physical landscapes, while American researchers have expanded its meaning so as to include a cognitive and perceptive approach.

In this book, landscape archaeology is intended as the *discipline that deals with the relationship between men and their environment, between the people of the past and their places, as shaped by them consciously or unconsciously*. For this reason I will be adopting a strong (geo)spatial and multidisciplinary approach, including reference to several different disciplines, technologies and methodologies (BARKER 1992:265, FORTE 2005: vii, RENFREW 1994). Landscape cannot take a back seat in archaeological studies, but has to be seen as a *determinant factor* for the development of ancient cultures, the result of a dynamic combination of geophysical, biological, cultural and anthropic elements in continuous evolution (BERTRAND 1978: 5).

In archaeology, unfortunately, in many cases the fieldwork or excavation is aimed at reconstructing a *single site* and *not a landscape*. In this way it may become very difficult to acquire sufficient data for a consistent reconstruction (FORTE PESCARIN 2006).

To study, analyse, interpret and reconstruct this landscape, an ecological and multidisciplinary perspective is necessary, requiring the application of disciplines such as remote sensing, GIS analysis, aerial photo interpretation, field survey, spatial 2d and 3d digital data acquisition, paleo-environmental researches (geoarchaeology, palaeobotany, etc.), geophysical prospecting, but also data post-processing and integration in spatial (interactive) systems.

The goal of this process is the *reconstruction of the ancient landscape as it could have been, in its potentiality*, and it requires the development of virtual (conceptual, realistic) models. The result can be useful to get back to interpretation itself, but it is also a powerful tool to visualise synthetically and immediately the results of several research projects. It can be integrated into communicative tools, such as virtual museums, and become part of a three-dimensional immersive experience, transformed into part of our historical awareness of the past.

Ancient landscape reconstruction cannot therefore just be considered a marginal activity, that can eventually be added on to the end of some archaeological research, just for (relatively unimportant) "communicative" purposes. It is a part of the research process, a *framework for the study, the interpretation and the communication of many different aspects of ancient man's life, integrated in*

*a natural environment and defined by cognitive aspects*. It allows us to connect several layers of information – deriving from history, archaeology, art history, but also geography, sociology, economy and other disciplines - to places, and to investigate connections and relationships among and inside ecosystems. We will therefore be dealing with *potential reconstructions* and not with *reproductions of past realities*, impossible to state scientifically in an extensive way. More specifically, this book deals with the *reconstruction of virtual ecosystems*, which include *archaeological, interpreted, potential, perceived and networked landscapes* (table 1.1). Moreover, I will suggest an *open* approach: landscape reconstruction is in fact a never-ending process.

Archaeological Landscape	<i>We are in the landscape: actuality, three-dimensionality, spatiality, dynamism</i>
Interpreted Landscape (Mapscape)	<i>We think they were: interpretation</i>
Ancient Potential Landscape (Pastscape)	<i>They could have been: potentiality, 3d, spatiality, dynamism</i>
Perceived Landscape (Mindscape)	<i>They perceived their territory: perception</i>
Network Landscape (Webscape)	<i>We connect over the net</i>

Table 1.1

Over the last ten years I've been working on many projects relating to landscape research and reconstruction, at CINECA Supercomputing Centre of Bologna and at the National Council of Research, the Institute of Technologies Applied to Cultural Heritage (CNR ITABC) in Rome, and in the VHLab, directed by Maurizio Forte until 2007. Because I had a background in archaeology and topography, with a specialist qualification in spatial digital systems, I was able to follow the entire digital pipeline of data acquisition and post-processing and its further exploitation in communicative networks, from the fieldwork to virtual reality applications. I've been giving several seminars on these topics, for post-graduate and post-doctorate students. During these courses I've become aware of students' urgent need to acquire practical skills and, most of all, to experiment with a multidisciplinary approach. At the end of each course they seemed satisfied, because they had been able to create connections between specific fields they were already skilled in, "bringing data to life", changing them into dynamic information. When I usually start a seminar on this topic, I can feel the varied expectations in the audience: the defiance of those persuaded of the usefulness of virtual reconstructions, and also the hope of those interested in finding reassurance, regarding the worth of the studies they are doing, or would like to do.

In these years, I've tried to compare the work I have been doing with similar projects and approaches, to analyse various possible solutions and discuss problematic aspects. I have found much good work that has reached excellent

results, but each one in a specific field: GIS, remote sensing, cognitive analysis, geoarchaeological and palaeobotanical studies, ICT applications, etc.

Dealing with the landscape, on the other hand, requires a broader, multidisciplinary approach, which forces us to overcome that kind of “solitary attitude” that often characterizes researchers in the humanities. For this reason, I have tried to collect and connect some of this specific research work and bring it into a broad digital methodology, including concepts, hardware and software tools and formats, and also practical suggestions and technological solutions, through the analysis of some case studies.

The topic is very complex: it deals with something continuously changing, uncertain and made up of very many different interconnected aspects. There are many risks to be taken into account.

Let's start with the title of this book.

What is ancient landscape? Why reconstruct it? How can it be analysed, interpreted and reconstructed in a coherent way? What are the main problems in the interpretation process and in the ICT process? How many reconstructions have been done? How many are widely available? How many are reliable, well-documented or transparent? How far should we go, in terms of a technological and epistemological development? What is the state of the art in the field of ancient landscape reconstruction?

Ancient landscape, in its archaeological and geo-spatial dimension, is one of the most complex topic both for analysis and reconstruction. Not just from an archaeological and environmental point of view, but also for Computer Sciences. This is why it is dealt with from a variety of perspectives, such as anthropology, archaeology, computer science, history, architecture, geography, topography, geology, etc. This doesn't mean that anyone interested in landscape reconstruction necessarily possesses all these skills. But he/she should *understand* the entire process and have a basic knowledge of the topics, so as to address the work correctly and involve the right experts.

Reconstructing ancient landscape includes various perspectives and approaches, such as cybernetics, cognitive archaeology and ecology (BATESON 1972, RENFREW 1994, MATURANA AND VARELA 1980 and 1999, FORTE 2008). The process involves reconstruction at different levels: archaeological landscape, interpreted landscape, ancient potential landscape and networked landscape.

*Archaeological Landscape* is the contemporary landscape in its diachronicity; it includes everything around us, such as archaeological remains and past historical traces. In this perspective *we are* in the landscape. The analysis of an archaeological landscape requires us to deal with actuality, three-dimensionality, spatiality and relation. Mapping is the primary central activity. Without it any reconstruction cannot be carried out. A typical bottom-up approach is commonly followed, since it requires the acquisition of information

in the field, through surveys, archaeological excavations, photo-interpretation, geological and botanical explorations, georadar and other geophysical acquisitions. It is generally studied through landscape archaeology, aerial archaeology and topography (FORTE PESCARIN PIETRONI 2005: 79-81, CAMBI TERRENATO 2004; CAMPANA PIRO 2009).

*Interpreted Landscape* is the *Mapscape*. It is the geographical spatial visualization of the interpretation process, the representation of knowledge acquisition processes and levels through maps. It includes its results: *collections*, *selections*, *essential characteristics*, but it can also include *excluded elements*. Its visual result is made up of 3d and 2,5d maps, layers in overlay, vector themes, raster grids, and databases. It is also an open working environment, closely or inextricably connected to archaeological and potential landscape reconstruction and to spatial and geophysical characteristics. A mapscape is a visualization of the landscape obtained by a digital classification process (satellite, aerial images, geophysical, spectral, etc.) (FORTE PESCARIN PIETRONI 2005: 79-81). It can be a representation indicating spatial relations or a diagrams in which spatial relationships are configured (RENFREW 2003: 168). Although it is a symbolic environment, can it be also treated as a real landscape? We have to be aware that “*the map is not the territory, it represents, but, if correct, it has a similar structure to the territory*”, “*which accounts for its usefulness*”, as Korzybski stated in 1933 (KORZYBSKI 1933: 58), but we should also notice that a part of us, probably the right hemisphere of our brain, normally identifies a representation with the object represented. Even a flag on a map, with the name of a country, becomes the country itself (BATESON 1979: 47). In this sense a mapscape can be a useful meta-universe of interpretations, where we can find our direction, our questions, our points of view.

*Ancient Potential Landscape* is the *Pastscape*. It is how the landscape might have been during a certain historical period, at a defined latitude. It is not a reproduction of what *it was*, but a reconstruction of what *it might have been, potentially*, based on explicit theories and scientific method, from an analytic, holistic and ecological perspective (RENFREW BAHN 1991). It requires us to evaluate three-dimensionality, spatiality and terrain potentiality. Starting from its main attributes, such as latitude, altitude, climate, morphology, soils and so on, it is possible in fact to define the natural attitude of a terrain unit (DI FIDIO 1993). Sometimes more useful resources are available, such as Soil Maps or Land Use Maps, although not for every region (FAO 1976). Potential landscape can then be compared with other available information and data, regarding the specific historical period. Archaeological maps or historical maps can be used to develop an analytic system, based on GIS spatial analysis and consisting of connected algorithms. During this process we very frequently have to face

much uncertainty. This is why it is very important to build it on a solid, scientific, open and transparent interpretation process. This promising approach was born at the beginning of the *New Archaeology*, when Binford and other archaeologists started to support the idea that conclusions should be based on an *explicit approach*, developed through logical arguments, and not just on the authority and prestige of the scholar. In the UK, thanks to archaeologists such as Clarke and his *Analytical Archaeology*, the analysis was focused on more quantitative techniques. (RENFREW BAHN 1995: 29; BINFORD CLARKE 1977). For the first time, they reconnected archaeology to other sciences, that were used to building their theories on *scientific method*.

Sometimes this is not enough.

Logic and quantity have proved to be inadequate tools to describe organisms, their interactions and their organisations (BATESON 1979: 37). New tools need now to be tested and adopted. *Perceived Landscape* is the *Mindscape*. It is how the territory was perceived in the past. It requires us to deal with concepts such as relations and perception (FORTE 2003). Richard Gregory in 1973 stated that *perception* has one main characteristic: it is a *hypothesis*<sup>1</sup> (GREGORY 1973: 49-96) and as such, it can be contradicted. The original idea of considering archaeology beyond its material culture, including the concept of perception, comes from *Cognitive Archaeology* and *Anthropology* (RENFREW BAHN 1991, RENFREW 1994). Although archaeology and anthropology are still thought of as two distinct disciplines, since they use different methods and techniques, they are also very similar when they deal with the study of long-term temporal processes based in the landscape. Cognitive archaeology tries to answer questions such as “what did they think?”. It studies how ancient men thought and what they believed, starting from the analysis of what they left: archaeological remains, symbols, ancient representations, rituals, myth and religious beliefs (RENFREW BAHN 1991: 345-377). It aims at understanding how past communities organised their lives and their settlements, or how they used and modified their landscapes. Recent developments in *Virtual Reality* applications enable us to adopt new interesting approaches, through the development of interpretative models that look at how ancient man lived and perceived his landscape.

*Webscape* represents specifically *relations* and *connections* among characteristics’ variability, objects, people, characters and cyberspaces. Networked landscapes (their topology consists of characteristics, interconnections and feedback) are a result of an iterative application of input and feedback; the landscape can be altered through the adjustment of network internal parameters (connection weights). Neural networks algorithms can be

---

1 For example when we see just a part of a table, because it is hidden behind an object, we assume it is a table, basing it on the past visual experiences.

used to develop this kind of landscape.

## **.B.1 Beyond the view**

How can we reconstruct an ancient landscape? Let's start from some basic considerations. Firstly, we cannot achieve any reconstruction without interpretation, comprehension, and knowledge. Secondly, we shouldn't work on the reconstruction of the past, without considering and mapping the present, i.e. the archaeological landscape. Thirdly, the only way to approach the present is by changing our perspective and viewpoints. Fourthly, our vision is the main activity involved in the entire process. Fifthly, knowledge acquisition depends upon the comparison of different characteristics and on the identification of *differences*.

The final purpose, interest in and focus on studies and research regarding our past landscape and our history, can be found in the structure of our mind. Day by day we try to acquire information (and knowledge) from the complexity that is around us, using our brain. We specifically use a part of it, that is connected to our vision (*visual brain*), whose main function is exactly "to acquire knowledge about this world", as stated by neurobiologists (ZEKI 1999: 4). We need to *observe* carefully all the details we can *see*, in order to classify them, to find essential "ambiguous" characteristics. We do this primarily for biological reasons (Chapter 2).

We use an analytical process consisting of a *de-composition phase*, where we distinguish different aspects and we systematize them, and a *re-composition phase*. In the first case we organise information into archives, databases, or GIS systems. In the second we use more advanced visualisation systems, such as virtual reality environments or 3d models. Unfortunately there is a risk implicit in the process: each time we re-compose the "picture", we lose information.

The problem is that if we want to use the reconstruction process as an active part of the interpretation, we need to work out how to find a way to preserve the details. Secondly, we should also be aware that visualisation of 3d realistic models, through movies or other broadcasting products, is often incredibly effective, in terms of knowledge transfer, since it can transform a "lesson" into an "experience." On the other hand, it also creates "dependency" on this opaque visualisation (TURKLE 1996). There aren't any good or bad visualisation systems or media, we should just take into account which is the right communication system for a specific purpose (Chapter 7).

Although there is a lot of resistance and suspicion in cultural heritage, due mainly to a lack of credibility, of authority reference, and peer-review control, there are at least three good reasons why we should persist, intensifying the research in this field. First of all, we should be aware that a wider public is increasingly asking for a better understanding of past history and archaeological

landscape, through the employment of visual interactive tools. Secondly, research teams are increasingly using VR tools as *working* tools, as we will be seeing in the next chapters, and not just for presentation purposes. Finally, *representation* is often the basis of *protection*. Although it is not the only way to propose areas for protection, it does contribute to draw public attention to archaeological finds, providing a consistent way to identify them through their knowledge.

Moreover it is quite evident that the sharp resistance to a certain theory, to a new methodology or approach, is part also of its cultural impact. Academic culture has confined philosophy inside seminar classes, but new computer systems are bringing it into everyday life (TURKLE 1991: 167-174).

Although we need to follow a clear and schematic interpretation process, reducing complexity, abstracting essential characteristics of the objects (ZEKI 1999: 5), we can also develop and implement in our visual systems complex models, to better explain living and dynamic phenomena, getting closer and closer to complexity. A cybernetic approach will be more adopted in the future even to landscape reconstruction, through the application of artificial intelligence algorithms, neural network programs, chaos theories, fuzzy logic, etc.

At the end of each interpretation process, we can deal with ideas and hypotheses regarding past landscapes inside visual spatial systems, where, in interactive sessions, we could select and gather together all available data, interconnecting it in the same cyberspace, and define constants and stable properties. Thanks to the selection of these constants it is possible to classify and order objects in categories, eliminating those not pertinent, in a continuous battle between complexity and classification.

Probably in the near future a new generation of VR applications, as virtual shared dynamic environments, will contribute to the development of this field, offering new solutions for different data integration, and multidisciplinary collaborative work for more reliable reconstructions.

## **.B.2 Digital Pipeline**

With the continuous evolution of technologies, applications in the field of Virtual Archaeology are increasing. Some of them seem to be driven simply by an interest in a specific technology (in a top-down approach); others by the consideration of a single typology of sources (in a bottom-up approach). Nevertheless, we should consider those that provide outstanding results, trying to bring them as much as possible into a single pipeline.

Ancient landscape, in its archaeological and geo-spatial dimension, is a complex topic to deal with, to analyze and reconstruct, not just for the archaeological interpretative process, but also for computer science. That's why



it is viewed from a variety of perspectives, involving anthropology, archaeology, computer science, history, architecture, geography, topography, and geology. Moreover it requires the reconstruction of a virtual ecosystem, with its environment and its multiple relations and interconnections. Virtual Reality applications can be successfully used for its exploration and interaction, and also for its creation itself. To obtain a coherent result, this process needs to be carefully defined by a *digital pipeline*, since it requires the interconnection of several methodologies, formats, software, inputs and outputs.

A digital pipeline is an explicit definition of all digital processes and sub-processes involved. It can be a flow-chart representation, a guidelines document or a simple drawing. The main issue is that it should be shared by all the teams involved in the project. It is commonly divided into principal activities, such as “acquisition”, “post-processing” and “reconstruction”. It includes a list of software and hardware used in all the activities. It should also include import/export formats. Connection lines can be drawn between sequences of activities in order to clarify which formats are needed, together with specifications and requirements connected to the final use of the reconstruction (table 1.2). Spending some time in the initial phase of a project on pipeline definition, helps save a lot of time in case of mistakes or difficulties, cropping up at the end. Many common problems can be easily avoided in this way, such as: differences in geographic coordinate systems or projections, the wrong level of simplification or optimization of 3d models, naming mismatching, not supported file format, etc.

*Table 1.2 - Digital pipeline.tif*

In the case of landscape reconstruction, the process is usually focused on the acquisition of four categories of data:

- I Digital Terrain Models (DTM),
- II geospatial imagery (Geoimages),
- III vector thematic layers, representing interpretative levels,
- IV other thematic layers (3d models) representing the natural and anthropic aspects of the landscape: monuments, forests, crops, etc.

DTM and Geoimages are essential components in the creation of the three-dimensional terrain model and in the definition of analysis dedicated to potential landscape reconstruction. To these data, we should eventually add also metadata and multimedia information.

A Digital Elevation Model (DEM) is “a digital and mathematical representation of an existing or virtual object and its environment. It is a generic concept that

may refer to elevation of ground but also to any layer above” . DTM, Digital Terrain Model, is generally used as referred specifically and “limited to ground elevation”, providing information about elevation of any points on ground (KASSER AND EGELS 2002:160-161). DSM, Digital Surface Model, is an elevation model that represents the highest available elevation of each points (top of trees or of houses for instance). These digital elevation data can have three data structures: (1) regular grids, (2) triangulated irregular networks, and (3) contours, depending on the source and/or method of analysis<sup>2</sup>.

The pipeline starts with “mapping” activity, acquisition of information regarding the archaeological landscape (Chapter 3). The creation of a GIS project accompanies this activity, constituting the spatial base of the entire process. It is essential to take into account the spatial dimension of all the data: geospatial images, historical maps, any vector information on archaeological sites or remains, plans, and so on. Even 3d models, acquired on the field with different techniques (such as photogrammetry, 3d scanning and so on) should be connected to geospatial information (georeferenced plans, the georeferenced centre of the model).

Although mapping technologies are becoming more and more efficient in terms of speed and accuracy (a scanner laser can acquire an entire area of a territory with sub-millimetric resolution, in accordance with the chosen instrument, in very short time), the longest part of the work is surely that carried out in the lab (“post-processing” activities: Chapter 3). Here raw data are downloaded and processed in order to obtain a first digital prototype of models: the terrain model, the 3d model of a monument, plans, etc. At the end, single elements of the archaeological landscape are ready to be visualised, interactively or otherwise, further analysed, or become part of a collaborative environment. Ancient landscape reconstruction starts at this point (Chapter 4 and 7).

Along the pipeline, there are some characteristics that should be stored, while carrying on the activities, since they influence the final result:

- acquisition method,
- processing method,
- data resolution,
- accuracy,
- reconstruction reliability level,

---

2 Square-grid digital elevation models have some disadvantages: the size of the grid mesh often affect the quality of the results, not handling abrupt changes in elevation. TINs are based on triangular elements (facets) with vertices at the sample points, usually constructed with Delauney triangulation. They are quite efficient because the density of the triangles can be varied to match the roughness of the terrain. The third structure divides landscapes into small, irregularly shaped polygons (elements) based on contour lines. Good reviews of digital elevation data sources and data structures are presented by Carter 1988, Weibel and Heller 1991, and I. D. Moore et al. 1991

- sources references,
- institution and team member in charge.

### **.B.3        Scale, level of detail, accuracy, and reliability**

The result of a reconstruction is necessarily connected and conditioned by the scale, the level of detail, the accuracy and reliability of available data (input) and processed data (outputs). It can be conducted, in fact, even on a single level, such as the local level (site, intra-site, farm, single field, etc.) project level (inter-site, settlement), or regional level. Each level requires different kinds of survey, different acquisitions, different resolutions, and produces different outputs: from a very detailed reconstruction of the local level, to the semi-detailed or reconnaissance level (FAO, 1985) of the regional level.

Each measurement and acquisition is in fact limited in accordance with the instrument and the method we are using.

The *scale* is commonly related, in cartography, to the ratio or relationship between a distance or area on a map and the corresponding distance or area on the ground, commonly expressed as a fraction or ratio, but it is also used to indicate the degree of detail or content represented, i.e. in a GIS. Scale refers to the “level of spatio-temporal” representation in archaeology. With the current use of digital cartography and GIS, which are substituting the limits imposed by the printed map, this concept (spatio-temporal scaling) is also opening new methodological problems . Any representation of the landscape, indeed, is linked to the level of accuracy and resolution in available data: any further analysis, therefore, should be very careful over stating “absolute” results. When we move then from GIS to the realm of Virtual Reality, even greater care should be taken, since in VR the accuracy level may be very difficult to define (LOCK 2000: xix-xii).

Accuracy and precision are used when a measurement instrument is evaluated. “Any measurement system involves errors that can be roughly divided in systematic and random errors. Each type of error originates a corresponding wrong behavior which is identified as *accuracy* and *uncertainty* (or *precision*), respectively” (GUIDI REMONDINO ET ALII 2008: 60)

*Accuracy* is connected to the quality of the obtained *results*, while *precision* relates to the *quality* of the *operation* by which the results are obtained. Precision concerns the reproducibility of an acquisition done several times on the same sample (ARTIOLA PEPPER BRUSSEAU 2004: 19-20). In spatial systems accuracy concerns the level of data correctness in accordance with some agreed-upon level of precision in the coordinate system in use.

*Resolution* is the amount of spatial detail that can be observed. It is the minimal mapping unit for vector data and the dimensions of the pixel (or cell) for raster data. In satellite images, the spatial resolution can vary “by order of magnitude,

(such as Spot of 10 meters, Ikonos of 1 meter). There is also a *temporal resolution* that is the minimum duration of an event that can be observed. *Thematic resolution* refers to the precision of the measurements of the attributes, it can depend upon a measuring device or the number of categories. *Spectral resolution* refers to the number, spacing and width of wavelength bands of electromagnetic energy that a sensor can detect (ARON GLASS 2001:85-86).

3d photogrammetry (imaged based semi automatic)	> = 1 cm
3d Laser scanner	< 7 mm
DGPS dual frequency	< 1 cm
DGPS with Racal satellite correction	< 25 cm

Table 1.3

*Consistency* is to the *absence of contradiction* in the data, in terms of space, time and theme, while *completeness* regards the absence of missing information.

*Reliability* concerns to what extent a reconstruction can be called correct, in accordance with resources used (historical, archaeological, etc.), input data accuracy and resolutions, the processing method followed (level of simplification, etc.), and scientific method applied.

## **.B.4 Virtual Archaeology: state of the art**

Virtual Archaeology, in the definition of Maurizio Forte, regards the reconstructive digital archaeology, computational epistemology, and the reconstruction of three-dimensional archaeological ecosystems (FORTE 2000, FORTE 2007: 8). Although it was originally used for 3d computer models of ancient buildings and artefacts (REILLY 1990: 133-139), the concept goes beyond the simple digital treatment of archaeological data, since it is related to the increased value of the information. The reconstruction of ancient landscape, although it has a wide perspective, is part of Virtual Archaeology.

Within this specific field, in the last 15 years there have been several examples. Unfortunately we cannot obtain a complete list, since most of these projects have been developed inside research groups, seen by just a limited number of specialists.

Nevertheless, I've started to create an archive of virtual archaeology projects<sup>3</sup>, analysing papers presented during well-known conferences in the field and published in the proceedings, such as CAA (Computer Application in Archaeology), VSMM (Virtual Systems and MultiMedia), VAST (Virtual

3 This work is still in progress and so has not yet been published

Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage conferences), Eurographics, SIGGRAPH and so on. Other projects have been found during Internet searches inside institutions web-pages. While awaiting a serious, scientific repository, I will try to summarize some results on projects regarding landscape reconstruction, emerging from the research. In table 1.4 are described the parameters taken into account.

The projects examined have various aims and follow a variety of methodologies. Some of them regard the construction of models and algorithms to understand the territory better, and reconstruct it better. This is the case, for instance, of the reconstruction of landscape evolution and cultural transformation at Durres, Albania (SANTORO MONTI 2003), which followed a geospatial analytic approach; the reconstruction of the territory and its catchment limits, during medieval times, at Jure Vetere (Calabria, Italy: fig. 1.1), through the application of a *Cost Surface Analysis* algorithm (FONSECA ROUBIS SOGLIANI 2007: 87-132, SOGLIANI et alii 2008); the stratigraphic landscape reconstruction in Daunia, carried on by the University of Foggia with the project Itinera and the creation of a VR environment “Time Machine” (DE FELICE ET ALII 2007: fig. 1.2).

Figure 1.1 [territorio jure-329Gabellone.jpg]

Figure 1.2 [TM-abbando2 copia.jpg]

Some projects have a stronger ecological approach, for example in the case of the study and reconstruction of ancient woodlands in Hungary (SZABÓ 2005; SZABÓ MÜLLEROVÁ 2008), or in the Ca' Tron project (fig. 1.3) where archaeologists, geologists and botanists have worked together to reconstruct 20,000 years of history (BONDESAN ET ALII 2009). In some cases, interactive applications have been developed to enable a wider public to access cultural knowledge, inside physical museums or on line, as with the “Narrative Museum of Appia archaeological Park”, the “Virtual Museum of the Ancient Via Flaminia” (fig. 1.4) and “Virtual Rome” projects (Appendix A).

Figure 1.3 [CaTron\_Rom\_ovile\_ok.tif]

Figure 1.4 [flaminia\_landscape.jpg]

Although it is a simplification, we can divide projects into two main kinds of applications: “GIS-oriented” and “VR-oriented”. GIS-oriented projects are developed mainly by archaeologists, historians, geographers, geologists and

ecologists. The products are used for the visualisation of scientific results aimed at the scientific community, for knowledge dissemination, and, in some cases, for preventive and predictive archaeology. Examples of products are geospecific GIS, webGIS and repositories, drawings and digital images, paper and traditional publications and videos. Tools commonly used are GIS software, database, terrain generators or ecosystem generators (Appendix B). VR-oriented projects are mainly built by computer scientists, architects or designers interested in landscape, and the computer-game industry; only rarely by archaeologists, art historians or artists. The products are mainly used for scientific visualisation or entertainment, although there are also some examples in the field of collaborative environments (CVE) (Chapter 7). These projects are based on: advanced 3d programming, massive use of computer-graphic and 3d tools for off-line or on-line interaction; in some cases game engines (Torque, OGRE, Quake engine, Unreal, etc.) authoring platforms for VR and games creation (VirTools DEV, Unity 3d, etc.), 3d graphics toolkits (OpenSceneGraph, OpenSG, etc) or social network platforms (Second Life, Active Worlds). They are more oriented to small-medium scale projects, more than to a wider scale (large territories). Examples of products are: videos (interactive or not-interactive), multimedia, VR application on line and off line.

Parameters	Sub parameters
GIS based or geospatiality	<i>In input; In output; in input and output; none</i>
Three-dimensionality of final results	
Interactivity	<i>Interpretation process; Resulting application; Research or/and dissemination purposes.</i>
Web-based	<i>Research process/resulting application</i>
Collaborative environment and networking	<i>On line/Off line</i>
Final results availability and accessibility	<i>On line/off line; publication/multimedia/VR</i>
Sources availability	
Acquisition methods availability and accessibility	
Processing methods availability and accessibility	

Table 1.4

## .B.5 Conclusions

As we have seen, the approach to landscape reconstruction is absolutely multiple. Landscape reconstruction is a complex process that includes tools for analysis, interpretation, visualisation and communication. It concerns the reconstruction at different levels: the archaeological landscape, mapscape, mindscape and webscape.

There are many interesting projects, but in most cases they are known only at a local or national level. Even in the case of international publications, final results remain rather unknown, often confined inside laboratories or research groups. For this reason, there are projects which develop the same topics. Transparency therefore is still a long way off in terms of commonly, applied scientific practice. Although almost every project has underlined the importance of multidisciplinary approach, there are few examples of data sharing or collaborative environment. Three-dimensional visualisation is considered, by researchers themselves, useful mainly: for the presentation of scientific results, to enhance the general interest in archaeological research, to communicate contents that facilitate interpretation or the grasping of ancient territory distribution for visitors. The E-learning perspective is also considered in the creation of virtual worlds for immersive facilities or for web based learning environments. The 3d interactive visualisation of reconstructed landscapes is also felt to be important to attract the attention of cultural authorities. There is also an increasing awareness over considering 3d and VR applications as useful for research, if aimed at exploring and studying past living spaces through virtual and simulation models, or at developing perceptual analyses and alternative modes of appreciating and constructing places.

I put forward some useful guidelines at this point that will be further discussed in the book, ten golden rules for ancient landscape reconstruction:

1. Use scientific methods, while defining your digital pipeline
2. Acquire all available archaeological, historical, architectonic but also environmental information (a multidisciplinary approach is required)
3. Start mapping the contemporary archaeological landscape, then work on interpretation, and finally propose a hypothesis on potential landscape reconstruction
4. Consider the spatial and temporal dimension of all data (2d and 3d)
5. Consider relations among data, objects, sites, etc.
6. Organize your data in a structured way (database, GIS etc.): get used to annotation during the acquisition, interpretation and reconstruction phases
7. Use an open approach: landscape reconstruction is a never-ending process. Use open standards and formats as much as you can: landscape reconstruction is a collective process and you probably need to share data, information and results
8. Make use of virtual spatial systems
9. Practice observation, comparisons and critical debates to correct or improve your reconstructions
10. Use Internet and publish your results in a transparent way





## Chapter 2

### Interpretation and Reconstruction

#### .B.1 Vision, interpretation, and knowledge

Interpretation comes from the Latin *intēprete(m)*, whose meaning is originally 'intermediary' or 'mediator'. In fact it consists of *inter* (in the middle) and *pretium* (price) (CORTELLAZZO ZOLLI 1999). Interpretation plays an important role in the cognitive process, because it creates a link, a bridge between vision and knowledge, among archaeological findings, observations or sources and knowledge.

Landscape reconstruction final output is a visual result: the reconstruction or reconstructions. It is therefore a visual activity. In addition, it is a product of our brain and must follow its laws. Although an archaeological reconstruction is commonly labelled “dangerous” by scholars since it freezes one personal vision of the world, shaping it as the real truth, without possessing enough data, we will see that this is inaccurate, first of all from a neurobiological point of view.

How do we acquire knowledge of the world? This is a central issue in the process of analysing available information and producing reliable interpretation, in order to obtain a better knowledge of the past. As we have seen in the previous chapter, *we observe to obtain a knowledge of the world*. The world around us is complex, because of the quantity of information, but also because of the speed this information changes. We must survive without going mad, keeping what we need. Our brain's activity is continuously focused on the identification of constant characteristics. It is essential, in fact, to classify what we see into categories, in order to understand. The classification takes place in three separate processes: *selection*, *exclusion* and *comparison*. We select constant properties from different variable information, then we eliminate what is not relevant and finally we compare it with what is already visually registered in our brain (ZEKI 1999: 4-23). Even a philosopher such as Gregory Bateson has defined the process of knowledge acquisition as an activity of comparison among differences (BATESON 1972).

We can build reconstruction of the landscape that can really help the acquisition of knowledge about our past. The use of vision is extremely useful in the extraction of essential information from the quantity of available data. The landscape itself is a perfect example of inconstancy: it is continuously changing. The attempt to define its essential characteristics, selecting constant elements, opens up a more durable interpretation of reality (ZEKI 1999: 28).

From a neurological point of view, the discoveries of the last thirty years have changed what we know about our brain and about the way it works. At the

beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century scientists like Henschen and Flechsig developed a theory which distinguished a main area of the brain, devoted to vision - interpreted as passive and primitive activity - and a second area around it, known as the "associative cortex", devoted to understanding - an active task -, obtained from the association of the received image (main area) and other images stored in this second area. In this first approach, passive observation was distinguished from active interpretation (FLECHSIG, 1907: 75-89). Recently, new observations have changed this theory. It is quite accepted today that there is a main area, known as V1 or "primary visual cortex" and located in the bottom left hemisphere of the brain, whose function is vision, and several distinct areas around it (V2, V3, etc.), committed to specific visual aspects, such as: *shape, colour, movement, depth* and *relation*. The entire observation process is therefore an active task, starting from vision itself, since it is a selective activity, defining essential characteristics (ZEKI 1999: 38). While we are watching a scene, we are already making choices, selecting constant aspects, referring to the shape, the colour and also to the *relation* among objects, situations or concepts.

Maps are perfect examples of the representation of essentiality, as they are built after a process of observation, selection and exclusion. Interpreted landscape should make use of interactive maps, exploiting their power to create mapscape. A useful constant concerns the identification of similar characteristics, common to a variety of situations, which can help to define a *representative condition*, called by neurologists "situational constant" (ZEKI 1999: 41). A mapscape is a depiction, a description of a representative landscape, a simultaneous representation of many realities, valid for most cases. Furthermore, it can really help in the interpretation process, proposing various potential visions. *Ambiguity* in this sense becomes a positive aspect, since it lies in the presentation of many different visions that contribute to the interpretation. A mapscape is also an interactive vision. Through the connection to sources and data it acts as a bridge between observation and knowledge, as an interpretation space.

How reliable is a reconstruction?

We should say that every interpretation uses the "comparison" with what is already stored in our brain. It is therefore intrinsically *personal*, since it is based on previous knowledge. Many archaeological interpretative processes are commonly considered subjective, since they depend on the skill of the interpreter, their experience and training. But they are subjective firstly in another sense: they are part of a personal process. Moreover, there is no uniquely "true" situation or correct answer. Nevertheless, what we have described may grant that the visualisation of reconstructions isn't restrictive. Virtual reconstructions should be striven for to obtain constants and permanent

shapes from multiple situations, an essential representative vision, reaching for a greater awareness (SCHOPENHAUER 1819: §38). Virtual Reality can represent the world in an essential shape, with such *intensity* and evidence that it can be considered as reality itself.

The use in the reconstructions of *ordinary* situations, ordinary characters, ordinary and not specific objects can contribute to maintain this ambiguity and representativeness. Ambiguity drives a user to put new questions, activating connections with previously stored information or stimulating to find new answers from new data.

Another neurological trick that enables a more effective interpretation is the “*unfinished*”, an *implicit constant*. Artists such as Michelangelo left many pieces of art unfinished, revealing the power of multiplicity; the observer participates in the work with his imagination, adapting different concepts and representations of his mind (SCHULZ 1975: 366-373, ZEKI 1999: 48). In this sense a reconstruction can be considered close to art, when it helps interpretation with the power of *evocation*, widening its horizons and its cognitive potential. Observing that reconstruction, we should be able to acquire information of the represented categories. Nevertheless, we should also remember that any represented objects cannot substitute the incredible wealth and complexity of a brain representation.

Reconstructions should present, if possible, *detailed* visualisations. The brain is interested in details, aiming to bring them into a more general scheme. But images are stored in our brain if they are recognized. Memory is connected to the temporal cortex and to the several specialized areas of the brain, above mentioned. Probably the specialization of these areas (the identification of colours, shapes, etc.) contributes to the memorization and the cognitive process (LOGOTHETIS et alii, 1995: 552-565).

In this perspective, the use of a *cybernetic* approach, which takes into account the complexity, will help to maintain a detailed visualisation.

The word “cybernetics” was introduced by the mathematician Norbert Wiener in 1948<sup>4</sup>. It comes from the Greek word *kybernetes* (steersman, governor). It was introduced as a way to solve a military problem: how to create an efficient anti-aircraft mechanism for artillery, capable of hitting a moving object (such as an aeroplane)? The required system had to take the trajectory into consideration, but also predict any possible irregular changes in its position, integrating a feedback mechanism for a continuous correction in accordance with its real-time behaviour. The problem therefore was the management of

---

4 Norbert Wiener (1948), *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*, (Hermann & Cie Editeurs, Paris, The Technology Press, Cambridge, Mass., John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1948).

complex situations in a future perspective.

Immoderate simplification can preclude a real understanding, and it is in this sense that complexity should be taken into account. The goal in fact isn't, again, the impossible reproduction of past realities, but a contribution to their interpretation, through the construction of models of the past. A technique that in the future will be increasingly adopted for this purpose is procedural modelling. It uses and develops algorithms for producing environments, using shape grammar, starting from a set of rules that can be part of the algorithms and also modifiable through parameters. An example applied to Roman architecture and the procedural generation of Roman cities has been applied successfully. In this test case, the Roman city of Pompeii was completely reconstructed, using a "shape grammar" (called CGA shape), with the production of rules that evolve, creating more and more details (fig.2.1). An advantage of this method is that the hierarchical structure and the annotation of the models can be reused, creating different procedural variations (MULLER et alii, 2006)

Figure 2.1 – cap2\_fig1b.jpg

Dynamic, chaotic and not linear systems, based on neural networks algorithms, can be used to build very complex environments which can evolve, independently from initial conditions. Neural networks, as explored by the mathematician and pioneer of chaos theory Edward Lorenz, can be very useful to deal with complex systems and to build relations. Today there are also new approaches which can be applied even to landscape reconstruction. While at the beginning scientists were much more interested in finding a way to create a replica of the human mind, today studies are more focused on the development of *relations*. There are new generations of neural networks, known as *smart adaptive systems*, that can better represent dynamic scenarios, continuously changing. These systems are built to adapt themselves to an evolving (over time, space, etc.) environment, recognizing changes and reacting accordingly, but they are also designed to answer problems very familiar to those who work in the field of landscape archaeology: is it possible to build a system, starting from very little information, through incremental learning?<sup>5</sup>.

Some projects on *Artificial Life* (AL) are trying to answer this question. AL is the discipline which is in charge of creating organisms and systems, that might be considered alive if found in nature (TURKLE 1997:174). One of the first applications, known as "the blind watchmaker", was developed by Richard

---

5 See EUNITE - the European Network of Excellence on Intelligent Technologies for Smart Adaptive Systems which from 2001 is working on the field (<http://www.eunite.org>)

Dawkins, while others have been created as computer simulations of nature development, such as “Tierra”, created by Thomas Ray in the early 1990s, or “SimLife”, a sort of ecological virtual system and genetic game. These simulations can be really challenging, to understand better how natural realms work.

*Genetic algorithms* represent another example of artificial intelligence, since they are built to include different variables, each one representing the solution to a problem. These algorithms create several *similar* solutions, maintaining some basic characteristics. They have no auto-organisation, although they evolve in different ways, maintaining some essential basic characteristics. In the near future, I believe they could be successfully applied also to the reconstruction of Ancient Potential Landscape, since they seem to be very powerful means of enhancing explanation and communication. A good example of the application of such an approach is the so-called *Generative Art*. Generative Art creates artificial digital objects whose common characteristic is that they have the same “genetic code” (fig. 2.2). We can say that in these kinds of artworks what is stored are the essential characteristics of objects. As the artist Celestino Soddu states, a generative project is a concept-software that works producing three-dimensional non-repeatable events as possible expressions of the generating idea identified by the designer as a subjective proposal of a possible world (SODDU 1991).

Fig. 2.2 – CelestinoSoddu\_generazioneCittaMedievali.jpg

Some scientists have applied artificial intelligence to sciences more related to landscape archaeology. Lovelock and later Margulis have developed the *Gaia Hypothesis*, defining the earth as a huge single organism that can self-regulate<sup>6</sup>. All the components (organic and inorganic elements) of the earth are strictly connected and can be thought of as one organism, a single system in which many retro-action rings keep chemical and physical conditions stable, thanks to an automatic control for example of the global temperature, transforming it into an inhabitable place to live. All the components normally evolve together: life maintains conditions suitable for its own survival<sup>7</sup>. Lately other scientists suggested that this auto-organisation can modify evolution speed, and this can be seen by a progressive increase of complexity. Although we live in a chaotic

6 James Lovelock, 2006, *The Revenge of Gaia: Why the Earth Is Fighting Back - and How We Can Still Save Humanity*. Santa Barbara (California); Lynn Margulis, 1982, *Early Life*, Science Books International, Margulis, Lynn, 1998, *Symbiotic Planet: A New Look at Evolution*, Basic Books, Margulis, Lynn and Eduardo Punset, eds., 2007 *Mind, Life and Universe: Conversations with Great Scientists of Our Time*, Sciencewriters Books

7 <http://www.gaiatheory.org>

and not casual system, where does the organisation we see everywhere around us and inside us come from? Complexity generates very much of the order of the natural world. Selection then acts to further refine it. Every system is in the middle between chaos and order, at the boundary (KAUFMANN 1995). The interpretation of ancient landscape should take into account organised and chaotic elements and it should consider schematic and evolutionary approaches since a successful exploration of our past lies in a sort of transition between order and disorder. We will often have to consider, for example, how a population has shaped its territory. Even in this case, we should know that communities that have not limited themselves to the exploration of a territory, and arrive at more remote areas, will find better and more stable conditions. We often face the problem of neighbouring communities (some GIS analysis, such as Thiessen Polygons, involves the identification of areas of influence), where a co-evolutionary approach should be considered: “in co-evolving systems, each partner clambers up its fitness landscape toward fitness peaks, even as that landscape is constantly deformed by adaptive moves of its co-evolutionary partners” (KAUFFMAN 1995: 20-27).

The way we work on the interpretation of our past has changed in the last century. Computers allow us to manage complex systems and a large quantity of information together, which was impossible to handle before. The continuous and rapid access to different information opens up new perspectives in the knowledge of ancient landscape, but it can also be “dangerous”, since it hides the risk of superficiality. In the simulation era, understanding depends upon exploration and upon personal paths, not just upon analysis. In the continuous navigation from one piece of information to another, we might stop at the vision of the surface, viewing the word as a collection of signifiers with no meaning. The risk of being manipulated by our simulations should be considered in the rapid and multidisciplinary access to information, for a greater awareness of research contributions (TURKLE 1997).

Another aspect highlighted by researchers such as Maturana and Varela is the concept of *autopoiesis* (MATURANA VARELA 1980). This new approach can give useful suggestions also in our case, since it stresses the prominence of *relationship*, rather than properties of living elements. The analysis of relations should necessarily follow that of separate characteristics and properties.

## **.B.2 Interpretation: a theoretically explicit scientific approach**

Reconstructing ancient landscapes is an interpretative and open process, where science, but also imagination and art, are important. Its value lies in its reliability, in the process of available data analysis through an explicit methodology (the scientific approach) and an interpretation process

(imagination – art). As Schopenhauer stated, the most important things should always be left to the *imagination* (SCHOPENHAUER 1819: § 34).

It is, moreover, an open process, since each "interpretative cycle" leads to the production of new data, observations, and analysis.

Landscape reconstruction doesn't just produce a "communicative" result for an end-user. More or less realistic and immersive visualisation inside territories and meta-territories can be considered part of the research activity. And this is thanks to interaction and transparency potentiality. Communication is integrated *in* the research process of interpretation, when it is used, for instance, to test theories. Chris Langton is considered the founder of Artificial Life (ALife), director of the Santa Fe institute in New Mexico. He worked on developing programs that evolve autonomously in the computer. He creates communities of individuals who initially learn some basic rules and then evolve autonomous ways. Langton tried to recreate "*life as it could be*" and not "*life as it is*", opening up to the reconstruction of its potentiality (LANGTON 1989).

Also ancient landscape can be considered an ecosystem, a complex system that needs interdisciplinarity and integration (of data, tools, formats, etc.) to be engaged in. It is strongly connected to space, time and relation concepts. It is something more than a simple "object" that needs to be reconstructed. It is a dynamic system whose aspects, whose creation and evolution are connected with each other, and depends upon geomorphology, climate characteristics, altimetry, anthropic modifications, and also cognitive and perception aspects.

In this perspective, each analysis and interpretation that takes into account the territory, should consider the spatial dimension of all data as fundamental. Moreover, it should start with mapping the existing archaeological landscape. Without the archaeological and observed landscape, in fact, it won't be possible to get essential information on ancient landscape reconstruction.

We started working on these concepts in the project of the "Virtual Museum of ancient *via Flaminia*". The aim was the realisation of a multi-user VR application regarding an archaeological landscape, in northern Rome, crossed during Roman times by the road *via Flaminia*. Although the final result of the project was a public installation inside a museum, with evident communication priorities, the reconstruction process of the landscape was based on a serious interpretative work, based on a GIS project, on the processing of all available data, on raster map analysis and on new data definition. At the end of the process, inside the reconstructed landscape, high resolution 3d models of archaeological sites have been integrated (fig. 2.4; Appendix A).

The reconstruction of Bologna during Roman Times has been another project following the same direction. Archaeological urban landscape has been first

created and used as reference for the reconstruction of Roman geomorphology (potential landscape), based on all available archaeological excavations. The simulated geomorphology has then been used to perform further GIS analysis on the potential hydrography and on the use of urban space (Fig. 2.3; PESCARIN 2002).

*[Figure 2.3: Bononia.tif]*

In the case of the Via Flaminia project the aim was to reconstruct the actual archaeological landscape, but also the ancient potential landscape. The work was carried out in a wider perspective, with the idea of analysing also a possible and more general method to reconstruct ancient landscapes, through the use of a formal explicit process and of a series of connected "algorithms". The reason for this approach was the idea of defining an open process, where observations and assumptions could be controlled step by step, and where it was possible to modify, almost automatically, the final result, as initial input data changed (modifications, new introductions). At the end, a VR application based on final outputs of such a process was used to test the hypothesis, working with interpretations. A variety of tools were used to obtain inter-disciplinarity, reliability and updatability. Although reliability depends strictly upon available data (quality/quantity), the creation of an updatable system was connected to the method used.

The final and accepted result was then used and implemented inside the MultiUser Virtual Reality application, created appositely inside a new room of the Roman National Museum at the Diocletian Thermal Baths in Rome.

*[fig. 2.4 \_fig05.tif]*

Ancient landscape reconstruction is achieved through various phases: the reconstruction of the archaeological landscape, of the ecological attitude, of interpreted landscapes and the reconstruction of ancient potential landscapes.

In the case of historical landscapes, through the study of the ecological attitude of a territory it is possible to reconstruct classes and related sub-categories, such as woodlands and agricultural lands (mainly for cereals, vineyards and olive trees, but also pasture) (DI FIDIO 1990: 215, VOLPE ARNOLDUS HUYZENDVELD 2005, DRAMSTAD OLSON FORMAN 1996, CHIUSOLI 1999). In order to obtain these classes, spatial analyses should be carried out on different raster grids. At the end what we obtain are vector layers, that can be further modified during following processing. These layers can be used as input in 3d terrain generation software and VR application development.



Although uncertainty is part of archaeologist's daily life, the importance of scientific method is quite evident. A scientific approach allows reliable analysis and reconstruction, with the final goal of getting to know new elements, propose new explanations, generate criticism and discussion, and correct/emend existing data, thus providing a positive impetus to research. The definition of an accurate and consistent representation of ancient landscape is an open and collective process which allows us to formulate an interpretation model of past landscape. Ancient landscape cannot be considered real or true, but we can work on the potential landscape, to be thought of as an open process, each time closer to the truth, with continuous approximations. The creation of potential landscapes will be further described in Chapter 4.

Table 2.1 proposes an example of how the scientific approach can be used, as referred to a Roman landscape. The initial input was how the landscape should have appeared, during the early Imperial period, in the *suburbium* (the area outside the city). This question was then subdivided into sub-problems easier to solve: such as the identification of Roman vegetation, of climate conditions for that period and latitude, of anthropic elements (archaeological sites and remains excavated or surveyed or predicted in archaeological maps), of cultural elements (funerary habits, and so on). The archaeological landscape was reconstructed, a GIS project developed, and vector information overlaid.

Scientific Method	Scientific Method in Landscape Archaeology	Steps in Roman potential landscape reconstruction
1. Identification of significant question	Identification of significant question	What did the Roman Landscape look like during the early Imperial age?
1B. Subdivision into sub-questions	Subdivision into sub-questions	Type of vegetation, of climate, of anthropic or cultural elements?
2. Collection of information and main data	Collection of information (published, ancient sources, on the field) and main data. Georeferencing	Distribution of archaeological sites; paleo-botanic analysis; geological analysis, etc.
3. Definition of a hypothesis that could explain the question	Definition of a hypothesis that could explain the question: reconstruction of ecological attitude of the territory and integration of anthropic	Ancient landscape can be defined by potential landscape and anthropic/cultural modification; how can theory formation be simplified with algorithms?

	and cultural elements.	
4. Hypothesis or explanation testing	Testing with VR 3d tools Tools of Virtual Reality enabling us to carry out further verification and observations	3d terrain generation, main ecosystems, anthropic elements; implementation in 3d real-time engine for testing in 3d.
5. Testing of hypothesis	Testing of hypothesis even with VR tools for further observations	Terrains 3d generation, main ecosystems; anthropic elements; implementing in a real time engine
6. Acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis	Get back to previous step for further work and new tests	Get back to GIS project and re-implementing of new data also in the 3d engine
7. Theory definition	Definition of possible theories on the reconstruction of ancient landscape	Reliable reconstruction of ancient landscape
8. Experimenting, test of the theory and acceptance or rejection	Theory verification on other landscapes and other data. Accept, modification or rejection	Use of the same algorithm with other case studies
9. Results published and data validation through peer review mechanism	Results published through traditional scientific publications, the web and other open tools	Results published in scientific publications and publication of results over the web through VR webGIS open source application

Table 2.1

The archaeological landscape can be employed during “interpretative sessions” involving archaeologists, computer scientists, geologists and botanists. Interactive 3d and 2d tools might be used for this purpose, such as VR systems, webGIS and VR webGIS. New thematic layers are then defined so as to identify main landscape classes (such as vegetation, hydrography, roads, etc.). These classes represent specific sub-questions, valid in a certain historical period, latitude, climate, geomorphology, etc. Each time a new set of data is created (specific DTM, farming terrains, potential land use maps, hydrography, location of archaeological sites, etc.) it is also tested inside a 3d or shared environment, where verification and observations are carried out from "inside"

and are employed to create further analysis (new areas of interest, predictive maps, etc.). At the end of the process 3d terrains and main ecosystems are generated, then implemented in a 3d real time application obtaining a final result. If the entire process is formalized and discretized, through the implementation of single analytic algorithms, connected to each other, it is possible to have a different final result each time initial inputs change or are modified (fig. 2.5). Despite the solid confidence that emerges from the application of this process, it *should* be said that every hypothesis can be discussed and demonstrated as false. Nevertheless, as Popper observed in 1934, a hypothesis *should be counterfeitable*, and a theory cannot be called scientific if it doesn't admit the possibility of being demonstrated as false. Theoretically, in fact, it should be always possible to make an observation that can demonstrate that the theory is false, even if this observation hasn't yet been made (POPPER 1934).

[fig. 2.5 *alternative\_landscapes.tif*

After the phases described, it is possible to obtain a more general theory, a self-consistent explanation of the initial question, based on a valid hypothesis. The definition of a theory helps to trace the new predictions for further testing

At the end, it is also essential to publish results, for validation by the scientific community through peer-review mechanisms, even using digital publications or more advanced interactive systems. Unfortunately, in the humanities it is almost impossible to define “general laws” and to get to definitive interpretations, without any uncertainty. Also for this reason archaeologists tend to postpone this moment as long as possible, although if we consider the development of research in a broader and collective sense, it would be better to take greater care over documentation production and results sharing (PESCARIN 2006: 137-155).

### **.B.3 Conclusions**

Every reconstruction is the result of an objective and subjective process at the same time. Final results' transparency of interpretation, therefore, visible through simulation and reconstruction models, is obtained through interactivity and an open approach (PESCARIN 2006, FORTE PESCARIN 2007).

Following a scientific approach, maintaining as much as possible the detail, can help in overpass risks and the limits of virtual reality simulations.

The work done in recent years by the Virtual Heritage community has demonstrated that the convergence of different disciplines in landscape archaeology can bring about a more efficient, valid study of the territory,

providing at the same time new interpretation keys of ancient landscape.

This convergence also allows a more appropriate and aware use of available technologies, using and modifying them in accordance with requirements.

The projects described can demonstrate how far ancient landscape reconstruction can go, and how reliable and valid they can be, if based on an explicit interpretation process (PESCARIN RUZZA 2004, GUIDAZZOLI ET ALII 2004, PESCARIN 2000, PESCARIN 2001, PESCARIN ET ALII 2007, PESCARIN 2007, FORTE, PESCARIN, PIETRONI 2005: 79-92, FORTE ET ALII 2006.).

### **Chapter 3**

## **Archaeological landscapes reconstruction: mapping the space**

Every project concerning ancient landscape reconstruction should start from the archaeological landscape, that is the contemporary landscape, considered in its diachronic dimension, consisting of monuments, sites, scattered remains, signs of agriculture, natural characteristics and so on. It is therefore necessary to start “mapping the space”.

As we outlined in chapter one, the archaeological landscape is made up of several elements (natural, anthropic material and immaterial, etc.) and by the relations which connect these elements.

The reconstruction process does not involve only “visible” aspects (reality-based reconstruction), but also “invisible” ones, such as cultural and relational aspects, or all those elements that might be deduced in the interpretation process or discovered with the use of specific technologies. In the past, any visualisation was “restricted” by its scale: objects beyond a certain threshold, unable to be represented on a map, were drawn at a certain scale. Moreover, the territorial scale was usually treated separately from the intra-site scale. Sites or monuments were often reconstructed as single detailed monographic studies, rarely even placed in relation to their absolute geographical dimension (see chapter 1). Also in terms of computing capabilities, the two realms, territory and site, were treated separately in an attempt to solve the various problems arising, and in developing different technologies to acquire them. Today, there is increasing interest in a sort of “global” integration, driven also by the technical capabilities of new hardware and software: terrestrial and aerial 3d scanners, the developed potential of photogrammetric applications, the accuracy of new cameras and DGPS, etc. integration of dataset at different resolution is leading, slowly, to new problems, in terms of precision, data structure, etc., as has emerged from projects such as Virtual Rome or 3d-ARCHs (PESCARIN ET ALII 2008, REMONDINO ET ALII 2009 and figure 3.1). How can we visualize models with different resolutions, and built to different scales, in a single frame? Can we merge aerial views with the internal reconstructions of monuments? Should we express the difference explicitly or had we better develop more homogeneous landscapes? Could these be threshold visualised, e.g. through transition surfaces (AGUGIARO KOLBE 2009), and how ? Also from a “perceptive” point of view, this problem has great impact. The process will probably remain slow, at least until high quality acquisition devices, such as 3d scanners, though already considered mature, become more affordable for Cultural Heritage and

Environmental applications (CIGNONI SCOPIGNO 2008).

[figure 3.1- (CASTLE\_TN.jpg)]

A common characteristic of all this data is *spatial dimension*. The geo-location of all elements, although often neglected, is central. For this reason it is important to have a *basic* knowledge of archaeology, cartography, image processing and 3d modelling issues. These are very different fields that commonly make use of different languages, different approaches, and produce different results. Landscape modelling requires us to manage and interconnect them. In spite of the fact that, in the development of the specific tasks required by a project, these fields should be approached by specialized experts, results can be more satisfactorily obtained if the latter have a *basic* knowledge also of interconnected disciplines.

The following sections will analyse various techniques and methodologies for data acquisition and archaeological landscape reconstruction. Communication and final visualisation will be further described in chapter 5.

Table 3.1 proposes a sequence of activities related to the creation of the observed landscape.

General activities	Methodology/data/sources
GIS project creation	GIS software selection, projections and coordinate system, thematic layers and levels of detail definition
Generation of contemporary DTM	Elevation data mosaic
Processing of geoimagery	Geoimagery georeferencing, mosaic, equalization (satellite, aerial, etc.)
Import (in the GIS) of acquired and georeferenced data	Archaeological map, historical maps, soil maps, etc.
Overlay with acquired data on the field	Data acquisition on site with integrated technologies (GPS, 3D scanner, etc.) and creation of detail survey of the monuments.
Identification of critics in the datasets	Data validation based on the comparison with all dataset.
Data correction and new layers creation	Data correction and creation of new vector layers (GIS and modeling software).
Final thematic layers creation	Export of useful thematic layers: hydrography, road system, etc.
3D terrain generation	3D model generation of the territory, based on processed geoimagery and DTM.
Vegetation generation	2D/3D vegetation integration at different details
3D models integration	Further postprocessing of 3D models and integration on correct location (lat/long/elev).

Tabella 3.1 Steps of archaeological landscape reconstructions.

## **.B.1 Visible landscapes**

The reconstruction of visible landscapes is obtained mainly with *mapping* activities. The first step is to verify the existence of available data, such as cartographic maps, thematic maps (vegetation, geology, etc.), aerial or satellite images, elevation models, planimetries, sections, etc. or any other sources useful in the construction of the basic digital dataset. A basic dataset is made up of at least one *geoimage* (or mosaic of geoimages), and one *Digital Terrain Model*. Thematic layers, vector or 3d models, are complementary. In the past, the usual way to obtain this data was to find printed images or a paper map, scan them, georeference and orthorectify them, and finally manually digitize contour levels or elevation points in order to produce DEM, or other required themes.

These datasets can easily be purchased from specialized companies at various rates, mainly depending on data resolution. In some cases, they can be freely downloaded from on line repositories, such as Global Land Cover Facility (GLCF) or USGS<sup>8</sup>.

GLCF is a centre for land cover science focused on the analysis of cover change through remote sensing. It is an on line database of many satellite images and elevation models, accessible through the Earth Science Data Interface (ESDI: figure 3.2)<sup>9</sup>. Here, Landsat series imagery can be downloaded: Landsat MSS (Multi-spectral Scanner), TM (Thematic Mapper), and ETM+ (Enhanced Thematic Mapper Plus). The highest available resolution is of 30 mt (15 mt for the Panchromatic<sup>10</sup> L7: table 3.3). There are today many types of satellite images, with a variety of characteristics. Knowing these characteristics helps to find the right source for a project. Table 3.2 reports available images on the market, with indications of their main use and resolution. Other available imagery products are aerial ortho-photos<sup>11</sup>.

DTMs with grid sizes of 500 up to 1m are increasingly available for different parts of the globe, such as through the US Geological Survey (USGS), the Ordnance Survey, the Italian Istituto Geografico Militare (IGM)<sup>12</sup> or Parma CGR<sup>13</sup> repositories. Low resolution Digital Terrain Models are also available on line from the USGS site, e.g. the GTOPO30, available since 1996 thanks to the work of the USGS Center for Earth Resources Observation and Science

---

8 <http://edc.usgs.gov/products/elevation/>

9 <http://www.landcover.org>; <http://glcfapp.umiacs.umd.edu:8080/esdi/index.jsp>

10 Panchromatic: Imagery Single-band or monochrome imagery.

11 Examples at: Terraserver ([www.terraserver.com](http://www.terraserver.com)); FlashEarth ([www flashearth.com](http://www flashearth.com)); DigitalGlobe ([www.digitalglobe.com](http://www.digitalglobe.com)); TerraFly ([www.terrafly.com](http://www.terrafly.com)); Italian CGR ([www.cgrit.it](http://www.cgrit.it)), and in many other countries.

12 <http://www.igmi.org/>

13 [http://www.cgrit.it/prodotti/modello\\_digitale.htm](http://www.cgrit.it/prodotti/modello_digitale.htm)

(EROS). This global DEM, based on the Shuttle Radar Topographic Mission, has horizontal grid spacing of 30 arc seconds (approximately 1 kilometer) deriving from several raster and vector sources of topographic information. Unfortunately the absolute vertical accuracy of the elevation data is 16 meters (at 90% confidence). Most of the available DTM are the result of photogrammetric data capture, performed with stereoscopic interpretation of aerial or satellite images through manual or automatic systems. DEMs can be acquired also by digitizing contour lines on old topographic maps and also by conducting ground surveys, with GPS devices<sup>14</sup>.

[fig. 3.2 srtm\_comparison.jpg]

Sensor	Description	Resolution
<b>ALOS /2006</b>	It has 1) Panchromatic Remote-sensing Instrument for Stereo Mapping (PRISM) for DEMs mapping, 2) Advanced Visible and Near Infrared Radiometer (AVNIR-2) for land coverage observation, 3) Phased Array type L-band Synthetic Aperture Radar (PALSAR) for land observation.	2.5m to 10m
<b>ASTER /1999</b>	It monitors cloud cover, land temperature, land use, vegetation patterns, etc. The multispectral images are in 14 different colours, used for change detection and land surface studies including vegetation and ecosystem dynamics.	15m to 90 m
<b>CARTOSAT-1 /2005</b>	Built by the Indian Space Research Organization as part of the Indian Remote Sensing series (IRS). It has 2 panchromatic cameras that take black-and-white stereoscopic pictures in the visible region of the electromagnetic spectrum, used to create accurate 3d maps.	2.5 m
<b>CBERS-2 /2003</b>	Born of a partnership between Brazil and China. Used for deforestation and fire control, soil occupation, etc. It includes cameras for optical observations.	20m to 260m
<b>CORONA</b>	photographic surveillance satellite used from the late 50's through the early 70's, after de-classification 860,000 images are available through Earth Explorer <sup>15</sup>	2.75 m to 1.8 m
<b>EROS /2000</b>	provides 1.8 meter panchromatic imagery (areas: 12,5x12,5 km)	1.8 m
<b>FORMOSAT-2 /2004</b>	It is used for land distribution, natural resources research, forestry, environmental protection purposes.	2m to 8m
<b>GeoEye-1 /2008</b>	Capable of acquiring image data at 0.41 meters panchromatic (B&W) and 1.65 meters multispectral resolution.	0.41m to 1.65 m
<b>GeoEye-2</b>	Forthcoming	0.25-meter
<b>IKONOS /1999</b>	Used for urban and rural mapping of natural resources, agriculture and forestry analysis. Available Ikonos Stereo Images for the production of Digital Surface Models (DSM's) or Digital Elevation Models (DEM's) with postings of ≤5m.	0.82m to 3.2m

14 There are several archives of old aerial or satellite images in many countries, such as Historical Aerial Photography in UK ([www.oldaerialphotos.com](http://www.oldaerialphotos.com)) or the Italian Fototeca ([www.iccd.beniculturali.it/Istituto/Organizzazione/aerofototeca](http://www.iccd.beniculturali.it/Istituto/Organizzazione/aerofototeca)).

15 <http://edcsns17.cr.usgs.gov/EarthExplorer/>



<b>IRS</b>	acquired over the visible green to near infrared	5.8 m
<b>LANDSAT 7 + ETM /1999</b>	first earth observation satellite. It has seven spectral bands that range from visible to thermal infrared regions.	30m
<b>QuickBird 2001</b> /	high resolution satellite: Pan: 61 cm (nadir) to 72 cm (25° off-nadir); MS: 2.44 m (nadir) to 2.88 m (25° off-nadir)	0.61 to 2.88 m
<b>SPOT-5 /2002</b>	It has VEGETATION 2 instruments which provide continuity of environmental monitoring. An image covers 60 x 60 km or 60 km x 120 km, and there is good balance between high res. and wide-area coverage	5m to 10m
<b>WorldView-1 / 2007</b>	A high-capacity, panchromatic imaging system features 0.5m resolution	0.5m
<b>WorldView-2</b>	Forthcoming: it will provide a high resolution Panchromatic band and 8 Multispectral bands	1.8m to 2.4m

Table 3.2 List of main satellite imagery. (Source: Satellite Imaging Corporation).

Satellite	Sensor	Spectral Range	Band #s	Scene Size	Pixel Res
L 1-4	MSS multi-spectral	0.5 - 1.1 $\mu\text{m}$	1, 2, 3, 4	185 X 185 km	60 m.
L 4-5	TM multi-spectral	0.45 - 2.35 $\mu\text{m}$	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7		30 m.
L 4-5	TM thermal	10.40 - 12.50 $\mu\text{m}$	6		120 m.
L 7	ETM+ multi-spectral	0.450 - 2.35 $\mu\text{m}$	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7		30 m.
L 7	ETM+ thermal	10.40 - 12.50 $\mu\text{m}$	6.1, 6.2		60 m.
L 7	Panchromatic	0.52-0.90 $\mu\text{m}$	8		15 m.

Table 3.3 list of Landsat imagery sensors.

When it is impossible, in fact, to use or find the desired spatial datasets, or when more details are needed, we can still obtain them by planning *fieldwork* and organising a direct acquisition. Traditionally, archaeology has used specific investigation techniques such as excavations and field surveys (RENFREW BAHN 1981). Technology today offers a wide range of techniques to acquire, model and visualize archaeological landscapes with many different scales and varied resolution, limiting excavations to few important cases.

Archaeological and environmental data are acquired by means of many kinds of survey and analysis, obtained with terrestrial or aerial acquisitions, direct or indirect. Usually it is convenient to use them in integration, in order to get better results on large-scale reconstructions for both intra-site and inter-site aspects. Terrain acquisitions can be used for detailed cartography, planimetric restitutions and the 3d modelling of sites, monuments, right up to single remains. On the other hand, aerial acquisitions can provide their context and location.

The main aim, for all of the techniques described below, is to acquire information to produce a *model* of the archaeological landscape. There are basically two types of system in the creation of 3d models. The first is based on measurements, acquired either with contact or non-contact techniques. The second one doesn't use measurements, e.g. in the case of computer graphics

(through 3d modelling software such as 3D Studio Max or Maya, etc.) or surveying (REMONDINO EL-HAKIM 2006).

### ***Terrestrial acquisition***

Terrestrial acquisitions are used for reality-based modelling. They make use of several different techniques and devices, and the most widely used are: GPS, laser total stations, 3d scanners and digital cameras for photogrammetric purposes. Instead of entering into a detailed description, I will provide general information with bibliographic references.

The widespread use of *Global Positioning Systems (GPS)*<sup>16</sup> provides many opportunities for the definition of the position of point on Earth surface and for the collection of elevation data, producing reference points for integrated surveys or detailed micro-topographic surveys. The introduction of *Differential GPS* (DGPS) has particularly increased survey accuracy. This enhancement of the traditional GPS, originally developed to solve the problem of Selective Availability (SA), can obtain better results, thanks to the use of a ground-based reference stations network, in charge of correcting the satellite signal through an in-built UHF band radio modem. Estimated accuracy can be under 10 cm. Differential GPS measurements can also be computed in *real-time* by some GPS receivers, when the correction signal is received using a separate radio receiver, as in the case of *Real Time Kinematic (RTK)* surveying.

There are many advantages to using GPS. For example, it is possible to *selectively* acquire position or elevation information. This operation can be further simplified by the use of PDAs, or other portable PCs, with GIS software installed in it, connected to the GPS. In this way it is possible to directly create a GIS in the field, at the same time controlling accuracy and the results of the work in progress (figure 3.3). Nevertheless, the use of this system to create Digital Terrain Models seems to have been made obsolete by 3d scanners, for speed and precision. Yet despite its well known problems, GPS remains the fundamental tool to *geo-locate objects on the earth*. For this reason it has been integrated into other kinds of acquisition devices, such as Total Station or Laser Scanner. Recently the market also offers a combination of Laser Scanner and GPS mounted on a car, for mobile mapping<sup>17</sup>.

---

16 Some references to GPS in archaeology: Wheatley, D. Gillings, M. *Spatial technology and archaeology*, London-New York 2002; Campana S., Sordini M., *Laser Scanner e GPS in archaeologia: geografia dei servizi e delle risorse in Internet*. In Laser Scanner e GPS. Paesaggi archeologici e tecnologie digitali 1 (Campana S., Francovich R. eds), Firenze, 2006.

17 Such as the LYNX *Mobile Mapper* system by Optech ([www.optech.ca/pdf/PressRelease-Lynx-Optech.PDF](http://www.optech.ca/pdf/PressRelease-Lynx-Optech.PDF))

[fig. 3.3 appia\_DGPS.jpg]

There are other techniques that don't require direct contact with the object and use various systems to obtain a measurement, such as light, X Rays, microwaves (i.e. radar), or ultrasounds.

Light is used by *Range-Based Modelling* (RBM) and also by *Image-Based Modelling* (IBM), through active sensors (3d scanner, laser total station) or passive sensors (photogrammetry or shape recovery from edges, texture, or shading) (REMONDINO, EL-HAKIM 2006).

*3d scanner* technology is relatively widespread in the field of archaeology and is an example of RBM<sup>18</sup>. It uses active sensors, which acquire objects in 3d, through triangulation or time-delay (TOF) methods. How do they operate? “They shoot some sort of light over the surface of the artefact and reconstruct its geometry by checking how the light is reflected by the surface”. Time-of-Flight (TOF) scanners are largely employed in landscape reconstruction. They “compute the time elapsed between the emission of a pointwise laser beam and the detection of the return beam reflected by the surface” (CIGNONI SCOPIGNO 2008: 3). They are generally used for large-scale acquisition projects. Triangulation 3d scanners use a different technique: they project a single spot or a pattern on to the object. Reflected images are acquired by an imaging device nearby, allowing you to compute the 3d position of the points by geometric triangulation. These scanners are commonly used for small-scale objects.

A typical sequence of activities include: scanner acquisition in the field, post-processing in the lab where Range-Maps<sup>19</sup> can be aligned, merged, edited and simplified), colour and texture mapping. These activities are supported by commercial software, although academic tools can present more advanced features<sup>20</sup>. There are several advantages in the use of RBM for landscape acquisition and reconstruction, such as the relative speed in the acquisition process and the accuracy of acquired data and of the final 3d model.

---

18 An overview on 3D scanning is offered by Curless, B. Seitz, S., *3D photography*. In ACM SIGGRAPH Course Notes, Course 19. There is a review article on 3d scanning in the Cultural Heritage field: Cignoni, P. Scopigno, R. *Sampled 3d Models for CH Applications: a viable and enabling new medium or just a technological exercise?* In the ACM Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage, Vol. 1, No.1, Art.2, Jun.2008;

19 *Range Maps* are single views of the acquired object that encode sampled points' geometry (CIGNONI, SCOPIGNO 2008:4)

20 For a review of the software available on the market: CAMPANA, SORDINI 2006 (cited). Examples of commercial software are: RapidForm, Geomagic, PolyWorks. Examples of academic tools are: MeshLab, TexAlign, Vrippack, Volfill, PointShop, Scanalyze.

Unfortunately there are also many disadvantages, due to the still very high cost of devices and of commercial processing software, to the complexity of post-processing, and to difficulties in managing very big 3d datasets. There is another important reason why this sector is still not found very widely, although successfully tested, in landscape archaeology; this is the “monolithic” way data are captured, not allowing an easy object extraction and selection. These problems emerge increasingly in aerial acquisitions<sup>21</sup>.

### ***Photogrammetry and 3D automatic modelling***

An example of *Image-Based Modelling* (IBM) is Photogrammetry<sup>22</sup>. It is commonly used to document, reconstruct, and visualise sites. It is a “measurement technique” that allows “the modelling of a 3d space using 2d images” (KASSER AND EGELS 2002 :1), through the identification of corresponding points in the images (automatic, semi-automatic or manual). A mathematical model can be used for this purpose, or other methods such as shape from shadows, from texture, from specularly, from contour or from 2d edge gradients (REMONDINO EL-HAKIM 2008: 271). Given the specific purpose of this book, I just mention some techniques useful for the reconstruction of 3d territories. Generally different views are needed to obtain a 3d model, although some attempts have been made in the direction of using a single image (EL-HAKIM 2001).

### ***Aerial acquisitions***

The reconstruction of the archaeological landscape requires the development of models representing the territory (DTM and Geoimages), its natural aspect, the identification of preserved archaeological sites, and also of anthropic/natural traces. We have seen that sources can be purchased or built in various ways. This section is dedicated to those techniques which can be used to obtain aerial bi- and three-dimensional representations of a territory and its characteristics, through the acquisition of 2d images or 3d datasets.

Acquisitions can be taken with different sensors mounted on satellite, airplane, kite, balloon (figure 3.4), small helicopter, plane or paramotors. While it's impossible to have control over satellite programs, we can, on the other hand, directly plan air-campaigns, organising and participating in flights over a

---

21 Many of these problems are handled in: *Laser-Scanners for Forest and Landscape Assessment*. In Intern. Archives of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences (Thies, M. Koch, B. Spiecker, H. and Wienacker, H. Eds), Vol. XXXVI, PART 8/W2, 2004

22 A good general review can be found in: REMONDINO, EL-HAKIM 2008 and specifically directed at site reconstruction, in GRÜN 2000.

territory, when this is possible, or using smaller devices, remotely controlled<sup>23</sup>. They provide data on the partial or complete extent of a territory, enhancing specific spatial and spectral characteristics. The detail is usually lower than that required for terrestrial acquisitions. For this reason it is good practice to integrate different models at various scales and resolution.

Since 1960, *aerial archaeology* is considered an important field for the interpretation of archaeological landscape, and not just for its representation. It uses a variety of techniques, according to the goal of the project and the kind of sensors (passive or active) mounted on board. It is characterized by two phases: the “observation and photography in or from the air” and the “interpretation of the images” (BOURGEOIS 2005: 15).

*Passive sensors*, such as cameras, can be used both for vertical and oblique photography. *Vertical acquisitions*, usually taken with cameras pointing straight down at the ground and fitted inside an aircraft, are used to produce orthographic images that may be useful for many archaeological purposes, such as topography (WILSON, 2000: 32, PICARRETA: 1987: xi). Unfortunately, even if the photo is taken with great care, it still retains some deformations. Usually what is acquired isn't a single picture, but a series of overlapping photographs. These can be used for any photogrammetric purpose, such as the creation of three-dimensional models of the landscape. Models like these reproduce what is visible in the aerial images and at the same resolution, that is to say: the terrain and all the structures on it, such as trees, buildings, etc. Various measurements can be achieved: from single-point measurements up to a regular terrain model, such as DSM, Digital Surface Model (KASSER EGELS 2002: 169 -190).

[figure 3.4]

Analysis	Aerial photo	Corona	Landsat	Spot	ASTER	QuickBird Ikonos	SRTM
Visual interpretation	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Contrast enhancement	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Georeferencing	x	x	x	x	x	x	
NDVI			x	x	x	x	
Classification			x	x	x	x	
Thresholding			x	x	x	x	
Principal Components Analysis			x	x	x	x	
Land Use	x	x	x	x	x		
DEM creation		x		x	x		x
Hyperspectral analysis					x		

23 An historical overview is available in: BOURGEOIS 2005. A review of several techniques can be found in: PICARRETA 1987, BEWLEY 2002.

Filtering			x	x	x	x	x
-----------	--	--	---	---	---	---	---

Table 3.4 Technique of geoinage analysis as referred to satellite imagery (source : PARCAK, 2009: 82)

*Oblique photography* is very useful for landscape interpretation and is much more used directly by archaeologists. It is a well known technique enabling you to recognize patterns on the ground which are otherwise impossible to see from the ground. Although in fact it gives a “distorted” representation of the features (perspective deformation), it is employed by archaeologists in the interpretation process. Through photo-interpretation, in fact, it has been possible to identify several archaeological sites, networks of tracks, fields and settlements, all over Europe, and of many historical periods, from the Neolithic onwards. An example of the use of this technique is the identification and reconstruction of an Iron Age fort at Bloodgate Hill, South Creake in north Norfolk (figure 3.5)<sup>24</sup>.

[Figure 3.5. bloodgate\_ok.tif]

In photo-interpretation, most of the traces originally derived from excavated features, such as boundaries, pits or post holes, can be seen as soil marks (variations of colour and texture of the soil) or crop marks (differential crop growth: positive marks over a ditch or negative ones over wall or stone foundations). More consistent remains on the ground can be recognized as earthworks. From the air, these features appear as dots or lines or areas of differently coloured crops and soil. Since these traces cannot be easily dated, it is necessary to verify them on the ground and integrate as much information as possible: some crop marks, in fact, do not belong to archaeological features, but are formed, for example, by geological features or modern agricultural practices (WILSON 2000:163-209). Another problem is correcting those images to draw the feature in the GIS, as vector layer. Although there are several softwares that can perform such transformations, two specific programs have been developed: Aerial and AirPhoto, included in the Bonn Archaeological Software Package (BASP)<sup>25</sup>.

In many countries there are accessible aerial archives, such as the atlas of oblique photos of the University of Siena in Italy<sup>26</sup>; the Austrian archive<sup>27</sup>; several archives in the UK, Scotland and Wales<sup>28</sup>, etc.

24 Wade-Martins, P. (ed.), 1997. *Norfolk from the Air*, plates 12-15. And: <http://www.norfarchtrust.org.uk/bloodgate/index.htm>

25 To download the software: <http://www.uni-koeln.de/~al001/airdown.html>

26 <http://shaq.archeo.unisi.it/oblique/>

27 [http://www.univie.ac.at/Luftbildarchiv/archiv/aa\\_ent.htm](http://www.univie.ac.at/Luftbildarchiv/archiv/aa_ent.htm)

28 Collection at Cambridge University (<http://www.uflm.cam.ac.uk>), the National Library of Aerial Photographs (<http://www.english-heritage.org.uk>), the RCAHMS in Scotland (<http://www.rcahms.gov.uk>), the RCAHMS in Wales (<http://www.rcahmw.org.uk>), the Aerial Reconnaissance Archives of the University of Keele with several RAF World War 2

Active sensors can be mounted on aeroplanes or satellites. An example of these sensors are those used for *airborne laser scanners*. Lidar (Light Detection and Ranging or Laser Imaging Detection and Ranging) is a well-known technology, and although not so widely used, it has gained general acceptance as an accurate and rapid method for three-dimensional surveying of the Earth's surface<sup>29</sup>. The Lidar system has several advantages, such as the ability to view subtle landscape changes and high resolution feature detection (resolution of 3 cm). It can be combined with vertical survey cameras or airborne digital sensors, to record the entire landscape. Its main disadvantage, on the other hand, is its high cost, together with the fact that it is quite impossible to fly in every place or country (PARCAK 2009: 76-77). Another problem of aerial laser scanning, as mentioned for terrestrial acquisitions, is the way data are acquired, in a "monolithic" way. The entire visible information is captured and stored without distinguishing vegetation, buildings, etc. This often means a long post-processing work to clean up, divide up and sometimes re-model part of the final 3d mesh. New algorithms and approaches to this problem are currently debated in specialized conferences.

There are other airborne sensors used in archaeology, such as the *RadarSat*, *AirSar* (*Sythetic Aperture Radar*) or *thermal radiometry*. It can acquire at a resolution of up to 3 meters and identify, no matter the weather conditions or darkness, pathways or sites even under dense vegetation. Unfortunately even this system is quite expensive<sup>30</sup>. Hyperspectral acquisitions are quite useful in various landscape applications, for example in the definition of natural features, such as vegetation (the classification and mapping of species). They are used, in combination with fieldwork and ground analysis, for the identification of culture characteristics (density, humidity, etc.), the analysis of relations between vegetation and geomorphology, and the monitoring of parks. In landscape archaeology they have been used to identify palaeo-channels or structures hidden under the ground or even to characterize superficial materials.

## **.B.2 Invisible landscapes**

Excavations aren't the only way to define what has been preserved under the ground. There are several techniques that can help us to analyse ancient natural or anthropic remains. Geophysics offers several methods to obtain information from underground (CAMPANA PIRO 2008).

*Geoarchaeology* can also be successfully employed to identify the geological, lithological, and geomorphological characteristics of a territory and to

---

photographs (<http://www.evidenceincamera.co.uk>).

29 A tutorial can be found at: [http://home.iitk.ac.in/~blohani/LiDAR\\_Tutorial/Airborne\\_AltimetricLidar\\_Tutorial.htm](http://home.iitk.ac.in/~blohani/LiDAR_Tutorial/Airborne_AltimetricLidar_Tutorial.htm)

30 <http://www.space.gc.ca/asc/eng/satellites/radarsat1>

understand how or when its shape (geomorphology) has changed through time (CREMASCHI BARONI 2000, GOLDBERG MACPHAIL 2006, PANIZZA 2005).

Another field that has been integrating increasingly into landscape reconstruction is *Paleobotany*. Vegetation biologists can analyse, within specific required conditions (such as the presence of water, or sediments), the remains of seeds or pollen and thus identify plant species, crop cultivation or deforestation, in a certain area and over a certain period of time (table 3.5).

Type of remain	Type of sediment	Obtainable knowledge
Soil	All	Type and environmental characteristic of the deposit
Pollen	Buried surfaces, deposits with traces of water	Vegetation, land use
Phytolith	All	Vegetation, land use
Bacillariophyta	Submersed deposits	Level of water salinity and pollution
Vegetable not burnt remain	Dry and drenched	Vegetation, diet, natural material used in constructions
Vegetable burnt remain	All	Vegetation, diet, natural material used in constructions
Wood	Dry and drenched	Dendrochronology, climate, materials and building techniques

Table 3.5 - (from: Renfrew Bahn, 1991: 223)

The first invisible landscape is the one that cannot be seen. Fortunately in recent decades detectors have been developed to see for us, where we ourselves can't see. This is the subject of the *Remote Sensing* field<sup>31</sup>. These detectors can be mounted on aeroplanes, satellites or other devices, but also used for terrain applications. The basic principle is well known: the earth reflects the spectrum of sunlight, providing us with a lot of information about the composition of this surface, and revealing also traces of past human activities. The surface is made up, in fact, of elements which emit heat at various levels, visible to sensors such as *multi-spectral scanners*. Differences in the soil or in vegetation can be detected by variation in temperature. The analysis of infra-red radiation at a variety of wavelengths, for instance, can help in identifying pathways in the landscape, irrigation ditches, buried stone walls (stone can absorb more heat with respect to its surroundings). Moreover, analysis through radar sensors allows us to study the ground even if it is covered by clouds or canopies or

31 Wiseman, J. El-Baz F., *Remote Sensing in Archaeology*, Springer, 2007; Williamson, A. Nickens, P.R., *Science and technology in historic preservation*, Ed. Springer, 2000; Miller W.F., Sever T.L. & Lee D. (1991). *Applications of ecological concepts and remote sensing technologies in archaeological site reconnaissance*. In Behrens C. & Sever T. (Eds) *Applications of space-age technology in archaeological site reconnaissance* 121-136. A good tutorial can be found in <http://www.cnr.berkeley.edu/~gong/textbook/>



hidden by darkness. Several commercial softwares have developed features to manage these analyses, identifying distinctive "signatures" characterizing specific features<sup>32</sup>.

The basic work one can do on satellite images is *band combination* (table 3.2 and 3.3). Each image, in fact, is characterized by several bands, each one representing a range of the electromagnetic spectrum (Aster: 15, Landsat ETM+: 8; Spot: 4, etc.). We should in fact consider various parameters when we plan to buy geoimagery, such as: spatial resolution, spectral bands, program history, image surface area, price and licensing. If we want to obtain, from a Landsat image, a true-colour or visible image, we should for instance combine bands 3, 2 and 1, assigning respectively a Red, Green and Blue value. The combinations of these bands enables us to distinguish vegetation, water or geological features better. These distinctions can also give interesting inputs to identifying archaeological features, often related to changes or discontinuities. Some useful combinations (Landsat imagery) in archaeology are:

- II bands 3, 2, 1 (RGB): visible image, useful to identify details;
- III bands 4, 3, 2 (RGB): false-colour image (pixel values not representing the true colour photo) where vegetation is enhanced, appearing in red;
- IV bands 5, 4, 3 (MIR, NIR, Red) to highlight differences between areas with or without vegetation.
- V bands 4, 5, 6 (RGB): useful to identify hills, barrows etc.;
- VI bands 4, 7, 5 have been used to identify, for instance, rammed earth.
- VII IHS Fuse of Bands 5,4,3: used to incorporate Band 8 of a Landsat TM image (15 m Panchromatic) to obtain a 'false' colour image of a 15 m resolution.

Other remote sensing analyses useful for archaeological landscape reconstruction are (PARCAK 2009: 91-99):

1. *Normalized Difference Vegetation Index* (NDVI): used to measure, in different images for different times of the year, the health of vegetation possibly affected by buried archaeological remains, or the outline of a settlement, or a ditch. This has been used, for instance in the Jure Vetere (fig. 1.1).
2. *Classifications*: to identify land cover or other kinds of clusters. It can use "Supervised" (human-assisted) and "Unsupervised" techniques. The former requires the control and identification on the ground of "training regions", that are then reported in digital classification in order to define different cells better. "Unsupervised" classification, on the other hand, creates clusters of multispectral images, each one representing similarities in the spectral space (FORTE, 2003: 85).
3. *Thresholding image segmentation*: classification in which it is possible

---

32 ErMapper, GRASS, etc. (Appendix B)

- to specify parts of image values that remain visible.
4. *Principal Component Analysis* (PCA): helps in clarifying classifications and band combinations. It has been used in archaeology for better feature recognition.
  5. *Land Use Land Cover Changes* (LULC): land use variation analysis as observed in different time periods.
  6. *DTM modelling*: obtained from SRTM data, stereo-pair SPOT, ASTER or stereo CORONA images.
  7. *Hyperspectral analysis*: useful in case the spectral signature of a specific material (such as stone) is known. Hyperspectral satellites datasets are needed, such as OMIS (Optical Monitor Imaging Spectrometer) sensors.
  8. *Radar analysis*: SAR or LIDAR techniques.

In the Aksum project, directed by the Oriental University of Naples and Boston University, with the cooperation of CNR ITABC, remote sensing analysis was employed to identify archaeological features (FORTE 2003: 81-93, BARD ET ALII 2007). This project aimed at the reconstruction of the archaeological landscape of Aksum (Ethiopia), the capital of one of the most powerful Red Sea kingdoms during the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD, and at its visualisation in a Desktop Virtual Reality (DVR) application. The aim was achieved thanks to an integration of fieldwork, ethno-anthropological investigations, paleo-environmental analysis, aerial photo interpretation and remote sensing. Thanks to the multispectral classifications of a Spot XS image, various thematic maps (soil use, vegetation, geomorphology, and archaeology) were obtained, and an interpretative map was developed. This was used in the reconstruction of the archaeological landscape which was used to build a VR environment (Figure 3.6).

[Figure 3.6 – Aksum\_ok.tif]

### **.B.3 Post-processing**

At this point, acquired spatial data needs to be further processed (table 1.2). The goal in fact is to manage and visualize them, developing a model of the archaeological landscape, made up of its anthropic and natural features, but also of the interpretative analysis carried out. This model will also be the reference point for any *interpretation layer* emerging out of the post-processing work. At the end of the process, in fact, on top of the reconstructed archaeological landscape, a “*mapscape*” will be created. It will represent all the interpreted features, identified after remote sensing analysis or aerial photo interpretation, and will be the basic source of potential ancient landscape reconstruction. Since all datasets should be considered in their spatial dimension, every

reconstruction process starts by building a GIS project, which will be the reference point for all activities, continuously updated.

*Geographical Information Systems* (GIS) are tools, or rather sets of instruments, initially developed by and for the army, for spatial dataset management. They are now considered essential also in archaeology, since they are used for many activities: archiving, analysing, querying, or just as reference and middleware. They have been described as “the most powerful technological tool to be applied to archaeology, since the invention of Radiocarbon dating” (MARIS AND TE BOEKHORST 1996, cited in CONOLLY LAKE 2006: 5). GIS describes space in terms of location and attribute. Each element inside a GIS needs two descriptors, which indicate what it represents (attribute) and where it is located (location), as referred to a space, either absolute or relative (CONOLLY LAKE 2006: 3-4). There is an extensive bibliography specifically regarding the use of GIS in archaeology (WHEATLEY GILLINGS 2002, LOCK 2003, LOCK STANCIC 1995). GIS is also basic during the reconstruction of archaeological and past landscapes. It can manage to overlay various pieces of information and, most importantly, it enables to compare data and carry out calculations on different parameters (grid calculations, vector analysis, etc.). In Appendix B there are specific GIS analyses, described in detail. The entire reconstructive process is based on GIS analysis, as described in Chapter 4.

*WebGIS* are commonly considered as Internet “extensions” of traditional GIS, although they often do not have the same analytic potential, but are used as digital on line archives dedicated to geo-spatial data, such as archaeological maps, digital images, grids and vector data. New projects are under way whose goal is precisely to extend GIS potentiality, mainly boosting editing and analysis capabilities. The MapServer Open Source platform, for instance, has several projects of tools specifically thought out for these purposes<sup>33</sup>. A project such as *Fasti on Line* is a webGIS, built on MapServer technology. It derives from *Fasti Archaeologici* (1946-1987) edited by AIAC. It allows registered archaeologists autonomously to add references to, and the location of, archaeological excavations in Italy, Albany, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Malta, Morocco, Romania and Serbia<sup>34</sup>. Other Open Source projects, whose evolution could offer interesting applications to landscape reconstruction, are: *Ka-Map*, an application Server Open Source<sup>35</sup>; *Embrio*, a web interface which combines map interactive visualisation, and PyWPS, enabling GRASS and QGIS integration and real time analysis, such as Viewshed, Slope, and Cost Distance<sup>36</sup>; *OpenLayers*, a javascript tool which enables the use of dynamic

---

33 [http:// www.mapserver.org](http://www.mapserver.org)

34 [http:// www.fastionline.org](http://www.fastionline.org)

35 [http:// ka-map.maptools.org](http://ka-map.maptools.org)

36 [http:// pywps.ominiverdi.org/demo/embrio/ka-map/htdocs/index\\_wps\\_qgis.html](http://pywps.ominiverdi.org/demo/embrio/ka-map/htdocs/index_wps_qgis.html)

maps and layered dataset, located in distributed servers and loaded “under” personal geographical data<sup>37</sup>. This last example, as in the case of GoogleMaps, opens up several possibilities in the field of landscape reconstruction, since it allows the sharing of various data, without actually “moving” them, but maintaining them in original servers.

GIS or webGIS are used to store a variety of spatial information during its process (raster, DTM, vector), to perform analysis, and finally to export spatial dataset to be used in the 3d modelling process. As mentioned, a basic spatial dataset is made up of at least one geo-referenced raster image and one digital elevation model of the terrain.

Generally, architecture or object modelling is carried on separately from terrain modelling. This is mainly due to the differences in the required computing work, and of elementary ontologies.

We have already described the way a monument, a site or archaeological remains can be modelled: mainly by measurement techniques, as in the case of a 3d scanner (Range Based Modelling) or photogrammetry (Image Based Modelling), and by non-measurement techniques, as in the case of computer graphics. Which technique is worth adopting is a question of the aim of the project, the required post-processing time and level of expertise and, last but not least, the available budget. No matter which technology is used, the crucial issue is *if* and *how* to integrate the models into the landscape.

As mentioned in chapter 2, the best place to test hypotheses and theory is a 3d virtual environment, made up of virtual ecosystems. Here the third dimension gets back to interpretation, and inter-relations and dynamics can be seen. A VR environment can get across communication in a more direct and simple way, turning a lesson into an experience, a study into a hyper-research. We should therefore handle not only GIS datasets in landscape reconstruction, but also integrate 3d models.

The most problematic (and still open) question is *how* to integrate those models in the landscape. A first decision to be taken concerns the use of the reconstructed environment as a whole: for real time purposes, or not? Real time applications, in fact, require great care in model optimization, polygon lowering, levels of detail, and paging generation. Various optimization techniques are continuously under development. Computer graphic rendering and animation, on the other hand, can handle much more complicated and realistic scenarios, using (relatively) less effort in optimization. Another question concerns the development of *on line* or *off line* applications. Even in this case, bandwidth requirements for on line projects play a central role in the definition of the dimension of objects. In any case, when we decide to work with 3d models, the entire team should take responsibility for their geographical

---

37 <http://openlayers.org>

spatial dimension and location. This is usually done inside the GIS, mainly in two ways: creating a vector layer representing their planimetry (polygons) or their centre (0,0 axis coordinate). In this way it is easy to locate the models on the ground automatically. With large models, some software may provide algorithms to level and smooth the terrain, in order to avoid a “flying” effect, an operation that can be also done in the GIS, although it requires a modification of the original DTM. A better solution is normally to avoid saving and using big models, preferring their subdivision into smaller pieces. With non real-time applications concerning smaller areas, modellers usually prefer to work in computer-graphic software<sup>38</sup> with a single file, integrating models directly in the terrain, to provide better control in rendering the effects of the entire scene. Terrain modelling, on the other hand, requires specific software to be performed, as well as tools that can handle its complexity, maintaining its spatial characteristics at the same time, and potentially enabling a final interactive exploration. It usually follows three steps: 3d terrain generation (from geoimage and dem), culture generation (both natural and anthropic characteristics) and 3d models integration. The first programs were created for the army to train soldiers to fly and hit a target (flight simulators), or drive a tank without losing direction. Reality-based reconstructions were essential, such as the geo-referencing of the digital scenario. Software for developing these kinds of applications were quite expensive at the beginning<sup>39</sup>. A complete review of available programs is published every year by the U.S. Army Topographic Engineering Center (Survey of Terrain Visualisation Software) and made available on line<sup>40</sup>. The goal of such a survey is clearly identified in the premise: “to provide the U.S. Army and DoD with more effective methods of merging, visualizing and analyzing battlefield terrain and environmental information.”

In the usual procedure<sup>41</sup> (figure 3.7), acquired data are processed in a GIS software to obtain a geoimage, or mosaic of images, a DTM (or more than one), and vector datasets representing landscape characteristics (rivers, lakes, roads, sites, plans, vegetation areas or plants, monument locations, etc.). At this point a Terrain Generator is required, a software that can import spatial dataset and produce a fully 3d terrain. Terrain complexity (both in terms of geometry and texture) is treated with the following techniques: Different Levels of Detail (LOD), paging and tiling. The final result, the *Terrain Database (TD)*, has a hierarchical structure, with a “master file” that usually opens all the tiles-files. *Paging* capability, which means that it is possible to tile together any number of

---

38 3d Studio Max, Maya, Blender, Cinema 4D, etc. (Appendix B).

39 Principal software have been Multigen Creator Terrain Studio (CTS) and Terrex Terravista.

40 <http://www.tec.army.mil/research/software/TD/tvd/survey/index.html>

41 In Chapter 7 is reported an example of this procedure.

terrains to make extremely large worlds, is important especially in the case of on line publications (LUEBKE, 2003: 187). A *tile* is a rectangular portion of the grid used to organise the TD. Each tile has several *LODs*, which represent polygon density: less detail for distant visualisation and more detail for near and steep visualisation.

Known terrain generators, which automatically produce TD with these characteristics, are: Terravista, Creator Terrain Studio and, on the Open Source side, OpenScenograph OSGdem<sup>42</sup>. Open Scene Graph is a graphic toolkit to develop graphic applications such as a flight simulator, scientific visualisation, or augmented reality environments. It is based on OpenGL. It has several features such as: crossplatform, Real Time optimisation, a wide range of input format support (flt, 3ds, obj, osg), extensibility through-plug-in architecture, built-in support of paged LOD terrain generation and navigation. OSG already provides both a tool to generate hierarchical paged terrains (OSGdem) and a network loader capable of providing the browsing of such hierarchies with reasonable bandwidth requirements (.NET).

While OSGdem is very essential, most advanced products can obtain direct DTM modifications in accordance with vector layers (river beds, road pavements, automatic bridge generation over rivers, etc.).

Other products, such as Visual Nature Studio, allow to process spatial datasets: adding effects and modifiers, managing complex ecosystem generation, adding 3d models; to create renderings and animation; to export the final landscape in formats (table 3.6) useful for: direct real-time visualisation (such as OpenFlight), computer-graphics manipulation (i.e. 3D Studio) or processed GIS datasets, ready to be further implemented with a Terrain Generator.

[figure 3.7 terrain\_generation.tif]

<b>Elevation data</b>	DTED (levels 0,1,2); USGS 1:250k; Arc Info BIL; ESRI Grid Ascii; ESRI Grid Float; GeoTIFF (as 16 bit elevation data); BitMap (as 8 bit elevation data); etc.
<b>Imagery</b>	GeoTiff; TIFF + Tfw; GIF; BMP; JPEG; etc.
<b>Vector data</b>	DFAD (all levels); Shape (import & export); DXF; etc.
<b>Textures</b>	SGI .rgb .rgba; TIFF; GIF; BMP; PNG; etc. (OpenGL usually requires power of 2 dimension: 256, 512, 1024, 2048 pixel)
<b>3D models</b>	(OpenFlight) FLT, 3DS, DXF, OBJ, WRL, Collada, X3D, OSG/IVE; etc.
<b>Tiled Terrain DB</b>	OpenFlight; Terrapage; OSG/IVE; Quantum3D VT; ViewTec Web Streaming TVW; etc.

Table 3.6: Landscape generation process file formats

The final terrain can be now visualised with a *3d viewer*. Most of the terrain generators offer their viewer, which can normally open proprietary files but sometimes also other formats. OpenSceneGraph, for example, has the

42 Other tools which support terrain paging are: Demeter

OSGviewer tool that enables you to explore OSG/IVE files in real-time. Another interesting open project is *Virtual Terrain*, that developed several tools for terrain handling, such as Enviro, for spatial datasets interactive exploration, with some interesting editing functionalities<sup>43</sup>.

In some cases the work isn't finished, but requires a further *integration* of 3d models, vegetation characteristics, environmental maps, behaviour and interactivity such as: link to external databases and other media, avatars, environmental effects, reference maps in overlay, etc.

In the Delta Po River project, Terrex Terravista was used to generate the large TD representing the archaeological landscape. The 3d reconstruction was also used as a sort of 3d interface, where further GIS datasets were overlaid, becoming a simulation space, to study the evolution of the coastline during four different periods: the Roman age, and the 14<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> Centuries (fig. 3.8). Two archaeological sites, with excavated Roman villas, were then modelled in detail and added to the landscape, developing a second level of walk-through exploration behaviour (GUIDAZZOLI ET ALII 2004).

[figure 3.8 delta.tif]

#### **.B.4 Data integration: problems and solution**

As we have seen, we are moving towards a massive integration of many different ontologies. Let's start to consider some possible solutions to the commonest problems. Integration can be considered mainly from two perspectives: the so-called Layer Fragmentation (LF), and Zonal Fragmentation (ZF). LF concerns elements belonging to various categories (i.e. a DTM and a 3d model), while ZF refers to the same feature class but with different characteristics (two DTMs not perfectly overlapping or at different resolutions, but also parts of a monument) (LAURINI 1998, AGUGIARO KOLBE 2009).

How can we embed high resolution objects, such as monuments or archaeological remains, in a generally low resolution Digital Terrain Model? How can we merge together DTMs of different resolution? More in general, how can we integrate acquisitions made at different resolution in a single visualisation and management platform? Integration can in fact generate errors or misunderstanding.

LF is still an open field. In real time applications a variety of solutions have usually been developed to integrate 3d models in a 3d scene. The more complex the scene the more care should be taken with respect to polygon numbers. Although model simplification seems to be a good solution, if exaggerated it can lead to the elimination of important detail. Usually other systems are used to avoid this problem, such as multiresolution techniques. A final solution is

---

43 <http://www.vterrain.org>

always a balance between target user/hardware/purpose, in order to obtain scenes as realistic as possible (complex, highly detailed), but also through rapid (sometimes interactive) rendering. The goal of multiresolution is to extract the necessary details from complex models and get rid of unnecessary ones<sup>44</sup>.

Recently CINECA Visit Lab has developed an integrated solution to enable the modeller to integrate high resolution 3d models into the terrain database. It is composed of a plug-in for 3D Studio Max (OSGexp) and a PostProcessing tool. The basic concept is that every modeller who works for realtime applications, can be limited in terms of file-dimension (geometry and texture). He can still obtain a complex and high resolution 3d model by subdividing the object into several separate files, each one with different LODs. In this way, the real time exploration can fit the actual perceptive capability of the users and also their interest in a specific area, whose details can be downloaded sequentially (PESCARIN ET ALII 2008). It might also be possible to connect terrain LODs with 3d models LODs, so as to give a better feeling of continuity during visualisation, and to avoid dramatic resolution differences (fig. 3.9).

*Figure 3.9 multires\_model.tif*

Various solutions have been proposed concerning ZF, such as the enhancement of a part of a DTM (KAREL KRAUS 2006), or of the entire DTM, taking information from a 2D vector dataset of known features and parameters (roads, rivers), thus increasing the number of known elevation data; in the same way, others have suggested increasing elevation information by capturing it from building planimetries. Multiple DTMs are currently supported in many landscape applications, such as CityGML (GROGER KOLBE ET ALII 2008) and OSGdem, and successfully applied in projects such as Virtual Rome (CALORI ET ALII 2009) (fig. 3.10).

Recently Agugiaro and Kolbe have attempted to solve the problem of integrating laser scanner high resolution and low resolution DTMs in more detail; the solution presented is addressed to the creation of a correct and clean “*transition surface*”, influenced by local parameters of both terrain models. This surface is generated in order to create a smooth transition in terms of geometry, precision and density (AGUGIARO KOLBE 2009).

*figure 3.10 – multi\_dtm.tif*

---

44 The commonest multires techniques are: image pyramids, volumetric methods, vertex decimation, vertex clustering, edge contraction (mesh optimisation, progressive meshes), simplification envelopes, wavelet methods, etc. Although not updated, a good reference point is: <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/afs/cs/user/garland/www/multires/bib.html>



## Chapter 5

### Communicating the landscape

This chapter presents specific techniques used to visualize landscape reconstructions, from a twofold perspective: research and dissemination. Although we often consider “communication” as a final, non-scientific and not even essential step, we need to reconsider this assumption. Most of the time the word “communication” is used instead of “dissemination”. There can be no real distinction, in fact, between research and communication, since we need to communicate while we develop our research and while we disseminate its results.

*Dissemination* regards the diffusion of scientific results to both a restricted and broad-based community, the circulation of acquired knowledge. It uses various communicative languages and media, such as publications, drawings, movies, interactive applications, etc. It can be directed toward a heterogeneous audience, with the goal of making the information on our past landscape accessible. In order to be as effective as possible, it requires specific technologies and techniques, adequate to the kind of communicable information and to public access and understanding.

Technologies for *research* regard a more limited group of people, the scientific community, whose interests are closely connected to the research subject and its aims, within a multidisciplinary framework. Communication, as previously mentioned, is part of the research process. It makes use mainly of *visualisation* and natural languages - often in combination - during data acquisition, interpretation, analysis, model development, simulation and cross-networking.

#### .B.1 Dissemination

##### *Drawings*

Images are commonly used in science to present data. There is still some debate about what image type should be used, whether 2d-digital or 3d-digital or hand-drawing. Archaeological drawings of human artefacts, such as stone tools, are sometimes still preferred to photographs. The human drawing system, in fact, is an *observational tool*. Drawings are synthetic representations of selected characteristics. When we consider the innumerable scientific images we can see a systematic connection between (1) image types, (2) purposes, and (3) contexts of use (ADKINS 1989, PIGGOTT STUART 1978).

Professional drawers have produced wonderful artistic reconstructions of past landscapes. The best, along with their artistic skills, often work together with

archaeologists and palaeo-environmental experts. These experts in fact provide exact references and information which enable correct representation, which is, nonetheless, a personal vision developed by combining the perspectives of the archaeologist, the artist and the naturalist.

If we follow the career of these professionals we find very impressive reconstructions of ancient landscapes. A well known historical reconstruction artist is Alan Sorrell (1904-1974), who travelled England and Wales, bringing vividly to life ancient monuments from the prehistoric up to those of relatively recent times. The Imperial Rome drawn by Gilles Chaillet or the Egyptian landscapes by Jean-Claude Golvin are other examples of amazing visualisations (HARRIS, RUGGLER 2007; GOLVIN 1999; GOLVIN 2007).

These drawings, thanks to their pictorial technique, help create emotional reconstructions. Their main limitations lie in the bi-dimensionality of the media and, most of all, in the static nature of the representations. The effort put into redrawing, whenever new data or interpretations appear, create a serious problem of updatability in some cases.

Today, artists and designers use a mixed technique. The drawing is first done with a traditional technique, on paper, and afterwards refined in various phases. 3D simple digital reconstructions of principle monuments are sometimes developed. They are used to gain different perspectives and therefore to choose striking viewpoints for the final version. This system permits a sort of “updatable” version of the drawing, which can be more easily re-drawn or repainted from the same viewpoint, changing just a few details. An example of this technique is used by Ink Link Studio<sup>45</sup>.

### ***Not interactive media***

The film industry still represents the most mature media for cultural heritage dissemination, with its schools, experience, comparisons, feedbacks and success. And also a colossal market. Movies can create involvement, thanks to skilful shots, effects, sounds, plot and with a shrewd direction, creating in the spectator a sort of personal experience. With a movie, you can get the public to understand many concepts in a short time and with immediacy. Moreover, story-telling techniques, as used in film production, are richly communicative, obtaining good results in terms of public satisfaction and knowledge transfer. This technique employs a mix of video sequences, images of real places, ancient maps, drawings, computer animations, characters and digital effects. Nevertheless, on the other hand films are *linear* media. This characteristic makes them immediate, but it is also their limitation, from a certain perspective.

---

45 <http://www.inklink.it>

When we watch a film, i.e. a computer animation of a reconstructed territory, the realism of the reconstruction is taken as *reliability*. We trust in the accuracy of the director or the computer scientists. We cannot see what there is in the backstage, how the reconstruction is done, which sources are used, which detail and accuracy level is followed. In this sense, we end up in *complete passivity* in front of the screen (TURKLE 1997). This doesn't mean we shouldn't make use of films, obviously. Videos are created, in fact, in almost every virtual archaeology project. Moreover virtually all TV programs on archaeology or history today use computer graphic animations and renderings. We just need to be aware of the risks as well as the benefits when we plan a communication project dedicated to a public.

In the *Imperial Forum Museum*, in Rome, the reconstruction of the territory is proposed in panels and in a video, composed using computer graphic renderings, traditional watercolour drawings and real photos (fig. 5.1). Other examples are the videos created for the Seabed Project, commissioned by Wessex Archaeology, or the Stonehenge Landscape reconstructed from Lidar data<sup>46</sup>. Also in the *Ca' Tron project*, the entire work of reconstruction of 20,000 years of history was summarized in a short video (Appendix A). Photo-realistic reconstructions and videos have been developed by CNR IBAM within the *Jure Vetere project*, where spatial analysis was used to reconstruct the Medieval potential rural landscape (fig.1.1, FONSECA ROUBIS SOGLIANI 2007, ROUBIS ET ALII 2008)), or in the reconstruction of the territory of *Metaponto*, in Italy (fig.5.2).

In the Virtual Museum of Ancient Via Flaminia, accessible in Rome in the Roman National Museum at the Diocletian Thermal Baths, a mixed technique has been developed. Real time VR interaction, in fact, is mixed with videos on specific aspects of ancient landscape, characterized by a “scientific-descriptive” language and with other videos created with a different and more personal “story telling” style (Appendix A) (FORTE ET ALII 2008, FORTE ET ALII 2007). Story-telling, although a well tried research field, has recently been taken into account in a new interdisciplinary perspective: *virtual story telling*, the use of this collection of techniques in Virtual Reality applications<sup>47</sup>.

Figure 5.1 *imperial\_forums.tif*

Figure 5.2 - *metaponto2.jpg*

46 [http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=1246762325049132604;](http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=1246762325049132604;http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pzYUx4l80m8)  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pzYUx4l80m8>

47 There is an annual international conference dedicated to interactive story telling (International Conference on Interactive Digital Storytelling): ICIDS 2008 Erfurt, Germany, November 26-29, 2008, Proceedings, Vol. 5334, Spierling; Szilas, Nicolas (Eds.), 2008

## ***Landscape Virtual Museums***

How can we overcome passivity and opacity? How can we access “the dark side” of reconstructions? Through *interactivity, transparency and openness*.

Examples of a possible use of all these characteristics are *Landscape Virtual Museums*. They are Virtual Reality (interactive, real time) applications specifically for landscape exploration and public access. In the article written in 2006 with Maurizio Forte on “Virtual Museum of Landscape” we defined it in this way: “*A virtual museum of landscape regards, first of all, the process of virtualization of dynamic relations concerning the ecosystem, humans, animals, plants, soils, earth, water, etc. It is an artificial ecosystem, map and alphabet of the landscape itself*”. Such a museum is “*focused on generating a holistic view of the environment, because without environment we cannot describe a landscape, and an ecological model*” (FORTE PESCARIN 2006: 87).

If we want to communicate what a territory was like in the past, who used to live in it, or which archaeological monuments could be seen, we can visit the place (in this case the landscape will be the museum of itself), read a book or visit a “non-place”, such as a virtual museum. Thanks to specific applications, the user can interactively interrogate elements, models, materials, becoming familiar with dynamic and static aspects. Through the creation of maps, it is possible to provide the user with interpretation instruments, which can help to decode something that no longer exists and is, therefore, very alien to our contemporary awareness. Without a code, in fact, we cannot achieve an interpretation. In a VR museum, the landscape is approached synchronically and diachronically. It becomes “*an open and evolving model, a scenario of simulation of artificial life, integrating different information ontologies*” (FORTE PESCARIN 2007: 87).

Landscape Virtual Museums consist of a variety of components:

- I Maps (ancient maps, cybermaps, etc.);
- II GIS (vector thematic layers);
- III Geoimagery;
- IV Environmental information (soil maps, land use maps, geological maps, potential ecosystems etc.);
- V Anthropic information (archaeological map, cadastre, etc.);
- VI Digital archives (databases, repositories, digital libraries),
- VII Interactive behaviour (querying, walking, flying, picking, slicing, editing, etc.);
- VIII Viewpoints (the landscape seen from specific perspectives);
- IX Places;
- X Relations;
- XI Dynamic simulations;

XII Story telling (video, past literature or sources, contemporary stories and memories);

XIII Artificial life.

How can we build a Landscape Virtual Museum? Unfortunately there are not many definitive answers or well-defined guidelines, also because available examples are in most cases the prerogative of restricted groups or scientific communities.

Nevertheless, many projects of the VHLab team at the National Research Council (CNR) or of other institutions and companies such as Visual Dimension, University of Foggia, University of Virginia, CINECA, etc. have demonstrated the potentiality of these VR museums: Aksum project (FORTE 2003), Certosa Virtual Museum (GUIDAZZOLI ET ALII 2004), Narrative Museum of Archaeological Appia Park (FORTE PESCARIN PIETRONI 2005), Delta Po River VR museum (GUIDAZZOLI ET ALII 2004), Virtual Bononia (PESCARIN ET ALII 2007), Virtual Rome (PESCARIN ET ALII 2008), Flaminia Virtual Museum (FORTE ET ALII 2007), Ename TimeLine exhibition, Itinera Time Machine, Rome Reborn, In the case of Aksum, the archaeological landscape was reconstructed by remote sensing analysis and ethnographic studies, collecting the results of ten years of excavations in Ethiopia carried out by Boston University, Naples Oriental University and CNR. The entire territory was generated in 3D, using Terravista simulation software<sup>48</sup>, while models of the main archaeological structures were placed in relation to roads, rivers and geomorphology. A Desktop VR (DVR) application was developed using the VTree (CG2) OpenGL library and a Vision Station was used to visualise it, simulating a 360° real time immersive exploration of the territory (figure 3.6: bottom left). A “sound GIS” was also created in order to give a deeper *perception* of being immersed in the landscape: the sound of water near rivers, of wind on leaves and birds close to woods, the voices of rituals approaching the villages. The DVR application was shown during an exhibit on the history of cartography in 2002 in Rome (BARD ET ALII 2007, FORTE 2003). On the same dataset, another VR application was developed for a Virtual Theatre, an immersive space characterized by a big semicircular screen and stereo projection, specifically for researchers’ interaction. This application, in fact, developed with Multigen Vega<sup>49</sup>, was strongly oriented to database search and real time visualisation of DB results. For instance, it was possible to identify in the database all archaeological structures that shared similar characteristics or belonged to the same chronological period, and visualize them in 3D in the archaeological landscape,

48 <http://www.terrex.com>

49 Vega Prime by Multigen Paradigm is a tool for the creation and deployment of visual simulation, urban simulation, and general visualization applications ([www.multigen.com/products/runtime/vega\\_prime](http://www.multigen.com/products/runtime/vega_prime)).

together with multimedia meta-information (figure 3.6: right)<sup>50</sup>.

Another VR landscape museum was created more recently for the Delta Po river project. In this case the final application was used to create two interactive installations (kiosks) in small visitor centres of Rovigo province, in Italy. The landscape itself became the interface to access information on the archaeology of two Roman sites, and also the history of the evolution of the coastline over the centuries (GUIDAZZOLI ET ALII 2004, PESCARIN RUZZA 2004).

In *Ename*, Belgium, a long lasting project has reconstructed the history of the village from the 11<sup>th</sup> century. The entire work has been exhibited in the local museum thanks to the *TimeLine* application (fig. 5.3)

Another virtual environment dedicated to a scientific exploration of a territory is the *Itinera Time Machine* project. The system, developed in the Digital Archaeology Lab of the University of Foggia, in Italy, is based on the scientific and archaeological documentation acquired in the field from the site of Faragola (Ascoli Satriano, FG). The Time Machine brings the visitor and his avatar back in time to explore different hypothetical reconstructions of the site and of the stratigraphic process (figure 5.4). He can also watch the threshold between archaeological reality and reconstructive imagination, through the visualisation of the inter-connections of stratigraphy and interpretative traces (DE FELICE ET ALII 2007).

An interactive space was recently opened at the Roman National Museum of the Diocletian Thermal Baths in Rome, dedicated to the virtual multi-user exploration of the ancient Via Flaminia (figure 5.5). In the Virtual Museum, located inside a real museum, visitors can choose one of four avatars and explore together the archaeological landscape, discovering its aspect during late Republican and early Imperial times, and also meeting historical figures, such as the emperor Augustus himself or his wife, Livia (FORTE ET ALII 2006, FORTE ET ALII 2007)<sup>51</sup>.

An example of a Virtual Museum dedicated to an immersive exploration of the archaeological site of Sacred Angkor, in Cambodia, or dedicated to Place-Hampi in India, are those developed by Sarah Kenderdine and Jeffrey Shaw, with the Museum Victoria, Swinburne University, Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), Monash University and Adacel Technologies in Australia. The environment (stereographic panoramas of the temple complex) is visible in the Museum, thanks to a state-of-the-art display environment, a unique place

---

50 The Virtual Museum of Aksumite landscape was developed by CNR ITABC, under the direction of Maurizio Forte, Aracnet (VTree library and Vision Station) and CINECA (Vega and Virtual Theater). More information on: [www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/Projects\\_Aksum.htm](http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/Projects_Aksum.htm). The exhibition took place in Rome at EUR during the annual conference of MondoGIS (22-24 May 2002).

51 <http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/flaminia>

for the visualisation of scientific and historical ideas, and associated objects<sup>52</sup>.

*figure 5.3 Ename.tif*

*figure 5.4 itinera\_ok.tif*

*figure 5.5 Flaminia virtuale\_museo\_nazionale.jpg*

### ***Social network and Virtual Communities***

In 2004, I followed the preparation of the Digicult Thematic Issue 5, dedicated to “Virtual Communities and Collaboration in the Heritage Sector” (GESER ET ALII 2004). This report divided Virtual Communities into two main typologies:

1. *Interest groups or discussion groups* (web-based discussions) focussed mainly on creating discussions or participation on specific topics, using mainly simple tools such as: newsletters, newsgroups, chat, IRC (Internet Relay Chat), Web-cam in real-time video conferencing meeting, groupware, MUD & MOOs
2. *Multi User communities*, whose main goal is to create a *meeting experience* among participants, through advanced 3D tools. 3D environments are re-created and users are projected into the cyberspaces by means of an “avatar”, who represent themselves even while communicating. The first well-known platforms were Blaxxun, Second Life and ActiveWorlds<sup>53</sup>.

Belonging to this second group, there is an interesting project is Quest Atlantis. With its 200.000 students, QA was developed by Indiana University. In this project artificial three-dimensional worlds, as in the case of the OPEN *Virtual Parks Project*, are re-created with learning purposes to immerse children, ages

52 <http://www.vroom.org.au>,  
[http://www.vroom.org.au/pdf/kenderdine\\_avatars.pdf](http://www.vroom.org.au/pdf/kenderdine_avatars.pdf)

<http://place-hampi.museum>,

53 <http://www.blaxxun.com>; <http://www.secondlife.com>; <http://www.activeworlde.com>

9-15, in educational tasks (quests) (figure 5.6). “Quest Atlantis leverages multi-user (online gaming) technologies to have QA students and their families virtually explore the rich histories and beautiful natural environments of National Parks. Through such engaging learning environments we hope more people will develop a greater appreciation of our shared global heritage”. The virtual experience inside the landscape enables young people to learn without really noticing that they are. Each one, in fact, is appointed to act as a specific character (the scientist, the ranger, the archaeologist), solving, alone or together with other students, impelling problems that even threaten the end of an ecosystem (BARAB ET ALII 2007)<sup>54</sup>.

Another example of the possible use of multi-user virtual communities comes from the University of California, Merced, where the reconstruction of the Roman Villa of Livia in Rome is used to teach undergraduate students, inside Second Life world, or in the case of the “Akragas doors project”, developed by No Real, where visitors can dress up as a Greek *hoplite* and take part in an attack, thus gaining understanding of the military tactics of 6<sup>th</sup> century BC Akragas in the Valley of Temples near Agrigento, Sicily (figure 5.7) or also in the case of the Digital Humanities island developed by King's College of London (Appendix B).

[figure 5.6 quest\_atlantis\_ok.tif]

[figure 5.7 Akragas.tif]

Key words of these communities are: communication, exchange, common interests, confidence, interaction, intermediation, authenticity, identity, and sustainability

Apart from very few experiences, significant examples dedicated to ancient landscapes are lacking. 3D communities are commonly used as a sort of 3D chat room, as in most Second Life islands, where what people commonly do is just meet and talk.

Nevertheless, there are institutions which could be really interested in creating Landscape Virtual Communities. Museums of territories or Archaeological and Naturalistic Parks may obtain positive results in the creation of communities centred on e-learning or social communication and participation, as in the cases above mentioned. They can help to create common interests and new synergies between public and institutions, also with the exchange of memories and stories. The creation of new landscape virtual communities, based on narration, can give importance also to social features, not just cultural, thus helping to produce new knowledge, public involvement and awareness through shared

---

54 <http://www.questatlantis.org>



participation in cultural policies, within democratic contexts.

Through these cyberspaces, powerful learning and tourist tools, it might be possible to visit archaeological territories virtually, meeting other visitors or guides for a greater and more intense understanding of ancient landscapes. But it would also be possible to shift a traditional perspective, creating an “upside-down” view of cultural digital portals with participants interacting directly and adding, not only receiving, content and information. In Virtual Communities cyberspaces become places, not just tools, and the system is the people (REINGHOLD 1994).

If the communicative level of VR communities can be very high, there is a problematic aspect that should be taken into account, i.e. the geospatial dimension. They are more suitable for the creation of scenarios or small environments rather than landscape. These cyberspaces are focused, in fact, on exchange and experience much more than on the scientific value of the geographical dataset. In most cases, scenarios are really simplified, so as to enable a diffusion over the Internet, and sometimes they should be created inside the chosen platform (as in Second Life), since to directly import geographical data is not allowed.

Another problem of these projects is that their success depends strictly upon how much they are used. In sociological studies, it was shown how similar virtual communities are to real communities. To have success they need to have a goal, be limited to that goal, have fixed rules, build habits, and be based on the idea of sharing and exchanging. Unfortunately, it is difficult to obtain an “exchange” when institutions try to exert close control over the communities, limiting them just to a museum activity for visitors.

### ***Mobile communication***

We cannot talk about communication without touching on mobile technology. It was the first to be developed for environmental and tourist purposes with car navigators, thanks to the integration of commercial GPS in low cost devices. Today this field is rapidly evolving in terms of digital content, moving toward future generation devices, such as smart mobile phones. Archaeological sites can be explored while visiting the areas through systems that integrate geo-localisation of visitors and information provided directly on PDA or mobile phones. Precursors of these kinds of application were ArcheoGuide, an augmented reality systems developed to enable a virtual visit of archaeological sites such as Olympia in Greece.

Recently there are examples of interactive exploration of archaeological areas through integrated systems based on a centralized Multi-channel Service, as in

the GITA project developed by Infobyte<sup>55</sup>, which allows presentation of multimedia content on demand or automatically on mobile devices (mobile phones, PDA, SmartPhones) or immersive mobile displays (Augmented Reality devices for outdoor applications).

Another new and very promising field is 3D interactive content, such as educational games, available for smartPhones, like iPhone. This market, although at its very beginning, is already very surprisingly active. In the iPhone and iPod AppStore, at the end of April 2009 there were almost 1 million downloaded applications!

## **.B.2 Research, communication and simulation**

### ***3d webGIS and VR webGIS***

After the success of Geographical Information Systems in archaeology, and their increasing use over the web through webGIS applications (chapter 3), today there are new typologies of web-based geospatial applications, such as 3D webGIS and VR webGIS.

While GIS and webGIS are typically considered as 2d (or 2,5d) systems, 3d webGIS fully manage the third dimension, enabling at the same time geospatial data on line access. Thematic layers commonly used in GIS are wrapped on the 3D terrain (vectors, raster maps). In principle, 3d webGIS possess spatial analysis potentiality.

VR webGIS are applications which have attributes typical of Virtual Reality (real time 3d interaction behaviours), of web-based tools (networking, on line access) and also of GIS systems (geographical dimension, vector-raster data management). They can integrate different types of information such as: 3d terrains, vector layers, 3d models and metadata, vegetation, multimedia contents, etc. The landscape can be explored and queried through graphical interfaces. Chapter 7 is dedicated to these specific applications.

Examples of VR webGIS were developed in the Appia and Virtual Rome projects (Appendix A). In these cases, the reconstructed archaeological and ancient landscapes were published in Internet, through a web plug-in, *osg4web*<sup>56</sup> which enhanced browser potentiality of 3d data exploration, querying and interaction. Users, no matter who and where they are, can access geospatial information and digital content through an interface, exploring the territory dynamically in different ways (flying, or walking on it), uploading other spatial dataset (2d, 3d, vectors, multimedia) on the landscape, to understand and analyse spatial relations better (fig. 5.8).

---

55 <http://www.infobyte.it>

56 [http://3d.cineca.it/storage/demo\\_vrome\\_ajax/osg4web.html](http://3d.cineca.it/storage/demo_vrome_ajax/osg4web.html)

Figure 5.8 appia\_virtualrome\_ osg.tif

**Research Virtual Communities and Collaborative Environments**

Landscape reconstruction is a multidisciplinary field which requires spatiality and interaction. For this reason, the emergence of interdisciplinary contexts is creating a need for research into a variety of fields. If interaction plays an important role in the dissemination of cultural information, this is even more important in VR applications for scientific communities, as in the case of Collaborative Virtual Environments (CVE). CVEs are a class of networking applications which support cooperation among remote users, through a common spatial environment and using 3D graphics; CVEs are updated so as to reflect the actions and the movements of the participants. In these communities, the exchange of information and data through the net, and the development of shared multidisciplinary interpretation sessions, based on scientific geospatial datasets, is essential. The future of the net itself seems to be connected with the future of community, democracy, education and science (REINGHOLD 1994). “A virtual community is a space where people can bring in their own objects and with these (digital) surrogates, their own interpretation [...] thus enriching shared knowledge” (HAZAN 2004: 8).

Unfortunately, we don't have many examples of these specialized communities, focused on the sharing of specific knowledge and topics. But we shall be seeing several developments of these platforms in the near future.

The main characteristics of CVE are interaction, spatiality, inclusivity, editing, sharing, multi-disciplinarity, networking, and repository and library integration (table 5.1). In these contexts researchers can exchange ideas and analysis, sharing the same dataset and environment as well, sometimes even the same perspective. Each participant can cooperate in the creation of the archive, in digital collection, and the creation of the virtual museum, bringing with him his own contribution (such as digital objects) and preserving those of others.

Characteristics of VR museum for dissemination	Characteristics of VR system for the scientific community
Experience, story-telling	Research
Learning	Analysis, selection and comparison
Game	Openness and transparency
Interaction (natural)	Complex interactions
Perception	Cognition
Simplicity	Complexity
Involvement	Sharing

Interfaces	Flexibility
Design	Updatability
Realism	Reliability
Information	Data
Content	Metadata
Communication	Communication
Immersivity	3d geospatial dimension

Table 5.1 (FORTE, PESCARIN 2005)

While in the modelling, design or military fields there are several examples of CVEs, there aren't as many examples in the Cultural Heritage field, and specifically in landscape archaeology. The causes may be mainly three: the cost of these solutions, their complexity and lack of flexibility, and also the lack of knowledge of their existence. Dealing with landscapes means having to manage a variety of data, such as: 3d models of different dimensions and resolution, detailed 3d terrains, high resolution geospecific images, vector thematic layers, vegetation, natural characteristics, etc. Each one has different attributes and might become a problem, when it is implemented into a VR system. MultiUser and On Line access amplify this problem.

There is also a fourth reason. Although there are still many technical problems in the development of such platforms, most complicated aspects aren't technical. As in the case of Landscape Virtual Communities, a successful CVE should be *used* by researchers. Unfortunately not everybody is interested in *sharing* information or data. Some might think that information de-contextualized and considered just as an exchange object is deprived of relevance, even dangerous (HAZAN 2004: 9). We need to face the development of new CVEs also from a sociological point of view, to understand what interfaces and exchange mechanisms should be used.

In the research field, CVEs might be developed as fully editable environments or just as interactive spaces used to access complex scientific databases.

Recently, VHLab team at CNR ITABC has been involved in two projects, whose aim is the reconstruction of ancient landscape: a FIRB project on Robotics and Virtual Environments (FORTE PIETRONI DELL'UNTO 2008) and Virtual Rome (PESCARIN ET ALII 2008, CALORI ET ALII 2008). In these projects, as an archaeologist, I have been able to experience personally the complexity of a real multidisciplinary approach. For this reason, we have been pushed to experiment a more efficient approach, testing and developing examples of low-cost on line Cooperative Virtual Environments, based on Open Source and Commercial platforms. The FIRB project has developed a multiuser cooperative environment, available on line, which enables researchers to work

together in the reconstruction of archaeological sites. It is based on VirTools Dev<sup>57</sup> and is available on line, with a common Internet browser (figure 6.10). Virtual Rome, on the other hand, has developed an Open Source web VR application, based on geospecific data, 3d models and multimedia contents, with front-end and back-end on line solutions, for the interpretation, reconstruction and 3d exploration of Roman landscapes (Appendix A, figure 5.9).

[Figure 5.9 landscape\_KR.jpg]

### ***Simulation models***

Reconstructions can be used also as simulation spaces. This is quite a widespread application field in the hard sciences, such as chemistry, physics, etc. but is still not very diffused in landscape archaeology. Nevertheless, in architecture it is a well known practice, even when dealing with ancient monument reconstruction. An example is provided by a project of the University of Caen, in France, directed by Philippe Fleury, where a 19<sup>th</sup> century plaster of about 70 square metres representing Rome and made by the architect Paul Bigot is being scanned and completely reconstructed in 3D, becoming an interactive laboratory on Roman architecture (Fig. 5.10)<sup>58</sup>. A similar project was carried out by UCLA, Virginia University and the Politecnico of Milan, on the plaster conserved in the Museum of Roman Civilization in Rome and representing this city in the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD, when Constantine was emperor. The result of the complex 3D scanning was post-processed and used in various media, also for communication and educational purposes (GUIDI ET ALII 2005)

A simulation of landscape dynamics was developed in the *Exploris* project, on the eruption of the Vesuvius volcano in Italy. In this case, a mathematical model of the eruption temperature surface was calculated by supercomputers and visualised in a VR application. The territory around the volcano was reconstructed in 3D and connected to dynamic databases, containing e.g. population density. The result of the simulation was then visualised in real-time and connected to a time display, so as to analyse the effects of the eruption on the territory (figure 5.11)<sup>59</sup>. The same simulation could be performed also on the Roman landscape, reconstructing the original volcano's shape, as it probably was before 79 AD .

57 <http://a2.media.3ds.com/products/3dvia/3dvia-virttools/>

58 Fleury, P. Madeleine, S. Réalité virtuelle et restitution de la Rome antique du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle après J.-C., in *Histoire urbaine. Société française d'histoire urbaine*, vol. 18, 2007: 157-165; [http://doc.ocim.fr/LO/LO044/LO.44\(6\)-pp.20-23.pdf](http://doc.ocim.fr/LO/LO044/LO.44(6)-pp.20-23.pdf)

59 <http://exploris.pi.ingv.it/>, Macedonio G., Costa A., Longo A. 2005, A computer model for volcanic ash fallout and assessment of subsequent hazard. In *Computer & Geosciences*, 31, N.7, 837-845.

These simulations can go beyond the field of research: they can be successfully applied also in environmental services, for cultural policy evaluations and preventive archaeology.

*Figure 5.10 fleury.tif*

*figure 5.11 exploris project*

### ***Preventive and predictive archaeology***

The use and application of *preventive archaeology*, changes significantly from country to country. In some cases, even within the same country, as in Italy, the rules change in accordance with individual regional regulations, due to the lack of clear central directives and effective coordination. From a theoretical point of view, preventive archaeology should be carried out by archaeologists and environmental experts in close cooperation with the administrators in charge of urban planning (PESCARIN 2008b, CARDARELLI ET ALII 2004). The results in fact should be used, for example, in the definition of the archaeological *risk* or of building restrictions for patrimony preservation, while their use for *predictive archaeology* is still quite controversial. An archaeological map, in fact, is a necessary and reliable tool since it is based on real-based knowledge, acquired during scientific investigations. Unfortunately, it is not enough to define portions of the territory potentially rich in remains. Predictive archaeology is, rather, based on theoretical models provided by environmental, cultural and geographical observation.

In the United Kingdom the general application of preventive archaeology is defined by governmental rules, since 1990, through the PPG-16 (Planning Policy Guide)<sup>60</sup>. The results of archaeological investigations are then implemented in the Site and Monument Record, an on line archive of known or potential remains. This information has also a public level of visibility, through the on line ADS ArchSearch<sup>61</sup>. It gives the exact location of archaeological sites, visible also on google maps embedded in the page, as well as basic information and other connected resources such as historical maps<sup>62</sup>, road maps and aerial images<sup>63</sup>.

Also in France preventive archaeology is a well established practice. Early examples date back to the 70s. There is a national institute in charge of these kinds of investigation: INRAP, the Institute National de Recherches

---

60 <http://www.communities.gov.uk/index.asp?id=1144057>

61 <http://ahds.ac.uk/archaeology>

62 <http://old-maps.co.uk>

63 <http://www.multimap.com>

Archeologiques Preventive<sup>64</sup>. It contributes to the creation of the National Archaeological Map prepared by following clear rules, a document used by the State itself for urban and environmental planning.

Another example in this field is from Italy. CART (Carta Archeologica del Rischio Territoriale) is the territorial management tool, developed by the Institute of Artistic Cultural and Natural Heritage (IBC) in cooperation with Emilia-Romagna Archaeological Superintendency and several public administrations. It is used as a tool for the knowledge and safeguard of our heritage and as a support for the planning of territorial interventions. CART is a GIS-based system connected with a geographical relational database, accessible on line for registered users. CART enables to add to and search archive information on the basis of various factors such as depth or location; to insert digitized excavations, researches or just traces recognized in historical maps or aerial images; to georeference data; to add geophysical and paleo-botanical analysis; to carry on spatial analysis for quantitative evaluation and simulation of potential reconstruction; virtual reality reconstructions; open access through on line interface at various levels; archaeological potentiality simulation for urban planning (depth or density simulation of possible archaeological findings).

The systematic classification and digitalization of all known archaeological data of a territory, in a geospatial system with editing, analysis and querying functionalities, is fundamental for several reasons: research, reorganization, standardization, availability of information and revision based on spatial analysis. The goal is to build a knowledge instrument on the state of the art of archaeological discoveries (archaeological maps), and a predictive instrument (risk map) useful to reconstruct ancient landscape dynamics in various historical periods. In this case, the reconstruction process produces preventive maps which can be used to support preservation, and our collective memory, for a better, more aware urban and territorial development.

---

64 [http:// www.inrap.fr](http://www.inrap.fr)





## **Chapter 6**

### **OpenLand: open source and landscape archaeology**

#### **.B.1 Introduction**

In 1999, in his famous book “The Cathedral and the Bazaar”, Raymond wrote that the style of the Linux community looked like a confusing bazaar, full of projects with different approaches. Although it would seem that only a miracle could bring about a stable and coherent system, this style works. The development of an open source project was compared by Raymond to a bazaar because it was different from a centralized approach like the common software development style. His objection referred to the need for a centralized approach, in relation to projects with a high level of complexity. In these cases, the traditional approach was directed at leaving the entire work of software development to individual genius or small bands of wizards, without any intermediate version available (RAYMOND 2000: 19-20). But the history of Linux and of some open source projects has indicated a valid alternative approach. The considerations that originally referred to software development might be of interest also to the archaeological field. Landscape reconstruction process could be inspired by some developments of Open Source tools.

In Cultural Heritage, projects do not have always a “linear” development, for several reasons, such as the continuous lack of substantial funding or the difficulties over sharing, or the way new data are found. This means that the “natural” development of a project is often subverted by more urgent priorities. Sometimes the projects themselves have a certain vagueness to allow for a necessary flexibility. If on the other hand we compare its approach to the one adopted in industrial and commercial fields, as in all those areas with a more pronounced economic impact, we can see the latter follows a “vertical management”, from the initial construction phase of a project to the hierarchical management of human resources. Several business models based on this approach have been analysed by economists for adoption by the humanities.

There is another reason why we can associate open movement and virtual heritage: the social aspect. The archaeological landscape, sites, parks, and historical monuments are heritage properties belonging to the worldwide community.

Researchers, scholars, and curators also have a social and public mission. This mission regards the study and conservation of our heritage to enable it to be transmitted to future memory.

Scientific research itself has a public dimension, in the creation of studies of our collective heritage and cultural landscapes, and also in the communication of

such studies.

What is often underestimated is that progress in research is also founded on information sharing criteria. This will be increasingly clear in Europe, where, in a sort of “global competition”, will emerge those who can get access to knowledge. The extension of an open source approach to the field of archaeological landscape may open up new horizons, in terms of available tools used and methodologies to be applied to sustainable projects, as EU projects such as Epoch<sup>65</sup> have demonstrated. The question, whether a “conversion” to open source and a rediscovery of a real public dimension of research in the actual economic panorama is really possible, is still open (LASER 2005). We could think about a softer approach, directed at the adoption of alternative possibilities to already available commercial products.

Although the Open Source movement started from software development, there is perhaps a lesson to be learnt also by cultural heritage (STALLMAN 2001, TORVALDS DIAMOND 2001): “visiting a bazaar” might produce good results in terms of research’s global (not just individual) growth. Open Source therefore can represent a possible alternative to commercial software and offer different models of project development and of business (AA.VV. 1999).

Open Source concerns the way a software is distributed, together with its code. It doesn't just mean access to the source code, as stated by the Open Source Initiative<sup>66</sup>, but should satisfy the following requirements:

- I free re-distribution;
- II source code availability;
- III opportunity for modifications and derived works;
- IV integrity of the author's source code;
- V no discrimination against persons or groups or against fields of endeavor;
- VI continuity in the distribution of licenses;
- VII no license specificity for a product;
- VIII no restrictions for other software;
- IX neutral development of technology.

In archaeology, we can treat Open Source as a movement that offers open (and often free) software, but we can also use it as a reference methodology for the development of a project or an application.

As we have seen in chapters 1 and 2, transparency in the reconstruction process is crucial. As a method, Open Source can offer several solutions to maintain transparency in the results.

In the next sections, I will try to describe its pros and cons, comparing a typical Open Source project with one belonging to landscape archaeology.

---

<sup>65</sup> <http://www.epoch-net.org>

<sup>66</sup> [http:// www.opensource.org](http://www.opensource.org)

At the beginning, programmers freely shared the software they were developing, together with the source code. The result of this practice is described as an incredibly rapid development of the field, with many consequent positive effects on final users (STALLMAN 2001). At the end of the 80s this development started to slow down, perhaps in part due to the introduction of software patents, thus giving only binary programs to final users. This commercial strategy led to the creation of probably more stable, robust and documented software, but it also blocked the creation of new algorithms and tools. In 1984 those programmers who believed in a different philosophy decided to join the Free Software Foundation and the Open Source Initiative (STALLMAN LAWRENCE 2002). Those who subscribe to the initiative and decide to publish their tools under a public license (such as GPL or LGPL<sup>67</sup>) believe that this can contribute to the creation of better software and to its rapid evolution. For an end-user, it means that it is possible to download and use tools (binaries or precompiled versions), modifying them (or asking for modifications) and adding new functionalities, appropriate for a specific purpose. It is also possible to continuously access new releases or updates and participate in the international community, as users, with requests and suggestions.

## **.B.2 Open Source and Landscape Archaeology**

While Information Technology is related to software and hardware, landscape archaeology concerns cultural and environmental information. Researchers in the former field are involved mostly in software development, while the interpretation process absorbs archaeologists, anthropologists and environmental experts. What I propose here is that this field can probably benefit from the application of an open approach. To what extent?

As described in the previous section, *participation* is a key element, typical of an open project, and connected to any further potential sustainable development. A project in fact can be maintained by the scientific community itself, if it is a research project, or by a users community, in the case of knowledge dissemination and communication. Involving people and taking them *into* the projects makes them aware of the scientific cognitive process or memory, enabling an easier continuous updating, preventing obsolescence. An open approach institutes a dynamic involvement process between players, encouraging a wider participation of the entire working group. Some analysts think that a new way, based on sharing and exchange, is slowly emerging,

---

67 For a description of most common licenses: <http://www.gnu.org/licenses/>

beside the typical private industrial economics, price-driven (BENKLER 2005). Other studies have underlined that the use of technologies in various fields, such as in archaeology, involves a continuous state of tension between a “working-together” and a “working-apart” philosophy (SURMAN REILLY 2003<sup>68</sup>). This dichotomy emerges even more clearly, when we consider the research that uses the network or that are web-based. In these cases, four main approaches can be identified: formal, informal, distributed and centralized (table 6.1). Each approach tends to use different applications and tools, making a different use of reconstructions.

FORMAL		CENTRALIZED
DISTRIBUTED	Research Networks, Collaborative Environments, Repositories	
	Social Networks, Wikis, Blogs, P2P, MuDs	Alternative Media (Interactive Kiosks, Virtual Museums), mailing lists, games
INFORMAL		

table 6.1 – schematic approach in cultural heritage

Institutions, such as museums, universities, government bodies, etc. tend to have a more formal centralized approach, controlling information and communication, in a top-down perspective, through “linear” systems such as traditional media. In a few cases, there are experiments regarding a more informal and interactive use, for example with Virtual Museums. They use mainly commercial products. The scientific community follows a more formal-distributed approach and employs some commercial tools, but also many open projects. The communication in this case, one-to-many, when directed at a public, or many-to-many, in the case of working environments, can in the future benefit from the diffusion of an open approach. In fact the construction of open systems which allow the exchange of data and information and the sharing of ideas inside multidisciplinary groups, can trigger a virtuous cycle, encouraging “working-together” initiatives, to the disadvantage of “working-apart”. Interdisciplinary activities, in fact, are essential in the development of innovative and useful projects. In its initial phases, a project should involve a variety of people and experts, to indicate knowledge bases, necessities, interests

68 On line version of the report is available at:  
[http://programs.ssrc.org/itic/publications/knowledge\\_report/final\\_entire\\_surman\\_reilly.pdf](http://programs.ssrc.org/itic/publications/knowledge_report/final_entire_surman_reilly.pdf)

and requirements. The definition of a common language is another requirement, the premise for and the consequence of this approach.

An open project of landscape reconstruction should therefore be characterized by an exchange and sharing practice, from its beginning distinguishing what the general development plan requires from the software development/use plan. The use of exchange tools (repositories, content management systems, etc.) and media (Internet) makes it really feasible (LUKE et alii 2004).

### **.B.3 Open Networks**

The use of a *network* is a fundamental requirement of an open and multidisciplinary approach.

The Internet is increasingly becoming a *working* environment and not only a communication media, useful to publish, often marginally, the results of research.

The network, thanks to the widespread development of physical infrastructures and the widespread availability of broadband connections in many countries, is today one of the most powerful media to access and diffuse information and knowledge.

The possibility of integrating different data, thanks to the network, increases *validation and criticism* of the research itself, preventing wasted effort and resources duplication. Moreover, it enables rapid development through sharing. The Internet is therefore an instrument for knowledge, communication and dissemination, but also for study and research (SURMAN REILLY 2003).

Available tools are: on line database, Content Management Systems (CMS), on line multimedia repositories, webGIS, VRwebGIS and, in the future, also Collaborative Virtual Environments (chapter 7).

### **.B.4 Open tools for ancient landscape reconstruction**

There are several open source tools already in use or potentially useful in archaeology, either as alternatives to commercial software or as starting points in the development of new applications specifically orientated to the field.

How can open tools be found? One of the principal sources is SourceForge<sup>69</sup>, with its 100.000 projects and one million registered users. It is a space dedicated to open source projects, where programmers can exchange source codes and users can access binary software. It is considered the largest repository of available codes and applications. It is a public and open resource where it is possible to publish projects and share their codes or information on them, working together through the net. The use of this kind of shared space strengthens the quality of delivered applications, because they are also open

---

69 This repository is available at: <http://www.sourceforge.net>

spaces, where other skillful developers belonging to a broad worldwide community, can freely express criticisms. The idea itself of putting forward a project in such a “glass case”, with tremendous visibility, represents a further motivation in producing products that are stable, robust, and error free.

It was said above that open source software is developed by several programmers contemporaneously, working on the same program (code), or who add sub-programs to the main one. Within this structure, the only way to produce reasonable results is to align and keep track of various versions, merging them, but preserving, at the same time, a history of the project. For this purpose, programmers use Software Configuration Management tools (SCM), such as CVS (Current Versions System<sup>70</sup>), Subversion (SVN) or Tortoise<sup>71</sup>. These softwares are exactly designed to control different versions and align them. Also in the landscape reconstruction process there are several researchers working on the same territory or on the same site or even model. Sometimes it can be very difficult to cooperate, avoiding wasted effort or duplication. A simple example of this approach is the shared writing of a document through an on-line management system, such as GoogleDocs. In 3d modeling this can already be seen. When different modelers have to work, for instance, on the same monument, but concentrating on different parts, it is quite helpful to use tools which can help to align them to the resulting merged model, keeping track of the different versions. An experiment in this approach was made during the Virtual Rome project, with the OSG Post Processing tool (fig. 6.1) (PESCARIN et alii 2008). Unfortunately there are no relevant examples in the “terrain” field, although this could be really challenging. Recently, there are some interesting initiatives that can provide stimulating suggestions for the scientific community. One of these is the Open Archaeology initiative, which hosts a number of sub-projects dedicated to tools specifically designed for archaeology, such as StereoPhotogrammetry, Digisite, and so on<sup>72</sup>. Another one is the Virtual Terrain Project, probably the most complete review web-site regarding terrain generation and visualization.

*Figure 6.1 osg\_postproc\_tool.jpg*

The complexity of landscape reconstruction makes acquisition and post-processing activities quite problematic. The risk is to create huge monographic studies, far from the spatial or temporal context, or which cannot be integrated

---

70 <http://www.nongnu.org/cvs/>

71 <http://subversion.tigris.org>, <http://tortoisesvn.tigris.org/>

72 <https://launchpad.net/openarchaeology>

into other research on the same topic. *Integration* is another central issue in data processing; it can be obtained by working inside a single digital “framework”, collecting and connecting data, procedures, technologies, formats, and methodologies, from different disciplines. In this way greater care is taken over exchange formats more than on standards, or on the methodological approach rather than on software lists. The more we use open exchange formats, the more researchers can be free to choose tools better suited to their uses. Projects and data can therefore be more easily updated and moved from one platform to another<sup>73</sup>. Users dependency on the software company in the case of commercial products is very great and makes for insecurity. If it fails, or decides not to produce a specific software we are using any more, we will no longer be able to read our data.

In table 6.2 there is a schematic list of the most common open source tools, useful for landscape reconstruction, together with their commercial references. In the Appendix there is a more detailed description of most of these tools.

Category	Commercial tools	Open Source tools
Operative System	Windows, Mac	Linux, (CygWin)
Server	Microsoft IIS	Apache
Suite Office	Microsoft Office	OpenOffice, KOffice
Web browser	MSExplorer, Safari, Opera	Mozilla Firefox, Konqueror
Desktop Publishing	Macromedia Freehand, Xpress, FrameMaker	Inkscape, Scribus
Image Processing	Photoshop	Gimp
CMS (Content Management System)	Oracle	Mambo, Joomla, Drupal, PHP-Nuke, MediaWiki
CAD	AutoCad	Qcad, BRLcad
Panorama Tools	QuickTime, PhotoVista	PanoramaTool, PanoTools, PTStitcher OpenQuickTime (Linux), Hugin
GIS	ESRI ARCGIS, ARCpad	GRASS, QGis
webGIS		MapServer
VR webGIS and 3d webGIS	Skyline	OSG4WEB
Virtual Reality CG libraries, development toolkits	VirTools, Vtree, Unity3D	OpenSceneGraph, OpenSG, Delta 3D
Game Engine	Torque	OGRE
Terrain generator and Ecosystem generator	Terravista, Multigen Creator Terrain Studio, Visual Nature Studio, Bryce	OSGdem, Demeter, VTP
GPS software	SkyPro	OpenSourceGPS, GPStoolkit,
3d modeling	3D Studio Max, Maya	Blender, Art of Illusion,

73 On open formats: Open-document Standard Initiative (<http://www.oasis-open.org/specs>)

		Wings 3d
Laser Scanner (acquisition, processing)	Cyclone, RapidForm	Grass, MeshLab, Scanalyze, MeshAlign, PointShop
3d viewer and web 3d viewer		
Software Configuration Management tools		CVS, Turtoise, SVN

Table 6.2

Landscape reconstruction requires the contribution of various disciplines, as we have explained, in a dynamic process. An open approach contributes therefore to creating a *research network*, through which various and distant working groups could cooperate, using Internet. Moreover, the entire digital pipeline described in chapter 2 can be successfully designed on Open Source software, as can be seen in the proposed scheme (fig. 6.2).

Figure 6.2: fig12\_1\_digital\_pipeline\_opensource.tif

Data acquired in the field, with GPS, Laser Total Station or Laser Scanner, are initially treated with specific software provided by the instruments. Almost all hardware companies, in fact, do not let their users freely access the source code of the accompanying software. Nevertheless, there are some projects which are developing tools to process raw data captured by instruments.

Raw data may be initially uploaded on a server, in order to store the original data’s accuracy and resolution.

After the acquisition, raw data are processed in the lab with various software categories. For 3d modeling processing, tools might be used such as Scanalyze<sup>74</sup>, MeshLab<sup>75</sup> or, although not open but free, the ARC3D webservice (Automatic Reconstruction Conduit)<sup>76</sup>, and in the following phase a computer graphic software more oriented towards realistic rendering and computer animation, such as Blender<sup>77</sup>. For terrain generation, the first step requires the use of GIS and Remote Sensing tools. The most famous and mature GIS package is GRASS<sup>78</sup>, that can be used both for vector and raster data. It also has powerful algorithms for remote sensing analysis. To generate 3d terrains and to create entire ecosystems consisting of forests, monuments and other objects, there is for example the Virtual Terrain Project or OSGdem, a tool that belongs

74 <http://graphics.stanford.edu/software/scanalyze/>

75 <http://meshlab.sourceforge.net/>

76 <http://www.arc3d.be/>

77 <http://www.blender.org>

78 <http://grass.itc.it/>



to the OpenSceneGraph library<sup>79</sup>. Metadata and other textual information can be stored in a database such as MySQL or, in the case of spatial data, PostGRE SQL.

Processed data can be uploaded in a structured repository, built on a geographical database, and accessible to non-programmers through a web-based interface. A Content Management System, based on various connected on line databases, can be successfully used in order to let users access repositories and add their contents (3d, 2d, multimedia, text), or modify those already uploaded. Although the majority of CMS are dedicated to text or image content, some experiments are actually in progress to enable a user to access and edit also 3d or 2d-geospecific data, embedding or integrating plug-ins for 3d visualization, such as OSG4WEB-backend,<sup>80</sup> or webGIS editing, such as ARK<sup>81</sup>. Through these systems data can be visualized, edited, dynamically modified, and connected to other repositories or database. Other useful tools for shared work are Wikis<sup>82</sup>. The entire set of processed information will be integrated in shared repositories, which can be successfully used in the following reconstructive phases (archaeological, interpreted and potential landscapes). The reconstruction work can be configured as a collective process, developed on shared resources inside 2d or 3d geospatial environments.

The digital pipeline ends with the landscape reconstruction and with its visualization on line or off-line, through an interactive real-time system (VR – AR) or through a non-interactive visualization (video, digital image). The creation of a Virtual Reality application, where users can dynamically explore the reconstructed landscapes activating various behaviors, requires significant programming activity, especially in the Open Source domain. 3D platforms dedicated to VR, such as OpenSceneGraph<sup>83</sup> or OpenSG<sup>84</sup>, or game and simulation engines, such as OGRE, Crystal Space<sup>85</sup> or Delta3D<sup>86</sup>, although very powerful, often do not offer development and deployment utilities. VR (web)GIS and 3d (web)GIS represent a good compromise for those who need to visualize geographical dataset and 3d models simultaneously and interactively, although open source solutions are still under development. One example is the OSG4WEB plug-in developed by Italian CNR and CINECA Visit Lab (CALORI

---

79 <http://www.openscenegraph.org/projects/osg/wiki/Support/UserGuides/osgdem>

80 See Virtual Rome project: <http://www.virtualrome.net>

81 See <http://ark.lparchaeology.com/>

82 There are several open source Wikis (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki>), such as MediaWiki (<http://www.mediawiki.org>)

83 <http://www.openscenegraph.org>

84 <http://opensg.vrsources.org/trac>

85 OGRE game engine: <http://www.ogre.org>; Crystal Space: <http://www.crystalspace3d.org>

86 Delta3D is a simulation engine that manages geospatial information: <http://www.delta3d.org/>

et alii 2008). OSG4WEB provides a framework for in-browser OpenGL-based application wrapping. The framework allows the development of OpenGL and OSG based applications embedded in the browsers, allowing JavaScript bidirectional interaction with surrounding page elements. It is particularly suited to landscape visualization over the web, since it supports paged LOD terrains (chapter 7).

Realistic rendering, animations and video compositing are still quite problematic, in both non-open and open communities. Landscape characteristics, in fact, make the management of large territories inside traditional Computer Graphics software such as 3D Studio Max or Blender, very difficult. One solution is to use a game or simulation engine that supports terrain rendering, or import terrain generation outputs.

A full and updated review of the most common open source tools is available also in the Wikipedia, divided into categories<sup>87</sup>.

## **.B.5 Other open case studies**

During the annual CAA (Computer Application in Archaeology) international conference held in Prato in 2004, some colleagues and I organized a workshop for the first time on open source and free ware in archaeology (“Open Source and free ware applications to archaeological research”). During the workshop the increasing tendency of the worldwide community to try out this relatively new approach emerged quite clearly. Some of the projects presented on that occasion are still maintained and developed, demonstrating that in the near future more and more users will start using and developing open source solutions for archaeology.

The following case studies represent interesting examples.

ArcheOS, developed by the ArcTeam, offers archaeologists the chance to have a Linux distribution which includes fundamental specialized tools for CAD drawing, GIS, database creation, GPS, Scanner Laser, statistics, stereo-photogrammetry, image processing and computer-graphic<sup>88</sup>.

I have already mentioned GRASS (Geographic Resources Analysis Support System), a powerful GIS and remote sensing tool at one and the same time, continuously maintained and updated by its main developer community based in Trento, Italy. This software was initially developed for the US Army in 1982 by CERL (Construction Engineering Research Laboratory). In 1997 it was released to the worldwide community open and free. Since that moment, this

---

87 Open Source software:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_open\\_source\\_software\\_packages](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_open_source_software_packages)

88 <http://www.arc-team.com/archeos/wiki/doku.php?id=home>

project, now available also under Windows, has created new functionalities for terrain creation and visualization, for GPS and Laser Scanner data management<sup>89</sup>. Now it is part of a wider framework, OSGeo.

In the field of VR application dedicated to terrain interactive exploration we should also mention the VISMAN project, a software framework for Managing Virtual Scenarios. It is currently developed at CINECA Visit laboratory and is mainly devoted to cultural heritage. It is written in C++ and uses the wxWidgets and OpenSceneGraph libraries, so it relies on open-source software only. It is available on Windows and Linux systems, being scalable from an average PC to a virtual theater with stereo capabilities. It has been used to develop advanced systems within virtual cultural environments, as in the case of the simulation of the results of a possible new eruption of the Vesuvius volcano<sup>90</sup> (fig. 5.10). The same simulation might be used to recreate the 79 AD eruption in Pompeii. Visman's goal is directed to the integrated fruition of complex 3D and multimedia contents on multi-platform technologies and in various contexts. The 3D virtual worlds become starting points for a straightforward interaction with complex environments that can be navigated, modified and queried through the link to more than one relational Data Base at a time (GIS, Multimedia, etc.), becoming an interface for accessing multiple information<sup>91</sup>.

## **.B.6 Conclusions and future perspectives**

Today software and contents are more and more integrating into advanced systems, available on line. The creation of programs, through an open approach, dedicated to the specific needs of the discipline, enables the creation of sustainable projects and the rapid evolution of the research itself.

We are slowly moving toward a shared on-line cyberspace, where interdisciplinary exchanges can happen and allow new ideas and methodologies to emerge. New cooperation agreements in the field of archaeology, computer science, psychology and the environment should be created.

The archaeologist's role itself is changing, and it will change all the faster

---

89 Useful references can be found in the FOSS4G conferences or in the GRASS users conferences, such as [http://www.ing.unitn.it/~grass/conferences/GRASS2002/proceedings/proceedings/pdfs/Brovelli\\_Maria\\_Antonia.pdf](http://www.ing.unitn.it/~grass/conferences/GRASS2002/proceedings/proceedings/pdfs/Brovelli_Maria_Antonia.pdf)

90 <http://exploris.pi.ingv.it>

91 [http://www.cineca.it/resources/files/visman\\_en.pdf](http://www.cineca.it/resources/files/visman_en.pdf); to download the software: <http://www.cineca.it/resources/files/visman.zip>

when they are involved inside (open) collaborative environments, where a more efficient and pragmatic perspective will assure more reliable results.

Archaeologists will still occupy a very important position in these projects even if they are not computer experts. Their perspective can help in addressing and testing applications and software development.

From this viewpoint, open source should not be intended only as a collection of softwares, but as a project that is also a network of people, methods, and technologies, adaptable to the various applicative contexts. Landscape reconstruction will be a pre-eminent field in the development of new applications web-based and GIS oriented, if it follows a few basic rules in the development of the actual project:

1. get your data out, perfection will come later;
2. avoid locking your data in proprietary formats;
3. prefer free and open source software for data editing and storage.

## Chapter 7

### Webscapes

#### .B.1 Internet connections

Internet is the most widely used planetary inter-connection system. If we examine the evolution of the Internet landscape (the webscape) over the last 10 years on a map, we will be very surprised<sup>92</sup>.

Although it started as an intra-net to connect leading research institutions<sup>93</sup>, its wide diffusion is mainly due to the use that has been made of it by ordinary people at home. In the 80's, the world began to be transferred from the outside to the inside. In this sort of “Escher” game, the perception of *time* and *space* changed. *Near* or *now* are today much more expanded concepts than they were in the previous era.

The internet is now giving new meaning to concepts of equity, of impact (also in terms of politics), of trust through collaboration processes, and sustainability (economic impact) (SURMAN REILLY 2003).

*Figure 7.1 – webscape.tif*

Internet has also exasperated the way information is sought. Interaction is on the increase through hyperlinks and windows interfaces. Understanding doesn't just depend on analysis, but also on navigation and on the creation of new personal paths.

In this new era these are also new risks: the risk of limiting our approach to surface explorations, to rapid navigation, losing our capacity to concentrate and analyse; the risk of dealing with the world as a collection of signifiers without a signified; the risk of being manipulated by simulations (TURKLE 1997: 121-140). This Internet era is in fact the era of simulations and of new freedoms, which become merely apparent and superficial, if we don't achieve greater awareness through the creation of critical instruments, tools to increase our potential for memorization and understanding. On the one hand opacity does enable us to deal with a higher level of complexity, and to create connections, which would otherwise be impossible. Internet is a parallel world, a new type of organism; new objects live in its connections, “lives on the screen” (TURKLE 1997: 42). While we work studying and simulating the landscape we are part of a complex

---

92 Map of connections: [http://www.telegeography.com/products/map\\_internet](http://www.telegeography.com/products/map_internet)

93 Further information and links at: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internet>

system of relations and connections (fig. 7.1).

Internet *is* everywhere in most of the world, it is part of us, and it will be a persistent aspect of everyday life more and more in the future. It is not a matter of *if* we want to use it in or for our research. The question is whether we want to be connected, or isolated and left apart, whether we want to dialogue, to disseminate, to measure the merits and results of our studies. Internet *is* today a medium of science, beside traditional scientific publications.

In terms of social change and global scientific development, it is necessary for new concepts to be diffused as far as possible. In some cases a capillary diffusion isn't necessarily connected to content validity, but to the way these concepts are diffused and the medium used. The way parallel programming (PDP) started to be so widely diffused was due to the free distribution of software to be tried out on floppy disks, in conformity with the successful model "try it, play it, modify it" (TURKLE 1997: 163-164).

The use and further development of web applications in this new and complex field of ancient landscape reconstruction depends, therefore, on social dynamics. From a certain perspective, the resistance to reconstruction activities we still experience in much of the Cultural Heritage field is a positive factor, part of the cultural impact of a new approach. This resistance tries to separate emotions and aesthetics from cognition and logic, returning our attention to essential characteristics, creating a distance between virtuality and the reality of ancient landscape.

What can be done for landscape reconstruction through or with Internet? There is no simple answer to this question. In this book we have analysed the various aspects of the field: *people* (scientists and the worldwide community, teachers and learners, etc.), *data* (geographical, spatial, bi- or three-dimensional, multimedia, ecosystems etc.), *processes* (visualisation, interpretation, transparency, interaction, exchange, cooperation, land evaluation, data acquisition, post-processing, etc.) and *systems* (simulation and communication systems, interaction, virtual reality, complex systems, etc.). I'll try to answer the question above by taking as reference this distinction, indicating a few general categories, analysing problems and state of the art, and finally proposing some solutions. Table 7.1 proposes a summary.

## **.B.2        webscapes**

### ***People***

*Social networks* represent an interesting possible evolution for scientific communities to exchange ideas and results. As described in chapter 5, these

networks aren't necessarily visual environments. In most cases they are places where people can exchange information, through text-base tools, and multimedia data, such as pictures or videos. One of the most famous social networks is *facebook*. With millions of members, its owes its success to its structure. First, it was designed for college students, *by* college students. Second, it allows information to spread widely but also protects *privacy*: you can *trust* it. Third, it emphasises *clusters* (socio-economic) and groups, thanks also to low-involvement communication; and last but not least, it offers *simplicity* and *speed*. It can be used by people interested in specific topics, such as ancient landscape. In fact the success of a social network depends to a great extent on having many users. It works when it creates social aggregations with people joining public discussions and forming personal relationships in the cyberspace (REINGOLD 1994).

*Virtual Communities* are more focused on the concept of experience (chapter 5). They include 3d visual environments at different levels. The user participates in the VR community through a digital alter-ego or an avatar, employed also to create a relation and an involvement with other users. A virtual community is based on the same concept as the social network, from a certain perspective: the creation of relations among people. In a Virtual Community the cyberspace becomes place.

In these cases, the language used, the interfaces, and the levels of interaction are crucial. Virtual reconstructions of ancient landscapes will be interesting for a wider community of humanists when developed applications start to speak the language of the humanities, and for a community of scientists when it starts to speak the language of logic and mathematics. As Sherry Turkle observed in her "Life on the Screen", sometimes it is necessary to create a Trojan horse to enable some ideas or approaches to be introduced into "enemy territories" (TURKLE 1997: 169).

*E-Learning* applications are commonly used for online education at various levels. They involve teachers/students in learning activities. Although in most cases they are used as the simple re-production of academic lectures, they could go much beyond the simple lesson, when they become an *experience*. They often are based on VR online platforms, such as Second Life or ActiveWorlds, but they are carefully put together by teachers. These 3D online e-learning platforms can be particularly successful, as in the Quest Atlantis described in the following section, since they personally involve students in the solution of problems, helping them to get to know and understand the basic or specific information they require.

## **Data**

*On Line repositories* are particularly useful for landscape reconstruction, since

they enable us to access basic shared resources, such as geoimages (like the Global Land Cover Facility), digital elevation models, 3d models, vector files, etc.. They can be simply FTP spaces, accessible widely or restricted to registered users, or they can be accessed through more advanced and structured interfaces, and included in digital libraries and WCMS.

*Digital Libraries* are structured typological archives of digital content, as in the case of Roman vegetation library or 3d terrains or 3d architectonic parts library. They are based on online database structures (like MySql or Oracle), geo-based in the case of geographical datasets (such as PostGreSQL). They are used in content management systems.

A web content management system (WCMS or Web CMS) is a content management system (CMS) software, usually implemented as a Web application, for creating and managing HTML content and connecting html pages dynamically to digital libraries and online repositories. It is used to manage and control a large, dynamic collection of Web material. It facilitates content creation, editing and maintenance. There are many available CMS platforms (like Joomla, etc.). Usually this software provides authoring tools designed to allow users to easily create and manage contents. The most advanced WCMS can include 3d visualisation and DB visual editing functionalities, embedding 3d plug-ins.

Other well known and fundamental tools for landscape online visualisation are *webGIS*. They started as web extensions of GIS software, used to manage cartography online, but they are more widely used now and have broader communicative attitude. A webGIS is used to disseminate geo-spatial information, but also to archive and share archaeological and environmental information with other users. In some advanced cases, they have a higher interaction level, including editing functionalities which more closely involve a variety of professionals, e.g. in public administration, higher education, tourist operators, etc.

An evolution of webGIS is *3d webGIS*. They enable on line 3d visualisation of geographical information with basic functionalities such as interactive exploration and in some cases questioning or problem raising. The first 3d webGIS platform was Skyline, an Israeli company which first believed in this promising field as early as 1997. Nevertheless, Google Earth is surely the most well-known application. Its developments are leading to a further development of this project directed at VR functionalities creation (VR webGIS).

## ***Processes***

There aren't many applications or examples which handle geo-spatial processes. This specific field, although at its very beginning, is very promising.

A recent tool, used also by specialists to exchange information or share specific



knowledge (such as software development or program use), is *Wiki*. The best known example is the *wikipedia*, but Wikis can be successfully integrated in the process of landscape reconstruction since they enable the scientific community to share, edit, modify, or correct textual information, integrating images or videos and referring to other tools, such as digital libraries or online repositories. They are also commonly used in the cooperative work of project development.

Less familiar applications are *cooperative environments*, also known as CVEs (Collaborative Virtual Environments). They are still at a very experimental stage. CVEs are a class of networking applications that support collaboration between remote users, through a common spatial environment and using 3D graphics; CVEs are updated so as to reflect the actions and the movements of each of the participants. They are based on the concept of data and knowledge sharing, and on editing and validating functionalities. They include 3d and real time characteristics, typical of virtual reality applications, and communication paradigms of VR communities. In the near future they could be very promising applications, useful to reconstruct and represent potential Roman landscape, through the integration of different sources, the definition of models to be loaded and the identification of content connected to 3d models. The entire process can be completely updatable and editable. Some attempts have been made in this direction, enabling 3d editing, apart from the 3d terrain that needs to be pre-processed to be handled online as paged. There are also inspired examples that have explored the possibilities of exchanging digital information in a sort of virtual reality networking matrix, as in the case of City Cluster.

Another interesting field for landscape reconstruction is *3d web service*. This includes a variety of services, from the distribution of stitched pictures, and geographical data on demand, including also post-processed remote sensing data, to the digital publication of scientific works. Recently there are some interesting new developments in the creation of 3d digital models online, from a series of pictures provided by users. This service, described below, is based on computer vision technology. Although not yet available, in the future there will be more and more of this kind of service, dedicated to 3d digital modelling or also to 3d terrain modelling, on demand. The success and diffusion of such complex projects will probably depend upon the service itself and the source code being (initially) freely and openly available .

## ***Systems***

In chapter 5, I dedicated some space to the description of Landscape Virtual Museums. One of the most promising communication systems, in terms of potential diffusion, of knowledge dissemination and cognitive impact are *online Virtual Museums*. If virtual museums, despite being known about and used

since the early 90s, are still considered at an embryonic stage, this is even more true for online VR museums. In the inclusive Internet dimension, where anything can be accessed with a click, it is essential to avoid hyper-information, which in the end may turn out to be no information. These applications should therefore provide the careful design of behaviour, the differentiation of levels of access to information, a well planned storyboard and well constructed storytelling.

Online *computer games* are surely more mature applications. The powerful role that they are playing in culture and society cannot be denied, as well as the issues that may be raised about the boundaries between the 'real' and the 'virtual'. It doesn't simply involve a "migration" of previous board games into digital online format, but has a wider social impact. Games have also gained a place at the academic level today, with thousands of courses held on the subject throughout the world. One specific type of game is the so-called MMORPG, an acronym for "Massively Multiplayer Online Role-Playing Game". In a MMORPG, thousands of players exist in the same game world at the same time. They play a role game together in a 3d environment. World of Warcraft is one of the best known MMORPGs. It enables thousands of players to come together online and battle against the world and each other. Players from across the globe can leave the real world behind and undertake quests and heroic exploits in a land of fantastic adventure. It allows players to play the game at their own pace; it offers interesting quests with story elements, and dynamic events. There are several game engines which can be used to create interactive 3d experiences, even on line<sup>94</sup>. Most of them are costly and proprietary, but rich in available behaviours, such as physics management, multi-user functionalities or artificial life implementation. Although a few of them are dedicated to geographical simulation, the majority aren't focused on the treatment of "real-based" spatial datasets. In order to maintain a high level of speed (frame rate) and interactivity, especially on line, they use specific techniques to visualise and create texture and geometry (procedural modelling, procedural texture creation, normal maps, shaders and similar effects).

While computer-games aren't usually based on geo-spatial scientific datasets, there is a type of application which includes some aspects typical of Virtual Reality systems and others of GIS: *VR webGIS*. These applications can be used to visualise large territories online, interactively, to explore sites in an intra-site and inter-site dynamic, to add to and query elements of the environment, to create personal interpretation paths, and to test simulation models, including artificial life evolution. They are spatial geographical applications and for this reason they can be successfully used by the scientific community as working tools. They can be developed through a cooperative virtual environment or a

---

94 A complete list is available at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_game\\_engines](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_game_engines)

web content management system (WCMS). Unfortunately, there aren't many examples of them, and a lot still needs to be done. In the panorama of 3d applications rendering platforms “browser embedded” there is no clear leader of the market, or even generally accepted standard. This panorama is currently led by game applications, which have also influenced its development (hardware and software), driven mainly by the high budget that characterizes these “productions”. This has implied the development of various hardware and software platforms and the creation of privately owned and expensive development systems, often customized to specific devices so as to obtain very high performance. On the other hand, Internet tends to define a different mode to access content, an open standardized one (e.g. html, Javascript, Xml, etc.). Open Source and cross platform projects are therefore fostered (see the Firefox project). For this reason, joining these two worlds (of 3d interactive and of web access) isn't easy, and there are still no consolidated approaches or standard technologies to use as reference (fig. 7.2). One of the projects that will be described in the following section, Virtual Rome, has proposed a solution to this problem.

We can subdivide available browser embedded systems into: VRML-X3D based systems, global earth geo-viewers, flash based systems and general purpose Scene Graph based systems (CALORI ET ALII 2009).

*Figure 7.2 – pipeline\_web.tif*

As we have seen there are several available applications, some of them based on well-established technology, other on experimental high-end technologies. If we are interested in the online publication of a landscape, it is important to start assessing what is available. In order to evaluate a web project or application we should take into account communication potential, interaction, transparency, functionalities and also intuitiveness. The following parameters can be considered in the evaluation process:

- Web browser integration (applications embedded in the web browser or stand alone);
- technology used to develop applications (original software; VRML-X3D based systems; flash based systems and general purpose Scene Graph based systems; global earth geo-viewers; Java based applications or game engines based applications);
- Operative Systems and Browsers (Windows/ Explorer; Windows/ Explorer and Firefox; Windows and Linux/Explorer and Firefox; Windows, Linux and Mac/Explorer, Firefox and Safari; other);

- graphic card use (OpenGL; DirectX);
- interaction devices (mouse; graphic interface; keyboard; natural interaction; other);
- content that can be loaded in final application (GIS 2d or 3d data (DTM, geoimages, etc.); vector data; labels; 3d models; multimedia; metadata; avatars; other);
- type of loaded terrain (paged or not paged);
- type of available behaviours (fly or walk functionalities; hyperlinks; reference maps; overlay of various layers; switching of layers, terrains, etc.; dynamic evolutions, simulations; animations; virtual communities; artificial life; etc.);
- type of licence (Open Source, commercial, application built on open libraries and released as freeware; other);
- type of downloading (streaming or complete download).

### **.B.3 State of the art**

This section is dedicated to examples, case studies, projects and web applications dedicated to the use of Internet for ancient landscape online publication and interaction. The most room is given to interactive 2d and 3d projects, whose utility has been extensively discussed in previous chapters.

category	type	Examples
People	Social Networks	Facebook
	Virtual Communities	FIRB
	E-learning	Quest Atlantis, Akragas doors in Second Life
Data	Online repositories	Global Land Cover Facility, Open Street Map, etc.
	Online Content Management Systems	Virtual Rome
	Digital Libraries	Roman vegetation library; 3d model libraries
	webGIS	ECAI TimeMap; ADS; Fasti On Line; CART
	3D webGIS	SkyLine, Nasa WoldWind, Google Earth (Rome Reborn)
Processes	Cooperative Virtual Environments	FIRB, Virtual Rome, City Cluster
	3d web services	Epoch 3d web service
	Wiki	Media wiki,
Systems	Online virtual museums	Donald Sanders; Clarke, Flaminia on line virtual museum
	VR webGIS	Appia VR webGIS, Salerno archaeological district, Virtual Rome
	Online computer games	Rome

Table 7.1

Examples of online repositories dedicated to geographical or spatial information, such as the Global Land Cover Facility or the USGS Earth Explorer, are listed in Appendix B.

WebGIS is quite a stable and well-known technology. Specific applications, based on webGIS platforms, have been developed for ancient landscape visualisation or archaeological site location, at different levels of interaction. All these projects are browser-embedded and their portability depends on the software or library used. The three cases given below are based on three different tools.

ECAI, the Electronic Cultural Atlas Initiative, developed the *TimeMap*<sup>TM</sup> Java application. It is a set of tools created by Ian Johnson and Artem Osmakov<sup>95</sup>. It is now an Open Source project that enables the generation of complete interactive maps with a few lines of html. It's easy for beginners, yet provides completely customisable power and distributed backend database connectivity for the expert. It's free for personal use. The peculiarity of TimeMap is the time-based maps delivery system, that allows you to combine space and time dimensions, to visualise urban growth, environmental changes, etc. Several projects have been developed with TimeMap, such as the PHALMS or Ankor projects, demonstrating the potentiality of multi-temporal study with multiple datasets.

Another already mentioned example is the *Fasti On Line* project<sup>96</sup>. Fasti was created by LP archaeology with the aim of continuing the “Fasti Archaeologici” publication, published by the International Association for Classical Archaeology (AIAC) between 1946 and 1987. It provides a list with the location of archaeological excavations since 2000. It is a database (MySQL) driven website, based on a MapServer Open Source library. PHP and *Mapserver*, on the server, connect to these data to produce the maps and the results pages<sup>97</sup> (fig. 7.3).

Fig. 7.3 *fasti.tif*

*CART* is an example of webGIS and database developed and used by public administrations in order to archive, manage and also produce “risk-maps” for urban planning purposes. *CART* is a geodatabase built in 2000 and based on a (privately owned//commercial application (Highways) and on open standards (Xml, Html). It enables a dynamic bi-directional connection with a desktop GIS (ESRI ArcGIS) that is used by public employees at the local level. Data are

95 ECAI: <http://ecai.org>; TimeMap: <http://www.timemap.net>; the software is available at: <http://sourceforge.net/projects/timemap>.

96 <http://www.fastionline.org>

97 For technical references: <http://www.fastionline.org/about.php?view=techsummary> and on MapServer: <http://mapserver.org/>

archived online, through an Internet Explorer browser interface, as coordinates x,y,z (points, lines, polygons are described as sequences of coordinates). All this information can be exported as ascii open file<sup>98</sup>.

A similar and more advanced webGIS system was created by the National Monument Record of English Heritage: the *Archaeology Data Service*. After the opening of the OASIS project (Online Access to the Index of archaeological investigationS), all archaeological data have been archived at national level in a unique geodatabase. The access to this database is possible at various levels. Institutions and professionals have user passwords, and they can query the entire archive or edit it to add new information on excavations, prospectings, etc. There is also a public and open access, through the ArchSearch interface<sup>99</sup>, where the database can be queried in different ways and basic information is provided, together with the location of the archaeological sites visible on Google Maps. This archive is also connected to other online repositories, such as the old-maps archive<sup>100</sup>.

There are some interesting developments of the webGIS application, aiming to make it a more interactive and editable environment.

Connected to MapServer library there are two interesting projects: KaMap and Open Layer. *KaMap* is an AJAX application that offers an intuitive web interface. It aims at providing a javascript API for developing highly interactive web-mapping interfaces using features such as interaction, continuous panning without reloading the page, keyboard navigation, optional layer control from the client's side, etc. These functionalities make this project really interesting for archaeological and environmental dataset visualisation and interaction<sup>101</sup>. *Open Layer* is dedicated to web dynamic mapping. It can display map tiles and markers loaded from any source. MetaCarta developed the initial version of OpenLayers and gave it to the public to further the use of geographical information of all kinds. It is free, Open Source JavaScript, released under a BSD-style License, and is part of the Open Source Geospatial Foundation (OSGeo)<sup>102</sup>. It implements methods for geographical data access, such as the Web Mapping Service (WMS) and Web Feature Service (WFS) protocols<sup>103</sup>. Also the Italian Military Geographical Institute has developed its online

---

98 GUERMANDI, M.P. 2000. *Rischio archeologico: se lo conosci lo eviti* (IBC, Documenti/31). In Atti del Convegno di studi su cartografia archeologica e tutela del territorio, Ferrara 2000; D'ANDREA, A. GUERMANDI, M.P. 2008. *Strumenti per L'Archeologia Preventiva. Esperienze, Normative, Tecnologie*, Archeolingua, Budapest 2008.

99 <http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/>

100 <http://www.old-maps.co.uk>

101 Examples are available at: <http://www.ominiverdi.org/index.php/kamap>

102 <http://www.openlayers.org/>; <http://www.osgeo.org/>

103 WMS: <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/wms>; WFS: <http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/wfs>

repository based on Open Layer<sup>104</sup>.

A specific multidisciplinary project on landscape archaeology has developed the *ArcheoServer PO-BASyN*, which intends to define a base for the experimentation of innovative solutions to exploit new conceptual tools, models, techniques and technologies to assist in the management of cultural resources. The choice of the context to experiment with this research approach is the study of the settlement dynamics of the Bronze Age in the Po river valley (northern Italy). It has experimented two online spatial analysis tools: settlements' spatial density tool (visualisation of the density in different Bronze Age phases) and sites' territorial tessellation (it calculates and represents a Thiessen polygon analysis on the sites: fig. 7.4)<sup>105</sup>.

Figure 7.4 - *Po\_Basyn2.tif*

Just as GIS software 3d features began to be more widely used, also with webGIS new applications and platforms were developed so as to implement the 3d visualisation of geographical data. There are several categories of 3d applications, divided into various categories. There are two important classifications: the first relates to geo-based or non geo-based spatial applications, the second refers to available behaviour and to the level of interactivity, also in terms of editing functionalities. Although these are not always easy to distinguish, we can recognize: 3d webGIS, VR webGIS and VR applications, the latter including online games, virtual e-learning communities and collaborative environments (CVE). *3d webGIS* enables the interactive exploration of territories and of geospatial datasets, with limited behaviour and editing functionalities, while *VR webGIS* includes a higher level of interaction, typical of Virtual Reality systems, such as fly through and walk through navigation functionalities or interactive querying. They are both strongly based on geospatial datasets: geoimages, digital elevation models and vector layers. VR webGIS may include virtual ecosystems and 3d models. Global earth geo-viewers or Scene Graph based systems belong to these categories.

Although *Skyline* Software Systems Inc. developed one of the first earth geo-viewers, complete with authoring tool and server support<sup>106</sup>, *Google Earth*, in its stand-alone version, is still the reference point for this sector<sup>107</sup>. It has been created and distributed since 2005. It is a stand-alone application which runs on Windows, Linux and Mac, based both on OpenGL and DirectX. It provides users with an immediate interface with various functionalities such as search

<sup>104</sup><http://www.igmi.org/ware/>

<sup>105</sup><http://www.archeoserver.it/pobasyn/webgis/index.php>

<sup>106</sup><http://www.skylinesoft.com>

<sup>107</sup><http://earth.google.it/>

panel, overview map, hide/show sidebar, placemarks, polygon or path inclusion on the scene, images in overlay, environments, navigation tools, etc.

An example of an archaeological project published using Google Earth is the reconstruction of 4<sup>th</sup> century Rome based on the Constantine plaster preserved at the Roman Civilization Museum in Rome (Fig. 7.5). It is the continuation of the *Rome Reborn* project, directed by Bernard Frischer (GUIDI ET ALII 2005)<sup>108</sup>.

*figure 7.5 romereborn\_google01.tif*

Google Earth has also published a plug-in that has a JavaScript API which embeds the 3d Google Earth into the web pages. Using the API it is possible to draw markers and lines, drape images over the terrain, add 3D models, or load KML files<sup>109</sup>. An example is *Florence on Earth* project, where it is possible to access one century of archaeological excavation in Florence regarding four periods: Roman, Late Roman, Early Medieval and Medieval. It is possible to explore also 3D reconstructions loaded on the 3d map<sup>110</sup>.

There is another recent GoogleEarth project dedicated to an open source version of the plug-in, *O3D*, for creating rich, interactive 3D applications in the browser. This API is shared by a broader developer community interested in establishing an open web standard for 3D graphics. Google Earth enables urban building and architectural coverage, also supporting Collada<sup>111</sup>.

Another global earth geo-viewer is *Nasa Worldwind*. It was developed in 2004 as an Open Source project by NASA, and is especially interesting as it permits the layered visualisation of scientific datasets. It is a stand-alone application, available as a full install under the terms of the NASA Open Source Agreement. It runs on Windows on PCs with a 3D Graphics Card with a fast Internet connection. It requires the .NET runtime environment and DirectX installed. It comes with some basic datasets (from NASA and TerraServer-USA of Microsoft Research), which are integrated and further downloaded after a certain point, during the navigation. Through Nasa Worldwind it is possible to explore datasets such as: Blue Marble, Landsat imagery, SRTM, NASA SVS dedicated to hurricane dynamics, MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectro-radiometer) catalogue of fires, floods, dust, smoke, storms and volcanic activity, GLOBE with earth temperature dataset, country boundaries and place names, and a visual tool for latitude and longitude (fig. 7.6). The latest version of WorldWind is Java based with better cross platform support<sup>112</sup>.

108<http://www.romereborn.virginia.edu/>; <http://earth.google.it/rome/>

109 <http://code.google.com/apis/earth/>

110<http://florenceonearth.com/>

111 <http://code.google.com/intl/it-IT/apis/o3d/>

112<http://worldwind.arc.nasa.gov/features.html>



In 2007 Microsoft also created its own 3d earth-viewer: *Virtual Earth 3D*. It is a stand-alone application that runs only on Windows and mainly on Internet Explorer, and is based on DirectX<sup>113</sup>. The Virtual Earth platform consists of two interfaces: Virtual Earth Map Control that lets users make requests via JavaScript to an AJAX map object and a MapPoint Web Service API using SOAP XML to communicate with other applications. Recently there is a new version of VE embeddable in browsers with sound Javascript SDK. Both NASA WorldWind and Microsoft VE unfortunately do not allow user 3d model insertion.

Figure 7.6 Nasaworldwind.tif

*Virtual Reality applications* are mainly not based on geographic datasets, although in some cases they start from geospecific data. Their characteristic is the complexity of available behaviour that extends the simple exploration of a 3d geographical viewer to a real cognitive experience, to the creation of collaborative spaces, and socially dynamic environments. They can be based on various technologies, although for those embedded in web browsers they are commonly VRML-X3D or Flash based, or even game-engine based systems. In some cases there are some experimental projects, scene graph based, that try to combine 3d webGIS (geospatial dataset in input, large 3d territories processing, etc.), with VR characteristics (interactivity, inclusivity, simulation, exchange, sharing, dynamics). I've called these applications *VR webGIS*.

Several projects, especially in the past, were developed on VRML, whose current improved version is X3D. *NuME*, the New Electronic Museum of the city of Bologna, was initially created with VRML and Javascript, although it moved to Performer and then to OpenSceneGraph libraries<sup>114</sup> (GUIDAZZOLI BONFIGLI 1999). Other interesting projects using the same technology, relative to archaeological sites' virtual exploration and interaction, have been created by Learning Sites Inc., as in the case of the reconstruction of the prehistoric settlements at ancient Nemea (fig. 7.7). Unfortunately X3D doesn't appear to be adopted sufficiently widely nor considered as a standard, lacking performance in world database paging (CALORI ET ALII 2009).

Figure 7.7 - java\_based\_sanders.jpg

The use of a Flash-Shockwave based application has the undoubted advantage

---

<sup>113</sup><http://www.microsoft.com/virtualearth/>

<sup>114</sup>[http://3d.cineca.it/3d/Nume/nume\\_3d.php](http://3d.cineca.it/3d/Nume/nume_3d.php)

of widespread availability and good browser integration. Examples of geodatabases are the Italian *Pagine Gialle Visual* and the *GeoMind* products (3DMap technology)<sup>115</sup>.

A different case, based on Skyline technology, is *Bologna 3d*, a three-dimensional interactive version of the city developed by Bologna City Council itself. To explore the city it is necessary to download the plug-in, TerraExplorer, a stand-alone application that runs on Windows, or can also be used as an integrated ActiveX component. It features automatic download and installation for web users, efficient streaming for terrain and overlays over the net an auto-pilot feature allowing pre-defined routes to be replayed automatically, easy navigation and "fly-to-location" using the information panel, a 2d map orientation synchronized with the 3d terrain, control speed, altitude and viewing angle via the mouse, keyboard, joystick, control panel, view of objects, symbols or geo-referenced information layers created within TerraExplorer Pro or TerraBuilder, web content integration, tools to measure distances and areas in the 3D world, and a saver of screenshots<sup>116</sup>.

The Sardinia region has created a 3d stand-alone version of the entire island fully explorable in 3d, thanks to CRS4 research Institute in cooperation with CORE. This project is part of the Regional GIS<sup>117</sup>. The software is based on the BDAM technology, efficient for large terrain visualisation and developed by CRS4, in cooperation with CNR ISTI. Sardegna 3d runs on Windows, Linux and Mac, on 3d graphic cards, and it enables mouse or interface command panel interaction. It allows to calculate distances and paths, to locate a site through a layer-menu and to place a marker to remember a specific location, as well as to access the archive of aerial photographs taken over the years. Recently CRS4 has released as open source *RATMAN*, a framework for terrain streaming and rendering, a real-time terrain rendering framework able to asynchronously access terrain information from remote servers. It contains a simplified version of our BDAM technology<sup>118</sup>.

Another example of VR viewer has been developed by the Scuola Sant'Anna of Pisa: the *XVR* player. Based on this technology is the project dedicated to *Piazza dei Miracoli in Pisa* (fig. 7.8). It is a browser embedded application where users can walk in time and space in the city. It is an ActiveX plug-in (only on Windows and Explorer), based on OpenGL. Models are completely downloaded on the client PC before starting the VR session. XVR imports 3d models from 3DSMax, including animations, and it has script language, vertex and pixel shaders support, real-time physics using the Tokamak(TM) physics

---

115<http://www.visual.paginegialle.it/3d/>; <http://www.geomind.it>

116<http://www.skylinesoft.com>

117<http://www.sardegna3d.it/>

118The source code is available as open source from <http://ratman.sourceforge.net>

engine, HTML pages interaction using Javascript or VBScript, video textures and audio (also 3d audio) support <sup>119</sup>.

Figure 7.8 - xvr.tif

Some projects have been built on privately commercial or open source game engines<sup>120</sup> or on development and deployment platforms, mainly proprietary, dedicated to interactive 3D content and game creation<sup>121</sup>.

*Exhibits Player*, based on VirTools and Direct X, has been developed to support 3d online exploration of sites and monuments and to access multimedia contents, improving the communication value. It is a stand-alone software that runs on Windows, downloading all data at the beginning of the session, an operation taking some time, but avoiding any long wait after having data downloaded. Many examples can be seen in the web pages of the Italian Ministry of Cultural Heritage (MIBAC), Cultural Internet (Internet Culturale), such as Bologna 3d<sup>122</sup>. Another example has been built for the Virtual Museum of Ancient Via Flaminia (Appendix A), where the individual user version of the VR museum, dedicated specifically to the Villa of Livia, is available online<sup>123</sup> (fig.7.9).

Figure 7.9 – giardino\_rep2.tif

Applications built on game engines are the *TiE project*, an EU funded project whose goal is to create an environment where you can have challenging and compelling game experiences by interacting with virtual representations of the European heritage. Specifically in the reconstruction of the scenario of the Mação archaeological site, that is part of the project, the Instituto Politécnico de Tomar in collaboration with the Museo Municipal de Mação used an integrated approach, including GIS data in a Game Engine, with the aim of developing a credible and educationally valid game adventure contextualized in the settings of an archaeological site<sup>124</sup>.

A recent low-cost engine, with great potential for landscape online visualisation, is *Unity 3d*. It is an open-ended 3D game/interactive software engine for web, Windows, Mac OS X, the iPhone, and Nintendo Wii. It includes a multi platform game development tool, designed from the start to

<sup>119</sup><http://piazza.opapisa.it/>

<sup>120</sup>Most known game engines are: Doom, Kaneva, Torque, Unreal: proprietary; Delta 3D, Ogre, Panda 3D: open source.

<sup>121</sup>Such as VirTools, Unity 3d, etc.

<sup>122</sup><http://www.internetculturale.it/genera.jsp?s=12&l=en>

<sup>123</sup>[http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/flaminia/VR\\_DEMO/Release\\_Ver\\_1\\_en.rar](http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/flaminia/VR_DEMO/Release_Ver_1_en.rar)

<sup>124</sup><http://www.tieproject.eu>

ease creation. A pilot project was started by CNR ITABC and SoftLogic with the aim of building Cultural Heritage VR applications, specifically designed for iPhone. An example of this approach is the *Villa of Livia* interactive application for mobile phone, available on line<sup>125</sup>.

There are also other case studies not specifically developed for or by the archaeological or environmental fields, but that are currently exploring new possibilities of using the network to exchange experience and information. This is the case of the City Cluster project, an artistic virtual installation created by Franz Fishnaller

. City Cluster is a virtual reality networking matrix, in which multiple environments or cities (Chicago and Florence have been the test cases), can be hosted, coexist and be connected through a common virtual territory, an high-speed network and a graphical interface, enabling distant users to collaborate in a shared environments (fig. 7.10).

Figure 7.10 -citycluster.tif

Projects specifically built for communication, dissemination, and e-learning purposes are based on platforms dedicated to virtual communities or online games, such as Second Life or Active Worlds. The reconstruction in Second Life of the Akragas doors in Sicily has become a way to acquire knowledge of Greek military tactics (fig. 5.7), while the “island” where the villa of Livia stands is used for teaching about Roman architecture and cybernetics at the University of California – Merced. The natural and archaeological landscape of Mesa Verde, built on Active Worlds platform, is one of the learning activities schools all over the world can do within the Quest Atlantis project (fig. 7.11).

figure 7.11 questatlantis.tif

Advanced applications which integrate online 3d exploration, multi-user functionalities like those required by virtual communities, VR behaviour and 2d and 3d editing functions, are *Collaborative Virtual Environments* (CVEs). They are, as already mentioned, new and promising tools, particularly for landscape reconstruction purposes. An experimental project was presented in 2009 by an Italian team (University of Pisa, Scuola Sant'Anna and CNR ITABC): “*Integrated Technologies of robotics and virtual environment in archaeology*”. The project, described in Appendix A, concerns the development of a multiuser domain on the web for a multidisciplinary scientific community of archaeologists, historians, experts in the human and social sciences, topographers and communication experts, and it was founded by the Italian ministry of University and Research. The 3d environment, built on VirTools

<sup>125</sup><http://unity3d.com/unity/>

platform, can be accessed by scientists in charge of specific tasks regarding the reconstruction of an archaeological site (figg. A4: 1-4), or by teachers interested in preparing a lesson in the “Virtuoteca”. They are projected in cyberspace where they can be discussed using chat and start editing sessions, to add, modify, or eliminate digital content from the scene.

Other solutions are based on the use of a *scene graph*, a middleware library with a level of abstraction between a base graphics library, like OpenGL or Direct3D, and a complete application as a game engine. It can be a good solution when multithread capability is needed to enable efficient data paging and when there is no particular need for advanced interactions, such as physics. VR webGIS such as the Appia project, Salerno Archaeological District, Cannes 3d or Virtual Rome are all based on a scene graph solution. There are several problems arising from the publication over the Internet of large 3d geospatial terrains, interactively explorable through complex behaviour: the dimension of the dataset (often GB of geoimages or DEMs); the coordinated systems management; the integration of high resolution 3d models, vegetation and vector thematic layers; the inclusion of multimedia content; the development of efficient and scalable navigation tools, useful fly or walk through functionalities; the creation of the 3d scene through editing tools, and the co-existence and harmonization of a research space with a communication space. The development of a specific plug-in, *OSG4WEB*, by an Italian team (CINECA and CNR ITABC), tried to offer solutions to these problems. It is based on the Open Source library OpenSceneGraph, and on previous work carried out for the Appia project, the Esaro and Salerno Districts (CALORI FORTE PESCARIN 2005, PESCARIN CALORI 2005, PESCARIN ET ALII 2005). Features of this library (paging quality, cross platform, Internet publishing tool, large input formats, active development community, etc.) oriented the choice. It has also been extended with the *osgEarth*<sup>126</sup> plugin, which is able to page in directly from OGC repositories as well as Google maps and Nasa servers (CALORI ET ALII 2009).

The *Appia archaeological park project*, directed by CNR ITABC, besides the Virtual Narrative Museum described in Appendix A, also created a VR webGIS for the team and the funding institution, the Superintendency, to offer a view of the state of the art of the survey work (years 2003-2006) (FORTE PESCARIN PIETRONI 2005, DELL'UNTO ET ALII 2006). The original idea was to publish in real time and over the web all the digital dataset, vector layers, DTM and 3d models acquired in the fieldwork, month after month, enabling the team to visualize

---

126 OsgEarth builds whole-earth or localized OSG terrain models at run-time: <http://wush.net/trac/osgearth>

them interactively (with free and open access), and to download the raw data (restricted access). The goal of the project in fact was to acquire, with different techniques and technologies (DGPS, Total Station, Scanner Laser, Photogrammetry), several sites and monuments of the archaeological park. The acquired data were processed with open source software, QGis and GRASS, to produce Digital Elevation Models, geoimagery and thematic layers. They were then processed with OSG, obtaining the 3d terrain model, and paged with various levels of detail, published on line. The landscape, although quite extensive, could be easily accessed online, maintaining the geographical information, and explored in 3d, thanks to the Net plug-in of the OSG library. 3d models and vector layers were then added to the landscape using VTP Enviro<sup>127</sup>, which was appositely modified so as to use the OSG paged terrain already created, and to export in the OSG/IVE format other 3d needed content (fig. 7.12). Thanks to Enviro, which already had a ready-to-use interface and several functionalities, archaeologists and architects have found a simple way to dynamically interact with the landscape, adding 3d models (3ds, obj, osg, flt, etc. file formats) or vegetation taken from a digital library (shp, xml, png), working at a continuously open and updated reconstruction. All the added or modified objects could then be exported in .osg or .ive formats and added to the 3d terrain for online exploration. The first plug-in built by CINECA, an ActiveX component for Internet Explorer, needed a further integration of PHP and JavaScript to add some more behaviour (switch, upload, view points). This plug-in, *OSG4WEB*, was further developed during two other projects, *Esaro Cultural District* and *Salerno Archaeological District*<sup>128</sup>, which coincided with the development of the Mozilla Firefox version of the plug-in (PESCARIN ET ALII 2005, PESCARIN ET ALII 2005b).

Figure 7.12 fig\_C\_web01.jpg

Based on the same technology and on the same OpenSceneGraph library, there is another project, *Cannes 3D*, on the exploration of the city of Cannes, in France. It is a browser embedded application where users can interact with the 3d scene with the keyboard, the mouse, or simply by using the graphic interface. It runs only on Windows and on Explorer and Firefox, with an OpenGL graphic card and a good Internet connection (ADSL)<sup>129</sup>.

127Virtual Terrain Project is an open source project available at: <http://www.vterrain.org>

128<http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/esaro/>; <http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/salerno/>

129<http://3d.cannes.fr/>

The most updated version of the *OSG4WEB* software was released for the *Virtual Rome project*. This project, described in Appendix A, aims to study, interpret and reconstruct the archaeological landscape of ancient Rome, and enable distributed and interactive visualisation through a web-based VR application, based on Open Source libraries, on Remote Sensing and GIS data, and on 3d models (VR webGIS: fig. 7.13 left). It includes a front-end interactive interface, browser embedded, and a back-end 3d CMS online lab which enable professionals of various disciplines to update and modify a variety of parts that include archaeological and ancient landscapes (VR webLAB: fig. 7.13 right). Virtual Rome enables visitors to explore the landscape at different scales and resolution, thanks to the OSG4WEB plug-in and its functionalities, such as paged geospatial dataset support, coordination and projection handling (both in input and output), large 3d terrain dataset management, 3d models integration (modelled with software such as 3D Studio Max, etc); natural elements, such as vegetation integration, vector layers integration; on-line 3d data publication and interaction, possibly embedded into a web browser; fly and walk navigation tools; behaviour integration: terrain, model switching, vector information and 3d model loading, selecting and loading external pages or multimedia content; environment integration (CALORI ET ALII 2008; CALORI ET ALII 2009). The procedure followed, described in figure 7.16, starts with data processing in a GIS (GRASS). Here vector layers regarding natural aspects of the landscape are prepared, as described in chapters 3 and 4, and used as input in the ecosystem and terrain generators (Visual Nature Studio and OSGdem). New geoimages, representing the archaeological or potential landscape, and digital elevation models are built (river beds, roads or other modifications are calculated) and exported in GIS formats (geoTiff, Ascii grid). The vegetation is also exported as a GIS vector file (shape) and as a XML/database file containing coordinates of each plant, the name of the species, and the texture associated with it. 3D models are prepared apart, as multimedia information, but a shape file is also created with the indication of the position of contents in the territory. All these data are finally joined in the back-end, where the graphic appearance of the site (the front-end) is established.

Figure 7.13 - *virtualrome\_cms.jpg*

## **.B.4 From Mapscape to Webscape**

This section provides a practical example of territorial dataset processing and 3d landscape online publication, using open source tools.

The reconstruction of ancient landscape is the last step in a complex process which involves the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the environment,

of its natural, anthropic and perception features, and of the dynamics and relations which intersect it. This process is developed through the reconstruction of the archaeological landscape, its ecological significance, anthropic modifications, and the ancient potential landscape.

The communication of this final result and the creation of collaborative environments where this process can be approached in a real multi and interdisciplinary mode will require, more and more in the future, the use of the Net.

In this section I will try to give a practical indication of the steps, data, and techniques required to build a simple example of *VRwebGIS*. The use of open source, free ware or low cost software will be taken as given, to enable every interested reader to start “having their finger in the pie”. This section is written as a tutorial for the creation of a simple three-dimensional terrain ready to be published on line through the *osg4web* plug-in. Let's start from the beginning.

What do we need? We need a variety of software and the basic knowledge of various disciplines:

- A GIS, to create vector layers, georeference geoimages, or re-project them from one coordinated system to another, to build digital elevation models of the terrain;
- a 3d modelling software: to include also 3d models on the landscape;
- an Image Processing software to eventually modify raster data;
- the OpenSceneGraph library compiled;
- an html editor to modify web pages and Mozilla Firefox as Internet browser;
- the *osg4web* plug-in installed.

It is clear that the basic knowledge required is quite extensive: cartography and topography to understand scale, projections, detail or accuracy issues; image processing to edit and modify digital images; GIS to handle geospatial datasets; photogrammetry, 3d modelling and computer-graphics to acquire, build or modify 3d models, handling geometric and texture optimization and terrain modelling.

In order to simplify the work, you can download a complete ready-to-use packet (*OSG\_PACK*<sup>130</sup>), created by CINECA, containing OpenSceneGraph already compiled, and other useful tools such as OpenEV, *OSGdem*, *Gdal\_info*, *Gdal\_translate*, *Gdal\_warp*, and *osg4web*. To use this packet, it is necessary to unzip the file in a directory and then to double click on the file *\_osgshell.bat*. This operation will open a DOS shell that will be used to lunch all the commands of the programs, such as *Gdalinfo*, *Gdal\_translate*, *Gdal\_warp*, *osgdem*, and *osgviewer*

We should then define the goal of the project, and analyse available datasets, in

---

<sup>130</sup>The packet, created by CINECA Visit Lab and L. Calori, is available at: [http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/openVRwebGIS/software/osg\\_pack.zip](http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/openVRwebGIS/software/osg_pack.zip)



order to eventually identify any further data required.

To build a VRwebGIS we would need, *at least*:

- one Digital Terrain Model (DTM);
- one georeferenced image (geoimage): aerial or satellite images, historical maps or other digital georeferenced images.

Complementary and accessory data are:

- Thematic vector layers (shape format) describing natural or anthropic characteristics of the landscape, such as rivers, road, etc.;
- 3d models (\*.3ds, \*.obj, \*.osg, \*.ive), of which we need to know the geographical location;
- multimedia data (html documents, video, images, etc.).

As fully described in the book, it is quite helpful to define a digital protocol in which all steps are indicated, together with required input and output. Table 7.2 summarizes the activities required by the creation of a basic VRwebGIS.

Activities	Software
1. Spatial dataset creation: DTM, geoimages, vector layers	GIS Software (GRASS, ESRI ARCGIS, etc.)
2. Pre-processing of spatial dataset	GIS Software; Gdal library (Gdalinfo, Gdal_translate)
3. 3D models creation and export in OSG/IVE format	Plug-in OSG for 3D Studio Max (OSGexp)
4. 3D terrain generation	OSGdem, OSGviewer
5. Web Data integration (terrain, thematic layers, 3d models)	PHP, JavaScript, osg4web, web-design tools
6. Exploration of the landscape online	Internet Explorer/Mozilla Firefox, osg4web plug-in

Table 7.2

*Spatial dataset creation*

To build a 3d terrain we need to describe its shape, in terms of clivometry, and its characteristics. We therefore need a DTM, raster georeferenced images, and eventually also thematic layers which describe the landscape. All this data can be processed with a GIS software. In case of operations such as georeferencing, band combination or colour calibration, a remote sensing software is preferable<sup>131</sup>. We should take great care over the projection of the original dataset, eventually re-projecting in the desired output coordinate system. To start working with a sample dataset, it is possible to download geoimages from free online spatial repositories, such as the Global Land Cover Facility, through

131Some GIS products, such as GRASS, cover various spatial operations, including remote sensing analysis and georeferencing.

the Earth Science Data Interface (ESDI)<sup>132</sup>, where a wide selection of Landsat imagery is available. In these repositories files containing different bands (geotiff format) can be downloaded. A remote sensing software, such as GRASS or ErMapper or even OpenEV<sup>133</sup>, can be used to perform data fusion, combine bands 3, 2 and 1, assigning respectively a Red, Green and Blue value, as explained in chapter 3 (fig. 7.14).

Figure 7.14 – openev.tif

We should now obtain the DTM. We might already have elevation data (points, contour lines, grid, tin) or need to interpolate them in a GIS. They can also be downloaded from a repository, although at a low resolution (90 mt), such as from the above mentioned ESDI or directly from SRTM<sup>134</sup>. In this example a raster DTM is required (ascii grid or geotiff format). The DTM can be used to carry on further spatial analysis such as: slope, aspect, buffer, viewshed, Thiessen polygons, cost analysis to identify resource accessibility, site catchment or site exploitation territory analysis, and cluster analysis (Appendix B). Vector thematic layers might be acquired from repositories or libraries, or on the field, or they can be digitized from raster maps in various ways. What we would need are *shape*<sup>135</sup> files both in input and in output. Vectors can be used in an ecosystem generator, such as Visual Nature Studio, where they can contribute to creating new geoimages representing the visual aspect of the landscape (potential, archaeological, or interpreted).

### ***Pre-processing of spatial dataset***

We can now verify whether the files are correct and then export them in a format compatible to the Gdal library<sup>136</sup>. *Gdalinfo* and *gdal\_translate* tools can be used for this purpose. *Gdalinfo* gives information on the raster files, and fundamental for the use of OSGdem are: *Coordinate System*, *Origin*, *Corner Coordinates: upper right* and *lower left* (fig. 7.15). The syntax is:

```
gdalinfo [options] [file path]137
```

*Gdal\_translate* performs raster files transformations. The syntax is:

<sup>132</sup><http://glcf.umiacs.umd.edu>; <http://glcfapp.umiacs.umd.edu:8080/esdi/index.jsp>

<sup>133</sup><http://openev.sourceforge.net>

<sup>134</sup>See also Appendix B for a list of geospatial repositories; <http://srtm.csi.cgiar.org>

<sup>135</sup>Shape is currently considered a standard in GIS.

<sup>136</sup>I recommend the use of the geotiff, \*.tiff (with \*.tfw georeferencing file) or \*.ecw compress file for geoimages and Ascii grid or Geotiff for DTM.

<sup>137</sup>The commands must be launched from the shell. A complete list of Gdalinfo options is available at: <http://www.gdal.org/gdalinfo.html>

```
gdal_translate [options] [input file] [output file]138
```

figure 7.15 gdal.tif

### ***3D models creation and export***

3d models, natural elements (vegetation), visual quality effects (lighting, shadows etc) are usually part of a reconstruction. The integration of these elements depends also upon the flexibility of the system: if there are ways to import models generated with off the shelf modellers, if the paging or streaming system can handle 3d models of interior scenes; if vegetation rendering is supported, if there are state of the art rendering techniques such as shadows and other visual effects supported. A rough qualitative measure is obtained by comparing the visual quality of the system on modelled input with that attained by commercial game rendering engines (CALORI ET ALII 2009). 300-500 Kb per file (model or part of a model) could be considered an average limit for a acceptable download. For this reason it is recommended, for instance, to subdivide the model into different sub-objects.

3d models that will be placed on the landscape and published online should have certain characteristics to be interactively managed. They should be small files characterized by many different levels of detail of textures and geometry; they should have the centre of the model in geographic coordinate x,y,z (according to the projection chosen by the project) or, alternatively, have the centre corresponding to 0,0,0 coordinates.

Models are generally built with software such as 3d Studio Max, Blender, Maya. etc. The final output should be in the format required by the VRwebGIS platform. In our case \*.osg or \*.ive that can be obtained using a plug-in for the 3d modelling software<sup>139</sup>.

### ***Terrain generation***

We now have all the necessary data to proceed in the creation of the 3d terrain (Fig.3.7 b). In order to produce a 3d territorial model useful for online interaction, the model should have a *hierarchical* structure, different *Levels of Detail* (LOD), various *tiles*, and be *paged*. Paging is the system which enables you to access a multi gigabyte hierarchical dataset of geospatial data (images, terrain, or features) in real time, adapting the image quality produced to the available bandwidth. It involves image and terrain compression multithreading, caching etc. Ideally it provides a player component, as well as a server able to

<sup>138</sup>A list of Gdal\_translation options is available at: [http://www.gdal.org/gdal\\_translate.html](http://www.gdal.org/gdal_translate.html)

<sup>139</sup>OSGexp, the plug-in for Max are available at: <http://osgmaxexp.wiki.sourceforge.net/>; for Maya: [http://www.cs.ucla.edu/~sunghee/osg2maya/user\\_guide.htm](http://www.cs.ucla.edu/~sunghee/osg2maya/user_guide.htm)

build a hierarchical database out of standard GIS georeferenced data. The performance of such a system can be qualitative, compared by looking at how fast the perceptual quality increases when a completely new viewpoint is selected, given a fixed amount of bandwidth and hardware resources. Another point is the amount of visual artefacts such as popping, aliasing, or seams that the multi resolution visualization generates (CALORI ET ALII: 2009).

The terrain is created with *OSGdem*, launching the program from the shell, as we have seen before with Gdal tools. OSGdem has several options, but the basic syntax is:

```
OSGdem -t [ texture with path] -d [dem file with its path] -o
[output]ad
```

Example:

```
OSGdem -t c:\...\mosaico.tif -d c:\...\dem.tif -o terreno.osg
```

Other important options concern the coordinate system (--cs: indicated also using the EPSG codes<sup>140</sup>, the geodetic parameter dataset known by all GIS-based software internationally); the extent of the area to be generated (-e)<sup>141</sup>.

A complete example:

```
OSGdem --cs EPSG:23033 --tile-terrain-size 128 --tile-image-
size 128 -v 2 -e 444482 4167928 375200 299600 -d dem.grd -l
10 --levels 0 10 -t image1.tif --levels 5 10 -t image2.tif -o
terrain.ive
```

To visualise the result, we can launch the program *osgviewer* from the shell and explore it:

```
osgviewer terrain.ive
```

## Web data integration

This includes all the aspects related to web usability and ease of integration with a typical web portal and applications. The comparison would again be qualitative and in some ways subjective. To name some criteria: browsers, operating systems and graphics platform supported, browser integrated or stand-alone application, the requirements of a special streaming server.

<sup>140</sup>Frequently used EPSG codes in Italy are: WGS 84 / UTM zone 32N: <32632> ; WGS 84 / UTM zone 33N: <32633>; WGS 84 / UTM zone 32S: <32732>; WGS 84 / UTM zone 33S: <32733>; ED50 / UTM zone 32N: <23032> ; ED50 / UTM zone 33N: <23033> ; Monte Mario: <4265>; Monte Mario (Rome): <4806>; Monte Mario/Italy zone 1: <3003>; Monte Mario/Italy zone 2: <3004>; Monte Mario (RM)/Italy zone 1: <26591>; Monte Mario (RM)/Italy zone 2: <26592>

<sup>141</sup>The extent might be written using this formula: -e = X [lower left x coord], Y [lower left y coord], X [upper right x coord – lower left x coord], Y [upper right y coord – lower left y coord]

If we copy the generated terrain in a directory on a web-server, we can simply visualize it with osgviewer typing the URL:

```
osgviewer http://www.landscape.org/terrain.live
```

To create an Internet application, with several possible behaviours, we should use a plug-in for the browser, in the case of a browser embedded project, or a stand-alone software. In this case we can use the osg4web plug-in for Mozilla Firefox<sup>142</sup>. There are several possible interactive levels with the 3d scene: view points, objects selecting and loading html, or other multimedia content, guided tours, model switching. The interaction can be programmed in JavaScript-Php, as in the case of Virtual Rome (Appendix A)<sup>143</sup>.

---

142Actually the version for Firefox is fully supported ([http://3d.cineca.it/storage/osg4web/htdocs/download\\_plugin/OSG4Web\\_1.0.2.xpi](http://3d.cineca.it/storage/osg4web/htdocs/download_plugin/OSG4Web_1.0.2.xpi)), while the ActiveX for Internet Explorer isn't currently supported. The source code, licensed under the GPL and LGPL, is available at: [http://3d.cineca.it/storage/prove\\_repo/osg4web\\_bazar](http://3d.cineca.it/storage/prove_repo/osg4web_bazar) Tests have also been carried out by CINECA for Linux: [http://3d.cineca.it/storage/bazaar\\_repo/BrowserEmbed/test](http://3d.cineca.it/storage/bazaar_repo/BrowserEmbed/test)

143An example of programming interaction javascript-osg4web is available at: <http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/openVRwebGIS/tutorial/osg4web.html>



## **Chapter 8**

### **A step into the future**

The ministry of culture has recently decided to start an extensive campaign of investigations, acquisitions and valorization of the region. The project is directed at the identification of the areas subject to a higher level of protection, and therefore to a narrower series of limitations in urban development and to a different kind and degree of exploitation (parks, etc.). It is a significant initiative, financed by the government and by leading private businesses and organisations of the territory itself, interested in its future prospects for tourism. The ministry has involved universities, public institutions and private companies in this work, but also the most important museums and a few schools. Moreover, for the first time, it has created a commission that has singled out a list of valid scientific work and activities, already produced by researchers, scholars, and various organisations in both public and private sectors. 12 months from its beginnings, the commission has published its report and produced an online available version, where the territory is explorable interactively in 2d and 3d and the whole project is geo-linked to the territory, subdivided for typology, chronology, resolution and results. This browser-embedded geo-report has been left open, in accordance with ministerial directions, to further updating by the developers themselves. Everyone may access the geo-report and indicate his own work by sending a mail, or locate it directly in the interactive map, clicking on the interested point or drawing an area. A new section has recently been updated, dedicated to the second phase of the project. As researcher of the European Council of Researches, I could ask for user password and be part of the team involved in the study of the north-east area. Although departments and institutes are involved, the ministry has singled out individual scholars who will be in charge of the work (as reference points and with responsibility for it). In addition to my lab, committed to 3d reconstructions and virtual heritage applications development, I'm actually working with a researcher of the Earth Science department and another of the Botanic, an officer of the archaeological superintendency and a couple of people in charge of 3d programming and of the web geo-database. The system is still being tested, but it seems quite promising. We are now working on the development of shared libraries (vegetation, archaeological remains, etc.) and in the mapping of the archaeological landscape. The botanists have finished identifying the main species in the area, from various periods, and they are working with geomorphologists and geographers to define the main

ecosystems. Those who are probably finding the most difficulties are architects and in general modellers. The latter are in fact required to develop their final models at various levels of detail, at least in the last stage adopting common tools requiring an Internet connection, to check model validity (naming conventions, group definitions, geometry, texture, metadata, etc.). The final result, produced in several formats (standard and/or open), should certainly achieve remarkable results, but at the present stage what is visible in the webscape is just a series of simplified objects that are increasingly being substituted by more detailed ones. The way the webscape is changing day by day is impressive. It has never been “empty”: the initial reported projects could (and can) be visible in this “restricted” section and may be consulted. But after this first starting point, the cyberspace has started to grow. I can arrive at the office and see that the site where I was working the day before has changed. New thematic layers and objects have been added and new signs indicate that there are studies or fieldwork going on at that moment. In this way, I can verify a problem I'm facing in a very short time, contacting the colleague directly or checking the archive. My lab will soon be able to start working also on ancient landscape (mainly the Iron, Bronze and Roman ages). We will be working on two different interactive projects. The museum's director has signed an agreement to include an interactive installation, in the new section he is creating, and this will ensure that the work will be widely communicated as well. There will also be a second project more oriented to educational purposes, we hope in a couple of years.

Something like this has never happened before.

In the first part of this final chapter I tried to give a substantial idea of possible evolutions of the applications and processes we have been discussing in the book. Most of the technologies are already available, although not integrated or not off the shelf.

The use of Internet can really be addressed to various objectives: to diffuse results or just new approaches, to co-operate with people at the same level (scientists, tourists, students, etc.) or at different levels, to disseminate cultural information and the memory of our territories. Is it possible to strengthen this use, in connection with past landscapes? To diffuse the ecological approach in archaeology? And most of all to support the collaborative model within landscape reconstruction? A model adopted in a distant field has worked. It was proposed by the first programmers on Parallel Programming, adopting the slogan “*try it, play it, modify it*”. This could be successfully used in our case, trying hard to create open systems, tested and used by different professionals, as happened in the Virtual Rome or the FIRB projects I have described in the



previous chapter<sup>144</sup>. In the future most of the services will become Internet provided, as in the case of arc3D<sup>145</sup>, but also most of our resources will be moved from our external hard drives to the web and, finally, even programs will be used through the Net (GRANELLI SARNO 2007).

Virtual ecosystems might be seen as interactive online environments where it is possible to experience multiple voices, elements, relations, diversifications, and where new and different cognitive paths, directed to “decentralization”, might be proposed (TURKLE 1997: 167).

Models emerging from virtual ecosystems, like those discussed in this book, might support a more integrated vision of ancient landscape itself. But we also have to be aware of the risk represented by “opaque” systems, where virtual reality incorporates emotion and aesthetic. Nevertheless the introduction of complex systems in VR might also contribute to the harmonization and integration of emotion with logic, and game with analysis, for a better understanding and for a more efficient interpretation of our landscape, our memory.

---

144A full description of these case studies is available in Appendix A.

145<http://www.arc3d.be>



## **Appendixes**

(I. Cerato, A. Palombini, S. Pescarin, E. Pietroni, V. Vassallo)



## Appendix A Case Studies

### **.B.1        - 20,000 years of history at Ca' Tron**

Location: *Ca' Tron (TV), Italy*

Time: *Upper Palaeolithic, Bronze Age, Roman Times, Middle Ages*

Period: *Summer*

#### ***Sources, methodology and techniques***

The research, conducted since 2000 by the University of Padua in this area of the Veneto plain, was addressed to the reconstruction of the "total history", from antiquity to the present, of a stretch of land (so far ignored by historical, archaeological and environmental research), and its valorisation by conveying the potential, historical landscape of this portion of the lowlands which was at last recovered from the marshes in the years 1930-40.

The area, of about 1137 hectares, is situated between the Sile river and the northern lagoon of Venice. It includes the Roncade municipality (TV) and a small part of Meolo (VE), now part of Ca 'Tron estate farm, so named by a noble Venetian family in the early seventeenth century. It was once formerly included in the east Altinum Roman Ager, and the ancient Annia Street crossed through the southern sector of the estate along the stretch uniting Altinum and the site of Iulia Concordia.

Interest in this area of the Venetian lowlands involves both its geographical and historical features: the former is linked to its pivotal position between the large Brenta and Piave alluvial conoid and its location on the internal lagoon edge; the second is related to the neighbouring topography of the ancient city of Altinum (which is only two miles away) and to the road network realized by the Romans in the territory, partly exploiting the existing connections (in particular Annia Street).

In recent years the methodology used to study an area has evolved, absorbing interdisciplinary trends: information from various fields and research areas allows us to have highly scientific data available for a virtual reconstruction of the ancient landscape in its totality.

The study of Ca' Tron lends itself to this multidisciplinary logic due to the complexity of the morphological and human history of the area. Certainly one of the most advanced features of research into the past is the integration of historical and archaeological studies with studies of the the environmental, and the relationships between environment and culture (Environmental Archaeology), reconstructing human history through the recovery of the

temporal dimension of the environmental dynamic.

Archaeological research is carried out in close relation with palaeo-environmental research, making use of the most advanced technologies of investigation, detection and data processing, with the primary aim of grasping the relationship between man and his environment.

An interdisciplinary project of this kind, in a landscape context, among the most unspoiled of Venetian valleys, has stimulated reflection on the issue of the valorisation of acquired knowledge, both in scientific and communicative terms. One of the most innovative solutions in this area requires the use of multimedia: "virtual reality" techniques enable us to increase the amount of information and the quality of our perception. Precisely because of the wealth of data from the research at Ca' Tron, it was possible to verify the potential offered by a virtual reconstruction system.

The aim of the project was the reconstruction (starting from the research results) of the Ca' Tron archaeological landscape using visual simulations as a tool for hypotheses testing, and the geo-spatial contextualization in a diachronic way of the geological, botanical and archaeological information collected during these years of research. Unable to perform a continuum transformation of the landscape, four periods of significant changes in geomorphology, vegetation and human presence were identified:

4. the Last Ice Age Maximum (LGM), about 18,000 years ago,
5. the Bronze Age (second millennium BC) (fig. A1.1),
6. the Roman Age (first century BC.) (fig. A1.2),
7. the Middle Ages (XIII-XVI century BC).

*Figure A1.1. Catron\_bronze.tif*

*Figure A1.2 Catron\_roman.tif*

The work consisted in:

- XIV Data Collection: geophysical exploration, probings, sediment analysis, interpretation of aerial and satellite photos, survey of the land by airborne laser scanner, palinological and other plant analysis, excavation samples, surface reconnaissance, detection campaigns.
- XV Data processing: creation of digital terrain model and its preparation for the four chronologically reconstructed phases, study of plant species documented in similar geographical and climatic contexts, study of the structures, surface and finds, 3D reconstructions.
- XVI Creation of virtual system (fig. A1.3): creation of a GIS system of the "observed landscape", identification of the most significant phases (LGM, Bronze Age, Roman Age, and Middle Ages); 3D virtual modelling of the main archaeological evidence, drafting in GIS of the "interpreted landscape " for the different phases; virtual landscape

generation and its ecosystems (software VNS), data export into a virtual interactive GIS (VTP open source software, CNR-CINECA).

*Figure A1.3 Catron\_VR\_archeovirtual08.tif*

## ***Acknowledgements***

The project is directed by the University of Padova, Italy under the scientific coordination of: F. Ghedini; Archaeological coordinator: P. Basso, J. Bonetto, M.S. Busana; Geomorphology and Remote Sensing: A. Bondesan, P. Mozzi; Geophysics: E. Finzi, R. Francese; Palynology: A. Miola, G. Valentini; Excavations: P. Michelini; VR reconstructions: A. Palombini, S. Pescarin, V. Vassallo, CNR ITABC.

## ***References***

<http://www.tenutacatron.it/fondazioneecassamarca/catron/ciat/index.htm>

GHEDINI, F. BONDESAN, A. 2002

*La tenuta di Ca' Tron: ambiente e storia nella terra dei dogi*. Fondaz. Cassamarca, Cierre 2002

BONDESAN, A. BONETTO, J. BUSANA, M.S. KIRSCHNER, P. MIOLA, A. MOZZI, P. PESCARIN, S. VILLANI, M.C.

20,000 years of landscape evolution at Ca' Tron (Venice, Italy): palaeoenvironment, archaeology, VR webGIS. In: *Proceedings of "Hidden Landscapes of Mediterranean Europe: Cultural and methodological biases in pre- and protostoric landscape studies"* Collegio S. Chiara, University of Siena, May 25-27, 2007, in print

[I.C. and V.V.]

## **.B.2 Via Flaminia Roman Landscape**

Location: *North of Rome, Italy;*

Time: *21<sup>st</sup> century AD and 2<sup>nd</sup> AD;*

Period: *Summer*

Location: *North of Rome, Italy;*

Time: *21<sup>st</sup> century AD and 2<sup>nd</sup> AD;*

Period: *Summer*

### ***The Project***

The Virtual Museum of Ancient Via Flaminia, begun in 2005 by the Virtual Heritage Lab of the ITABC-CNR, aimed to reach a virtual reconstruction of the Via Flaminia archaeological landscape (about 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.). The goal was the creation of a Multiuser Virtual Reality museum installation for the Roman National Museum in Rome. The VR system is a MUD (Multiuser Domain) planned for 4 users with single displays and a HD stereo display 1024 x 768. The visitors share interactively the same virtual space, interacting through their joined actions and creating a virtual performance which is visible to the other visitors in stereoscopy (FORTE ET ALII 2007).

The reconstruction of the landscape was conceived of with two uses in mind. On the one hand it was targeted to be used in the Virtual Reality application and also to build computer-graphics movies, to be included in the VR multi-user system, developed using a story telling technique. This application is now installed in a specific room of the museum and it is characterized by four computers, connected in a network through a local server (Fig. A2.1). On the other, it was conceived as a basis for a 3D WebGis system, to allow people to browse the Via Flaminia landscape and reach its information content through the web.

The two platforms have different features and requirements. The museum VR system implies a limited time for users, and a cyclic and structured application, but at the same time it allows a wide-band of data-flow; whereas the web system allows users to decide their fruition timing and features, but is more limited in terms of data-flow.

The ancient landscape reconstruction has been carried out for use on both systems, aiming for at least two levels of detail: the first related to the whole territory around the Via Flaminia inside the Roman County area (about 20x40 km); the second, more detailed, for the Virtual Reality high-resolution application, and limited to the areas of archaeological interest along the path.

At the same time, the double-sided work of reconstruction (monuments and landscape) implied different strategies. For the monuments, a top-down strategy



was performed, starting from the hi-res reconstruction (obtained from Laser scanning), and simplifying data in order to reach a web-optimized version. For the ecological aspects of landscape, on the other hand, a bottom-up process was carried out: the simple GIS information layers (landscape features, ecosystems distribution and so on) were a starting point to obtain virtual reconstructions of natural items (plants, rivers, etc.) in the landscape context, at varying resolution. In both situations, the reconstruction needed a complete and reliable definition of the ecological features for the whole territory studied, corresponding to about 135.000 hectares. As a matter of fact, while for the Virtual Reality application – focused on a few hi-res monumental areas – vegetation was no more than a frame for architectural context in the limited areas where users moved, the VR webGis system required knowledge of the whole browsable territory (Fig. A2.2).

*Figure A2.1 MNV\_avatar\_sala.jpg*

*Figure A2.2 flaminia\_reconstruction.tif*

### ***Pre-processing and post-processing***

The available data for an historical approach to landscape reconstruction are unfortunately quite incomplete. We have various resolution digital elevation models (DEM), but they represent the actual terrain morphology, which slightly differs from the ancient one, as does the hydrology. We also have nature studies and literary texts which can give us information on the presence or absence of species of vegetation, as well as distribution data on archaeological findings, which may lead to indirect information about the distribution and typology of human occupation (villas, necropolis, monuments, etc.).

Such data needs a certain amount of preliminary processing before it is suitable for an historical landscape reconstruction.

Concerning the terrain model, the first step is the collection of reliable data on the terrain height in antiquity, for the areas where such information is available (from archaeological excavations, the presence of clearly datable items such as monuments, roads, etc.). At the same time we delete the morphological items whose modern origin is certain (banks, earthworks, hill-edge cutting, etc.).

Such specific areas can be used to be connected and/or interpolated with modern observed DEMs, to get closer to the ancient landscape situation.

This kind of operation, particularly over extensive areas, is naturally not exhaustive for the features of an ancient landscape, but its reliability is proportional to the amount of available archaeological documentation and then of ancient human presence in the territory, to give the most reliable possible representation of it. When dealing with such a topic, we should recall the

concept of uncertainty management: narrative or virtual reconstruction do not allow any “lack” of information. For this reason we are forced to operate choices among the various possible options, whenever a doubt arises, so that the fundamental issue is that choices should be transparent and plausible.

Once we have obtained a digital model of the ancient terrain, we have proceeded to the next step, preparing thematic maps of all the ancient features of the territory: the reconstruction of the ancient hydrography, through the comparison of historical maps and analysis of aerial photographs (Fig. A2.3), the map of ancient roads, and the map of archaeological occurrences. The latter was divided into different themes according to archaeological typology: the thematic map of the villas was one of the most important parts of the work that followed, and it is very important to have a reliable scheme of such buildings' spatial position. To this end, to avoid considering the features of the same villa as different sites, all the occurrences lying at less than 150 meters from each other, were considered as individual instances (Fig. A2.4).

*Figure A2.3 flaminia\_hydrography.tif*

*Figure A2.4 flaminia\_ecosystem.tif*

### ***Advanced elaboration***

The next step represents the fundamental and original part of the landscape reconstruction process. Starting from the Digital Terrain Model, a new slope map was created and then simplified so as to reach a five slope categories map. Geological and agronomic scientific literature offered a wide range of documentation about possible cultivation on the terrain slope, so that it was possible to assign to each slope category a list of the vegetation potentially present (chapter 4). Such a map was then refined by taking into account a lithostratigraphic soil map.

It was thus possible to obtain a new map concerning the ancient use of the soils, including different cultivation areas (vineyards and olives, cereals, and, particularly, fruits), as well as grazing areas, dense and light woods, bushes and areas of river shores, normally not cultivated and rich in a dense spontaneous vegetation (Fig. A2.5). Once all the areas potentially suitable for the various agricultural uses had been selected, we determined which ones were probably really cultivated among them. We hypothesized that such areas could be sought for among the ones closest to living structures and therefore easily accessible.

Study of the ways to determine the most easily accessible areas for food production purposes in ancient societies is by no means a new subject, having been carried on since the dawn of spatial analysis in archaeology, well before the spread of PC use. An important step in such a direction was Site Catchment

Analysis (Appendix B) (HIGGS VITA-FINZI 1970).

In the Roman context, we have many studies on the possible range of agricultural activities (GAFFNEY STANCIC 1991). On the basis of previous work and statistical analysis on specific site density, we chose to adopt 1357 mt ray areas, around the villas (for a more detailed explanation of the process see PALOMBINI VASSALLO 2007), inside such areas they are primarily considered the ones easily reachable in terms of slope and distance (cost analysis).

All these data and other analysis factors (the ancient hydrography, the reconstruction of possible ancient *centuriatio*, the correlations of fields to roads and streams, and so on) can easily be integrated into the frame of GIS calculation formulas, to obtain thematic maps of the final hypothetical reconstruction of land use through a common GIS software (we used GRASS 6.0).

The first result of such an elaboration is highly bitty and fragmentary, so that another step has to be taken to give the map a minimal threshold in shape regularity and the size of cultivated areas. Once again it has to be stressed that what we're going to reach is a plausible reconstruction of an historical landscape, and not the reproduction of a real situation, whatever the word real may mean in such a context. In fact, the real situation of the landscape, even if accessible to our knowledge, would be a constantly changing context.

Nevertheless, this process, thanks to its scientific plausibility and procedural transparency, can be considered an ideal meeting point between the ecological a cognitive reality of a landscape, reproducing both the landscape's scientific model and (through the next step of terrain generation) the landscape's emotional impact on the observer.

### ***Terrain generation***

The reconstruction process performed so far has, for its output, a series of 2D maps (raster or vector) containing information on ancient landscape features and various areas. Specific Terrain generator software is used to shift from this level to the real 3d landscape reconstruction.

Such software (we used Visual Nature Studio) helps in creating simple or mixed ecosystems, using starting data as a basis, and generating single plants according to specific graphic libraries which can be customized through pictures of vegetables.

All ecological parameters (density, dimensions, the presence of species) can be customized as well. The next step is the insertion in the landscape of architectural models of monuments.

The final result (Fig. A2.6) is a real, highly impressive landscape, which can be rendered at various resolution and complexity levels, according to the required use (local or web-based).

Figure A2.5 - *flaminia\_landuse.tif*

Figure A2.6 – *flaminia\_results.tif*

## Acknowledgements

Production: CNR, Istituto per le Tecnologie Applicate ai Beni Culturali di Roma. In collaboration with: Arcus S.p.A., Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma, Museo Nazionale Romano, Complesso delle Terme di Diocleziano; Scientific Director: M. Forte; Project of the multiuser system of virtual reality: M. Forte, E. Pietroni, C. Rufa; Coordination of the historical and archaeological content: V. Vassallo; Coordination of the project communication: Eva Pietroni; Coordination of the archaeological landscape reconstruction: Sofia Pescarin; Texts and scripts: A. Palombini, E. Pietroni, V. Vassallo; Architectural modelling, photomodelling and texturing: N. dell'Unto, M. Di Ioia, F. Galeazzi, A. Moro, L. Vico, S. Borghini, R. Cariani; Landscape modelling: S. Pescarin, E. Pietroni; Virtual characters modelling: N. Dell'Unto, M. Di Ioia; 2D Graphics: A. Moro; Photos: B. Trabassi, L. Vico; Video recording: B. Trabassi; 3D rendering movies: N. Dell'Unto, M. Di Ioia, F. Galeazzi, A. Palombini, S. Pescarin, No Real, I. Tumino; Video editing: E. Pietroni, B. Trabassi, I. Tumino, No Real; GIS and VR Web GIS elaboration: C. Camporesi, A. Palombini, S. Pescarin; Original music: G. Mangiocavallo; Historical research: G. Messineo, V. Vassallo, L. Vico; Laser scanning: M. Di Ioia, F. Galeazzi, A. Moro, E. Pietroni, B. Trabassi, L. Vico; Territorial reliefs: F. Galeazzi, M. Mascellani, A. Palombini; Territorial reliefs in the area of Grottarossa: A. Angelini, R. Gabrielli, D. Peloso; Resources implementation inside the application of virtual reality: E. Pietroni; Programming and developing of the application of multiuser virtual reality: C. Rufa; Programming and developing of the web application: C. Camporesi; Funding: Arcus S.p.a.

## References

FORTE, M. 2007

*La villa di Livia: un percorso di ricerca di archeologia virtuale*, L'Erma di Bretschneider, Roma.

FORTE, M. PESCARIN, S. PIETRONI E. RUFA, C. 2006

Multiuser interaction in an archaeological landscape: the Flaminia project. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Int. Conference on Remote Sensing in archaeology "From Space to Place"*, Rome 4-7 Dec. 2006, BAR Int. Series. 189-196.

FORTE, M. PESCARIN, S. PIETRONI, E. RUFA C. 2007

Multiuser Virtual Reality museum application for Cultural Heritage: the Ancient via Flaminia project. In: D. Arnold, F. Niccolucci, A. Chalmers (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage VAST (2007) Project Papers*.

VASSALLO, V. PALOMBINI A. 2009

Between Virtual Reality and Spatial archaeology: The Via Flaminia landscape reconstruction. In *CAA2008 proceedings*.

web: <http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/flaminia>

[A. P.]

### **.B.3 Appia Archaeological Landscape**

Location: *Rome, Italy*; Time: *21<sup>st</sup>*; Period: *Summer*

In 2002, the Institute of Technologies applied to Cultural Heritage has signed a research agreement with Roman Superintendency with the goal of creating in four years a spatial bidimensional and threedimensional archive of the monuments of Appia archaeological park, Rome (Italy).

#### ***Sources, methodology and techniques***

The Appia Antica project (the archaeological park of Roman Via Appia, located in Rome, Italy) was a good chance to experiment different technologies and approaches, allowing a continuous comparison with different mapping and VR techniques. It was developed between 2003 and 2006 by the interdisciplinary team of CNR ITABC, in collaboration with Rome Archaeological Superintendence. Maurizio Forte and Paolo Salonia have been the scientific coordinators, while I was the responsible for 3D modelling, laser scanning, virtual storytelling and the application *The narrative Museum of the Archaeological Park of Ancient Appia Antica*. The work was characterized by an intense activity of archaeological and architectonic survey with the goal of acquiring data for a real-time spatial interactive system. All the techniques used (DGPS, Total Laser Station, 3D Scanner Laser, 3D Stereo Photogrammetry, Photo-Modelling Techniques) were used in integration.

All the data acquired were post-processed: part of them (topography) were overlaid in a GIS project, while 3d models (architecture), obtained from scanner-laser and photo-modelling or reconstructed from archaeological sources, were geo-located and connected with external multimedia databases. For our activity it is very important to preserve the link between the fieldwork, survey activities and VR communication. That's why our efforts have been oriented to experiment a common protocol to manage data, without losing information during the successive phases of elaboration and communication. The software used: Arcview, Terravista (GIS elaboration), Photomodeler (photomodeling), Cyclone and RapidForm (laser scanner data elaboration) 3D Studio Max, Photoshop (optimization and design of the landscape), Virtools-DEV (real time engine), OpenScenograph for the 3D webGIS .

#### ***The archaeological landscape as a digital ecosystems***

The priority of the archaeological information consists in the contextualization of data and of cultural itineraries, in the inter-relation between human life and

sites, landscape and archaeological objects, the life of the past and the life of the present. The more information enhances difference and connectivity, the more the symbolic associations grow up and also the possibility for visitors to assimilate and elaborate cultural contents. We need to introduce “life” in the environment, activities, characters, behaviours, narrative contents to allow to comprehend ancient people mind, in relation with cultural models of the past and of present. How did ancient people live in the territory? What kind of activities did they develop? Which symbolic values did they attribute to the places? What kind of cultural message did ancient people perceived from object and places? Which relations can we establish between the past and the present culture?

### ***Results: The narrative museum of Appia archaeological park***

The aim of this project has been to utilize all GIS, topographical, architectonic data to construct digital spatial models, and associate them to a communicative system dedicated to the public and educational use.

A fly through the 3D model of the territory of Rome helps us to contextualize the Appia Park before analysing and observing in detail the environment. Some tools allow us to modify the visualization, changing the textures of the geometry and loading cartographic layers, highlighting areas of interest, taking measures on the territory. From the holistic level it is possible to choose two area of interest, the Caffarella valley and the via Appia Antica and explore them in a successive, more detailed level of representation. When we choose to walk inside the park we are full immersed in the context, every element of the landscape is described in 3D and we can decide to interact directly with historical and cultural contents through complex behaviours, narrative metaphors, characters and avatars. While walking through the park we can meet ancient travellers, famous characters of the past, animals, talking sacred trees, gods that tell us some tales about the park, legends, myths, stories (fig. A3.1 -2).

*Fig.A3.1 Appia1.tif - Fig.A3.2 Appia2.tif*

When we get near the archaeological structures we can listen to an audio explanation of the monument we are looking at, we can open movies, tales, animations, iconography, and so on; all the metadata are associated inside the three-dimensional space. Sound is spatially integrated in the 3D space, so to communicate the specificity of different places also through the suggestions produced by sounds, noises, voices.

In the real time visualization and exploration of the whole landscape a simplified version of the object and monuments, obtained by photomodelling

techniques, are used, while the high resolution version obtained by laser scanner are employed for a monographic analysis of the monument.

For the Nimphaeum of Egeria and S. Urbano Church we can explore and compare the models of the monuments as they appear today and their hypothetical original aspect (fig.A3.3). The Roman road has been reconstructed from the fourth mile to Casal Rotondo, also in this case monuments have been acquired by laser scanner or photomodelling techniques.

*Fig.A3.3 – Appia3.tif*

An important part of the archaeological monuments along via Appia Antica have been restored, and recomposed by Luigi Canina (1795-1856), an architect exponent of the neoclassic and antiquarian culture. During his long studies he made a lot of prints, designs of archaeological views, prospects of building, detail of decorations. These views show funerary monuments as they were in the 19th century but also as Canina imagined they could appear in the ancient time. We have represented one of his views in three-dimensions, so we can make our avatar walk or run inside Canina's print, exploring and visiting monuments as he imagined them (fig. A3.4). *The narrative museum of the archaeological park of Appia Antica* has been shown to the public during some international exhibitions of virtual archaeology: "Immaginare Roma Antica" (Trajan Market Museum in Rome, Sept.15 – Nov.15, 2005) and "Archeovirtual" (Paestum, Mediterranean Exchange of Archaeological Tourism, November 2006) obtaining a good success. Public had the possibility to explore and interact directly with the virtual landscape and cultural contents wearing stereoscopic glasses to enhance the impression of immersion inside the 3d environment.

Figure A3.4 – Appia4.tif

[E. P.]

## ***Aknowledgments***

GIS and documentation: scientific dir: M. Forte, P. Salonia; Surveys: M. Mascellani, E. Pietroni, F. Galeazzi, A. Palombini, S. Pescarin; Photomodelling: M. di Ioia, N. Dell'Unto, F. Galeazzi, E. Pietroni; GIS and webGIS: S. Pescarin, A. Palombini, C.Camporesi; Photos:B. Trabassi; Direction: Soprintendenza Archeologica Comunale di Roma, L. Sasso D'Elia and A. Mucci. VR System: Computer graphics: E. Pietroni, N. Dell'Unto, F. Galeazzi, L. Vico, L. Gomez, Scanner laser post-processing: E. Pietroni, 3d content implementation in VR engine: E. Pietroni, programming: C. Rufa, 3d landscape: S. Pescarin, E. Pietroni

## ***References***

FORTE, M. PESCARIN S., PIETRONI E. 2005

## **.B.4      Robotics, Virtual Environments and Landscape Virtual Communities**

Location: *Rome, Pisa (Italy), Luxor, Medinet Madi (Egypt) and Khor Rori (Oman).*

A FIRB (Funds for the Investments of Basic Research) project, *Integrated Technologies of robotics and virtual environment in archaeology*, financed by the Italian Ministry of the University and Scientific Research, gives us the opportunity to experiment and realize a multi-user domain on the web addressed to a multidisciplinary scientific community. The project, in collaboration with the Department of Archaeology of the University of Pisa and with Scuola S. Anna of Pisa, focuses on three archaeological sites: the Teban tomb 14 in the necropolis of Gurna-Luxor, the Temple A of Middle Kingdom in Fayum Medinet Madi, both in Egypt, and the ancient settlement of Khor Rori, in Oman. Maurizio Forte was the scientific coordinator of the CNR unit, I was the responsible of 3D modelling and VR Multiuser domain project.

### ***Sources, methodology and techniques.***

Typically the scientific communities do not consider VR environment an operative tool for archaeological research and, in particular on the web, there are few examples of 3D e-learning and e-communication. It is not yet common to share interpretations, hypotheses and data in the same virtual domain.

We think it could be very important to promote the use of the “virtual” also within scientific communities of experts, researchers, managers of cultural heritage. How technologies, and in particular virtual reality, can develop the organization and visualization of cultural contents? How can they support us in the interpretation, simulation of hypothesis and in the creation of integrated informative systems? Which are the most efficacious ways to interact with models and metadata? How can we share and exchange data?

Archaeological research produces during the phases of acquisition, post-processing and communication, huge quantities of spatial data, disseminated in different archives (with various formats, ontologies and typologies). The consequence is that the process of *interpretation* and communication becomes partially compromised, or even obstructed, by the inaccessibility of all data inside the same informative system. Moreover in most cases virtual reality applications are developed as final processing and 3D output of a previous long term work of research and study. They are not conceived as environment for simulation, sharing of information, testing hypothesis, editing of digital



ecosystem in order to experiment different solutions.

The three archaeological sites involved in the projects present very different characteristics and interpretative aspects. The tomb TT14 is a small and narrow space with a very complex stratigraphy; the Temple A is a well preserved architectonic context; Khor Rori is a typical example of archaeological landscape correlated with environmental studies. We have expressly distinguished and emphasized these features of all the archaeological contexts in order to apply different methods of communications and virtual re-contextualization. This variety of conditions of the archaeological contexts has required the use of different integrated technologies of data acquisition, elaboration and representation: scanner laser, computer vision and topographic relief for TT14 (fig.A4.1); GPS, total laser station, GIS, remote sensing, photogrammetry, computer vision, 3D panorama for the settlement and the landscape of Khor Rori, 3D computer graphics on the base of topographical relief for the Temple A of Medinet Madi. A collection of metadata, interpretative layers, multimedia contents are linked to models and integrated in the three-dimensional space.

*Figure A4.1: Firb1.tif*

## **Results**

All these data converge in a virtual scenario in the web where the scientific community can meet and interact in real time, exchange and test hypothesis, share data and make simulations in the 3D space<sup>146</sup>. This virtual space is an editable and dynamic environment in continuous evolution.

In fact 3D models are not closed and no longer accessible from users, as in most part of VR applications, on the contrary, they are open to continuous possible re-elaboration; they can be disassembled and recomposed according to different combinations and solutions. The models can be also exported from the application in “obj” format and re-used for different purposes. Beside the 3D models of architectures and archaeological structures, obtained from topographical reliefs, the VR application introduces other kinds of ontologies such as the “*Virtuoteca*” (fig.A4.2), an imaginary cyberspace, like a library, where users can find digital contents, papers, multimedia related to the archaeological site and studies.

*Figure A4.2: Firb2.tif*

These are the main functions and tools of the applications (fig.A4.3-4):

---

<sup>146</sup>[http:// www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/FIRB/Release/Home.html](http://www.vhlab.itabc.cnr.it/FIRB/Release/Home.html)

1) set project path; 2) load object (in .nmo format); 3) load scene, (in .txt format), 4) delete object, 5) load texture, 6) change the camera; 7) change textures on models; 8) tools of lightning; 9) tools of measurements; 10) move object, 11) hide/show objects; 12 link metadata to 3D models; 13) chat; 14) walk and move in the space through the avatar; 15) export3D models; 16) save scene.

*Figure A4.3: firb3.tif*

Every new version of the virtual environment can be saved and uploaded on the web as a new “space” of the MuD (only users with full rights), so that many different informative worlds can coexist and be compared in real time. The possibility to load, share and interact with data in the same spatial virtual environment can increase the level of learning and scientific communication; in this way the information become hyper-real and contextualized.

The application is developed in Virtools DEV, a real time rendering engine, and Virtools Mutiuser Pack.

It can be very usefull for education, collaborative sessions of learning, design and planning of conceptual maps. A possible scenario is the virtual classroom where the teacher can interact in 3D with the students, discussing about key features of the archaeological sites, interpretations, hypotheses and general overviews.

*Figure A4.4: firb4.tif*

## ***Acknowledgements***

A special thank to my colleagues of Virtual Heritage Lab of CNR ITABC; Claudio Rufa (Softlogic, Rome), Nicolò dell'Unto from UC Merced, the informatics and archaeological teams of Scuola S. Anna and University of Pisa (M. Bergamasco, E. Bresciani and F. Silvano, M. Betrò, A. Avanzini, and their collaborators), A. Giammarusti.

## ***References***

- Pietroni E., Forte M (2006). *The Museum's mind: a cybermap for cultural exhibition*, Proceedings VAST 2008, Nicosia, Cipro 30 ottobre – 4 november “The evolution of Information Communication Technology in Cultural Heritage”, edited by M. Ioannides, D. Arnold, F. Nicolucci, K. Mania: 70 -73.
- Forte M., Pescarin S., Pietroni E. (2006). *Transparency, interaction, communication and open source in Virtual Archaeology*, in proceedings FROM SPACE TO PLACE: II International Conference on Remote Sensing in Archaeology, 4-7 Dicembre 2006 CNR, Roma, edizione BAR, pp.535-539.

[E. P.]

## **.B.5 Virtual Rome**

Location: *Rome, Italy;*

Time: *2<sup>nd</sup> AD;*

Period: *Summer*

Virtual Rome is an open project whose aim is the interactive exploration and dynamic editing of 3d cultural information regarding landscape reconstruction and the territory of Rome. One of the result of the project in fact has been the identification of a method and the reconstruction of the potential landscape of Rome during Imperial times (2<sup>nd</sup> AD) (fig. A5.1). Virtual Rome has also developed an Open Source VR webGIS application, based on geospecific data, 3d models and multimedia contents, and a VR webLAB Content Management System dedicated to interactive and shared reconstruction process.

In the web browser final users can interact dynamically in the reconstructed space and activate different behaviours in order to enhance their knowledge of the territory. The VR webLAB is developed as to involve different researchers in the complex activity of landscape reconstruction, inside a cooperative environment. The VR webGIS, on the other side is built to enable visitors to explore archaeological landscape, trying to understand how should have been in the past, where can most important and best preserved monuments be found and how eventually to visit them, need. The project, started in 2006, has been directed by the Virtual Heritage Lab of CNR ITABC in Rome (IT), in cooperation with CINECA Supercomputing Center in Bologna (IT), thanks to the sponsorship of Seat Yellow Pages and Roman Chamber of Commerce. It is based on previous works, developed in 2004 and 2005, for the Appia Project and Esaro Cultural District project (FORTE PESCARIN PIETRONI 2005; PESCARIN ET ALII 2005). After an analysis of different open source projects and 3d graphic toolkits, such as Virtual Terrain Project, OpenSceneGraph, OpenSG, etc., we decided to base the work on OpenSceneGraph, the only one that in that period offering paging support for terrains and on-line publication capabilities, through the *.net* plug in (KUEHNE MARTZ 2007). It was specifically developed a plug-in, OSG4WEB, for Internet Explorer and Mozilla Firefox.

*Figure A5.1 virtualrome\_villa\_XX\_II.jpg*

For Virtual Rome project the following characteristics and behaviours have been developed:

- paged geospatial dataset support
- coordinate and projection handling (both in input and in output)
- large 3d terrain dataset management
- 3d models integration (modelled with software such as 3D Studio Max,

- etc)
- natural elements, such as vegetation, integration vector layers integration
- on-line 3d data publication and interaction, possibly embedded into a web browser
- Fly and walk navigation tools
- Behaviours integration:
  - terrains, models switching
  - vector information loading
  - models loading
  - picking and loading external pages or multimedia contents
  - overview map
  - environment integration

The project followed three main directions:

- 1.the definition of a digital pipeline which could enable a share collaborative work,
- 2.the creation of digital contents (study, interpretation and reconstruction of the landscape and main archaeological sites)
- 3.the development of the software.

Digital contents include:

- I archaeological and Roman potential landscapes reconstruction;
- II 3d models creation, optimization and integration in 3d scene;
- III vegetation creation and integration;
- IV multimedia Contents creation and integration in the 3d space (fig. A5.4).

Software and developed tools are:

- OSG4WEB plug-in;
- front-end web site, based on JavaScript, PHP. and Ajax programming, which embed the plug-in (front-end section) (fig. A5.2),
- CMS which integrates the plug-in and enables scene creation and project publishing (back-end section) (fig. A5.3)

*Figure A5.2 virtualrome\_frontend.jpg*

*Figure A5.3 virtualrome\_backend.tif*

*Figure A5.4 virtualrome\_metadata.jpg*

### ***Digital Pipeline for landscape reconstruction and on-line publication***

Virtual Rome project has identified a methodological approach which allowed, first of all, the definition of the archaeological modern landscape and, secondly, the reconstruction of the ancient landscape. The latter is based on the same GIS data used for the first, modified in accordance with archaeological data and with the integration of all relevant paleo-environmental and historical

information. Figure A5.5 and table A5.1 describes various activities, software and formats defined.

<b>Steps in the reconstruction of Virtual Rome Landscapes</b>	
1. Geoimagery, vector and DTM data acquisition	<i>GRASS GIS, QGIS</i>
2. Data re-projection in the same coordinate system	<i>GRASS GIS</i>
3. Colour calibration	<i>GRASS GIS and Er Mapper</i>
4. Archaeological Landscape: Terrain Generation	<i>OSGdem</i>
5. Vector thematic layers (Interpreted landscape)	<i>GRASS GIS and Quantum GIS</i>
6. Database annotation	<i>DBF and MySql</i>
7. Export of shape files in OSG format	<i>VTP ENVIRO extended version or direct integration</i>
8. Geo-archaeological maps integration in the GIS and DB	<i>GRASS GIS</i>
9. Creation of Roman Land Use Map	<i>GRASS GIS (or other GIS software)</i>
10. Virtual Ecosystem generation	<i>Visual Nature Studio (or other terrain and ecosystem generator)</i>
11. GIS and vegetation Export	<i>Visual Nature Studio and GIS</i>
12. Ancient Landscape: Terrain Generation	<i>OSGdem</i>
13. Vegetation integration	<i>OSGdem</i>
14. 3d models integration	<i>OSG4WEB, Python and MySQL</i>
15. Publication over the web for end user	<i>OSG4WEB and JavaScript</i>
16. Updating of the process through cooperative environment	<i>3d CMS</i>

Table A5.1

Figure A5.5 pipeline\_vrome.tif

## **Digital Contents**

To reconstruct the archaeological landscape, it was necessary to build an initial GIS archive, containing all spatial information, such as the aerial photographs (20 cm resolution) provided by Nuova Telespazio, and other satellite images with different resolutions in integration to not covered areas. The used coordinate system was WGS84 UTM32N. The entire geoimages dataset was quite big (35 GB) and in order to handle lower and higher resolution images we preferred to maintain separately all photographs, after blending and colour calibration, rather than producing one large mosaic.

The available DTM (10 mt resolution) was used with the geoimages dataset to build the 3d terrain with OSGdem. The final result was a 3d model of the entire Roman area, divided, geometry and texture, in various Level of Details (LOD) and in tiles. During the exploration, the user doesn't have the feeling of the

amount of data that are loading, because of the hierarchy of the model.

Vector thematic layers regarding the archaeological landscapes were also added to the GIS, such as location of archaeological sites, Roman roads, river system, etc. The majority of this information came from archaeological excavations and surveys, aerial photo interpretation, historical maps and geoarchaeological observations. A modified version of the open source tool VTP (Builder and Enviro) was used to export vector layers in the \*.osg and \*.ive file format. Data in this formats may be in fact published on line, and, in our case, they have been published in the front-end, though the 3d plug-in and also thanks to the back-end interaction.

Potential Roman Landscape was then reconstructed and published as well as a further “switchable” layer. It was obtained thanks to the soil map and land use map of Rome developed by Rome City Council. This map was then modified in order to define different (Roman) Classes, and Land Uses (aLU: chapter 4) (ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVELD 2003, VOLPE AND ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVELD 2005). Each dominant soil use of the various areas was reconsidered, comparing it with Roman geomorphology and known Roman archaeological sites or paleo-botanical analysis. In this way the territory around Rome was divided into different potential environmental classes, accordingly with different land capacity values. A new map was thus obtained, representing the different potential ecosystems of Roman period in that specific part of Rome (fig. A5.6). Each ecosystem has been better defined by specific species, taken from a digital library of Roman vegetation appositely created, and also by characteristics, identified by sub-categories, such as top and bottom vegetation, density, rules of nature, etc. Visual Nature Studio by 3D Nature was used for this specific project. At the end of the process a new geoimage was generated and exported. Different view points have been rendered and movies produced. The entire coverage was also exported in GIS to generate the 3d terrain models in osg for real time on line purposes. 3d models have been added in the ecosystem generator, in the CMS or in the 3D graphic software.

The interpretation and reconstruction process of this project is not finish. New data and new information can be always found, new hypothesis formulated, new areas investigated. Nevertheless, although a work in progress, the VR webGIS has been available since the beginning of the project on line (the front-end) at [www.virtualrome.net](http://www.virtualrome.net) (fig. A5.7).

*Figure A5.6 virtualrome\_ecosystem.tif*

*Figure A5.7 virtualrome\_archeovirtual2008.tif*

[S. P.]

## ***Acknowledgements***

*Scientific Direction:* S. Pescarin (CNR ITABC) and M. Forte (CNR and Univ. California - Merced); *Software Design:* C. Camporesi (CNR ITABC), L. Calori (CINECA); *Programmers:* C. Camporesi, B. Fanini (CNR ITABC); L. Calori, S. Imboden, A. Negri, T. Diamanti (CINECA); *Web programmers & graphic:* C. Camporesi, M. Pescarin, C. Albano; *Landscape Reconstruction:* S. Pescarin, A. Palombini, V. Vassallo; *3D Modelling:* F. Galeazzi, M. di Ioia, A. Moro, L. Vico (ITABC); F. Delli Ponti (CINECA). Foundings and sponsorship: Seat Yellow Pages, Roman Chamber of Commerce. Cooperation: Rome Dept. X - IV° U.O. and Antonia Arnoldus-Huyzendveld.

## ***References***

- PESCARIN, S. CALORI, L. CAMPORESI, C. DI IOIA, M. FORTE, M. GALEAZZI, F. IMBODEN, S. MORO, A. PALOMBINI, A. VASSALLO, V. VICO, L. 2008  
Back to II AD. A VR on-line experience with Virtual Rome Project. In: M. Ashley, S. Hermon, A. Proenca, and K. Rodriguez-Echavarria (Eds), *proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage VAST (2008)*.
- CALORI, L. CAMPORESI, C. PESCARIN, S. 2009  
Virtual Rome: a FOSS approach to WEB3D. In *Web3d International Symposium 2009*.
- CALORI, L. CAMPORESI, C., PESCARIN, S., FORTE M. 2008  
*Virtual Rome*. In Siggraph 2008- Poster
- web: <http://www.virtualrome.net> (this version of the site is currently visible mainly with Mozilla Firefox)





## **Appendix B**

### **Sources and resources**

(A. Palombini, V. Vassallo)

#### **.B.1 Spatial repositories**

##### ***Global Land Cover Facility***

GLCF is a centre for land cover science with a focus on research using remotely sensed satellite data and products to assess land cover change for local to global systems. The GLCF provides earth science data and products helpful for the study and understanding of global environmental systems. It develops and distributes remotely sensed satellite data and products. Every primary data and products available at the GLCF are free to anyone via FTP (and on-line accessible through the Earth Science Data Interface, ESDI): they are satellite imageries and products derived from that, such as vector products.  
<http://glcf.umiacs.umd.edu>

##### ***Military Geographical Institute (Istituto Geografico Militare: IT)***

This is the organization preserving the largest aero photographic collection of Italy, providing geo-topo-cartographic support to the Units and Commands of the Italian Army as Cartographic Organization of the State. Of fundamental importance are the photos taken before or during the Second World War.  
<http://www.igmi.org/>

##### ***Italian Aerial Photo Archive (aereofototeca)***

Since 1973, it is a centre for the collection and study of the Italian territory aero-photographic material and it has acquired over the years a heritage of over two million images.  
<http://immagini.iccd.beniculturali.it>

##### ***Italian State Archives***

The Italian Archive of Cultural Heritage.  
<http://www.archivi.beniculturali.it/>  
Access with search engines and on-line inventories:  
<http://www.archivi-sias.it/index.asp>

## ***Mapping Mediterranean Lands project***

Part of the Digital Library for International Research and under the aegis of the Council of American Overseas Research Centres, it aims to identify, catalogue, conserve, and make electronically accessible early and unique or rare maps from archaeological excavation and exploration held in the collections of American overseas research centres around the Mediterranean Sea. The multi-phase project resulted in fully searchable catalogued records of over 4,000 single maps and maps in books through an on-line catalogue.

[http://www.aiys.org/aodl/public/medmaps/Digital\\_Maps\\_MEDMAPS\\_project.htm](http://www.aiys.org/aodl/public/medmaps/Digital_Maps_MEDMAPS_project.htm)

## ***OpenStreetMap***

A free editable map of the whole world, made by users. Creating and providing free geographic data allows to view, edit and use them in a collaborative way from anywhere on Earth. The project was started to overcome the problem of legal or technical restrictions on the use of maps, and to enable to use them in creative and productive ways.

<http://www.openstreetmap.org/>

## ***Remote Sensing Data: various sources and resources***

1. EROS Data Gateway: <http://edcimswww.cr.usgs.gov/pub/imswelcome/plain.html>
2. Astronaut Photography:  
<http://eol.jsc.nasa.gov/default.htm>
3. MrSid GeoCover Landsat TM images:  
<https://zulu.ssc.nasa.gov/mrsid/>
4. Terraserver:  
<http://terraserver-usa.com>
5. Astronaut Photography:  
<http://eol.jsc.nasa.gov/default.htm>
6. NGA Raster Roam:  
[http://geoengine.nima.mil/geospatial/SW\\_TOOLS/NIMAMUSE/webinter/rast\\_roam.html](http://geoengine.nima.mil/geospatial/SW_TOOLS/NIMAMUSE/webinter/rast_roam.html)
7. GeoData:  
<http://gos2.geodata.gov/wps/portal/gos>
8. Landsat:  
<http://www.landsat.org>
9. Tropical Rain Forest Information Center (TRFIC):  
<http://www.trfic.msu.edu/index.html>
10. African Data Dissemination Service: <http://edcsnw4.cr.usgs.gov/adds/index.php>
11. Centre for Remote Imaging, Sensing and Processing (CRISP):  
<http://www.crisp.nus.edu.sg/crisp.html>
12. ESA Earth Observation Earthnet Online:  
<http://earth.esa.int/>
13. SPOT Vegetation products:  
<http://free.vgt.vito.be/>
14. Free data for Canada:  
<http://geogratis.cgdi.gc.ca/clf/en>

15. Shuttle Radar Topography Mission (SRTM): <ftp://edcs9.cr.usgs.gov/pub/data/srtm/> and GLCF
16. ASTER Protected Area Archive: <http://asterweb.jpl.nasa.gov/APAA/default.htm>

### ***Rome: Map Resources***

Project developed by the Dalton School and thought as a collection of Rome resources for the community and a useful research tool to find interesting information. It is divided in several categories: literature, archaeology and maps of Roman Empire, etc.

<http://intranet.dalton.org/groups/rome/RMAPS.html>

### ***United States Geological Survey (USGS)***

American national centre for collecting, managing and analysing data aimed at providing scientific understanding about natural resource conditions, issues and problems. It offers a variety of maps and digital data (maps, aerial photographs, satellite images, remote sensing resources etc.).

<http://edcsns17.cr.usgs.gov/EarthExplorer/>

[V. V.]

## **.B.2 Sources**

The reconstruction of the archaeological landscape is a very complex process including many kinds of data and activities in a virtual ecosystem following a multidisciplinary approach. The integration of different data, makes it possible to interpret the functions, aspects and uses of structures and places and propose a reliable reconstruction. Very important for the study of the ancient landscapes and for the organization of the settlements are: ancient writers (Vitruvius, Cato, Varro, Columella, Pliny the Elder, etc.), inscriptions of monumental roads, topographical and thematic maps, etc.

### ***Archaeological Maps***

Fundamental to landscape reconstruction. The use of archaeological maps allows to analyse in a wider way sites distribution within a territory and report survived archaeological elements or even contribute in sites and remains recognition. Thanks to archaeological maps it is possible to identify ancient roads, linear structures, ancient buildings etc. They contribute in the evaluation of preventive archaeology. These maps can be used to find sites position and orientation. They can be found in every official archaeological offices of different regions or counties, or, in some cases, they may be recovered on specific texts<sup>147</sup>.

---

<sup>147</sup>Such as the *Forma Italiae* volumes, founded by G. Lugli and it is currently directed by P. Sommella, published by Leo S. Olschki, Florence.

## ***Geological, Lithostratigraphic and Geomorphological Maps***

Geological maps show the distribution of geological features. They are usually built on top of a base map, printed with light colours, to not interfere. Geology is represented by colours, lines, and special symbols unique to geologic maps. They describe superficial rocks and soils, deepen rocks and soils, age of the rocks, etc.

<http://geology.wr.usgs.gov/wgmt/aboutmaps.html>

<http://www.nature.nps.gov/geology/usgsnps/gmap/gmap2.html>

## ***Land evaluation***

“the process of assessment of land performance when used for specified purposes” involving the execution and interpretation of surveys and studies of landforms, soils, vegetation, climate and other aspects of land in order to identify and make a comparison of promising kinds of land use in terms applicable to the objectives of the evaluation” (FAO 1976).

## ***Soil Maps***

Soil maps present soil classification and distribution in a specific area, through a geographically referenced soil database generated at a given resolution by using field and laboratory observation methods coupled with environmental data through quantitative relationships<sup>148</sup>. There is an International Soil Classification Systems that serves to correlate experiences on similar soils all over the world. A World Reference Base for Soil Classification was published by International Union of Soil Sciences in cooperation with the International Soil Reference and Information Centre (ISRIC). The classification is based mainly on soil morphology. (FAO 1988)

## ***Greek and Roman sources (regarding the landscape)***

- **Agricultural landscape** of the Agro Pontino: *Dionysius of Halicarnassus* 5.6.2-4; *Livy*, 2.14.6; (Roman and Greek). *Archytas*, *De Agricultura* (from *Diogenes Laërtius* 8.82)
- **Gardens as farms of poor people:** *Pliny*, 19,52; **Urban gardens disappearance:** *Pliny* *Naturalis Historia*, 19,59
- **Landscape:** *Tacitus*, *Germania* 5,1-3; Aboriginal people myth and forest-marshy landscape . *Sallust*, *De coniuratione Catilinae* 6,1; Archaic landscape: *Lucretius*, 5.1241, 5.1248, 5.1365; *Cicero*, *De re publica* 2.6.11; *Hesiod*, *Teogonia*. v. 1013; Conflict between city and countryside: *Cicero*, *De officiis*, 1, 150-151; Inexhaustible natural resources: *Aeschylus*, *Agamemnon*, 958-962; Inexhaustible natural

---

<sup>148</sup>Working Group on Digital soil Mapping, WG-DSM: <http://www.digitalsoilmapping.org>

resources: *Aulus Gellius*, *Noctes Atticae* 2,22,27; Limits of man against nature. *Varro*, *De Re Rustica*, 2, 1-2-3; 1,4,3-5; 1,12,1-4; Natural beauties of Italy.: *Q. Curzius Rufus*, *Strabo* 2,5,26; *Propertius*, *Elegies*, Book III, XXII elegy; Not propagandist story about natural beauties of Italy. *Pliny the Elder*, *Nat. Hist.*, Book III

- **Natural resources:** tuft galleries. *Pliny* *Nat. Hist.*, 36, 108; 36, 124; agricultural resources are not inexhaustible *Sophocles*, *Antigone* 332-40:43; Not inexhaustible natural resources: *Pliny the Elder*, *Naturalis Historia*, 2, 207-8; 33, 1-3; Exploitation of natural resources, *Seneca*, *Controversiae*, 2,1,11; Inexhaustible natural resources. *Virgil*, *Georgicon*, 2, 165-6; *Xenophon*, *De Vectigalibus*, 4, 25-29
- **Pollution**, *Vitruvius*, 8,4,2; *Pliny the Elder*, *Naturalis Historia* 18, 2-3; Pollution by lead in water pipes, *Vitruvius* 8,6,10-11; Air pollution due to the smoke of the chimneys: *Seneca*, *Ad Lucilium de providentia*, 104, 6
- **Roman Landscape:** *Cato*, Beginning of the *De Agricultura* 1,1-3; *Cicero*, *De lege agraria*; *Columella* 1,3.1-2; *Virgil*, *Georgicon*, Book II, 109-135; *Virgil*, *Aeneis*. 3,701
- **Rome:** crowd and traffic. *Juvenal* 3,25; 3, 254-62; Everyday life scenes. *Horace* *Epistulae*. 2,2,65-80; *Martial*, *Epigrammata* 12,57 1-17; Noise *Seneca*, *Epistulae*, 56, 1-4; Marshes of the first settlement is crossed by swimming and sailing. *Chronica urbis Romae*, 18; Rome originally was settled in a landscape of hilltop settlements that overlook watercourses and swampy areas or subjected to flooding and suitable for grazing. *Livy*, 1.4.6; 1.7.4
- **Urban landscape.** Against the excess of buildings; on the increase of villas and decrease of gardens: *Horace*, *Carmina* 2, 15; Buildings height in the city: *Strabo*, 5,3,7; Building rules: *Ulpian*, *Digesta* 43,8,2,8; Directions on where to build: *Vitruvius* 1,4,1-5; Urban development: *Seneca*, *Epistulae*, 89,21
- **Viability.** Etruscan and Roman road system (Tiber) *Polybius*, 3.22.11
- **Water** resources: water sacrality and prohibition of intervention: *Tacitus*, *Annales*, 1, 79; *Vitruvius* 1,2,7; Attica hydrogeological instability: *Plato*, *Crizia*, 110e – 111d; Creation of pipes to improve marshes: *Vitruvius*, 1,4,11-12; Channel dug by Scaurus between Parma and Piacenza to reclaim the marshes. *Strabo*, 5,1,11; Ostia connected to Rome by channels for transporting salt. *Virgil*, *Aeneis*. 8.87 ss; 9.314 ss
- **Woods.** Sacred woods in imperial times in Rome *Pliny* 15, 77; 16, 235; Decrease in sacred forests due to the construction expansion. *Varro*, *De Lingua Latina*, 5, 49; Deforestation dedicated to pasture. *Lucretius* 41;

Deforestation in ancient time (Greece): *Theocritus*, 17, 9-10; Deforestation in some areas made with criterion. *Cassiodorus Varias*, 5, 16, 2; Etruria wood for house girders. *Livy*, 28.45.13; Larici road cut: from the north crossed the Po up to Ancona, but didn't arrive in Rome: *Vitruvius* 2, 9, 16: Laws or measures to counter the excessive deforestation and protect forests and water. *Plato*, *Leges*, 824a; *Pliny* 17,1; Pitch extracted from Sila forests (known as Calabrian). Used in medicine and to treat the jars: *Pliny* 14, 127; 24, 37-40; Ravenna built entirely of wood, *Strabo* 5, 1, 6; Search for minerals causes the demolition of the mountains and natural upheavals. *Pliny the Elder*, *Naturalis Historia*, 33, 1; Sila wood (poplar, beech, pine, oak, ash) used for construction and shipbuilding. *Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, *Antiquitates Romanae*, 20, 15; Villas and palaces of Rome constructed with Etrurian wood. *Strabo* 5, 2, 5; Wood uses in Rome. *Pliny* 12,5

[ V. V.]

### **.B.3 Geographic spatial analysis**

#### ***Spatial Analysis***

During the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century, archaeologists and environmental scholars developed many models for spatial analysis (HODDER AND ORTON 1990), that is to say, to better understand the criteria of human organization in relation to settlement distribution in the landscape. Today, many of these models are easily developed by GIS software. Here below, we'll describe some of the most diffused operations on raster and vector files, to apply spatial analysis models.

#### ***Buffering***

Buffering is the operation of defining a circle with a given ray (or more concentric circles) around points, defining areas referred to sites. This operation has a really high number of applications. From an ecological/economic point of view the most interesting can be considered the site catchment analysis.

#### ***Cost analysis***

It is a study of the cost of paths, from a starting point to different destinations around it. It can be calculated taking into account the linear distance together with slope and other factors affecting each grid cell

## ***Delaunay triangulation***

The Delaunay triangulation is the operation to collect all the points on a surface by lines forming a series of triangles not overlapping each other, the mathematical definition is that “*a Delaunay triangulation for a set  $P$  of points in the plane is a triangulation  $DT(P)$  such that no point in  $P$  is inside the circumcircle of any triangle in  $DT(P)$ .*” It is used in many applications: is the basis of 3D modelling, being the first step to create polygonal surfaces from vector points, and can be used as well to calculate the Clarke-Evans index of randomness/organization in settlement pattern through the nearest-neighbour analysis (see below). Delauney triangles also have many important geometrical properties and can be used in a wide range of algorithms.

## ***Nearest neighbour analysis***

It is a method used to study the characteristics of a distribution of objects/sites and to compare different distributions or parts of them, identifying different settlement logics in an area. For each point the distance to the nearest point is calculated. The average of these distances (observed value) is compared with the value that it would have if the distribution of points was random (expected value). If the observed value is similar to that expected it means that the distribution of points is similar to a random scatter. If the observed value is significantly lower than the expected, it means that the points are grouped, because the distances between them tend to be low. In the opposite case the observed highest average means that items are regularly distributed in space, since they tend to have the greatest possible distance between them.

## ***Site Catchment analysis***

Site-catchment analysis can provide valuable information on ancient survival strategies and social organization. Developed by Eric Higgs and Claudio Vita-Finzi during the late 1960s (HIGGS VITA-FINZI 1970), the purpose of site catchment analysis was to reconstruct economical aspects of an archaeological sites. The size of the areas may be based on the sources of material found in the site, or on deductions such as the distance that could be covered within a day's journey. It was noted that in ancient societies, most of the settlements are located in territories located within a radius of 2-3 km from the site. Using site catchment analysis, it is possible to analyse settlement choices of a group. A group, in fact, tends to minimize the energy needed to survive, choosing a settlement, permanent or seasonal, located in such a way to facilitate the exploitation of the certain environment, according to given rays of action. This technique can be used to rebuild the productive development of a region. The relationship between sites and environment can also be analysed also for predictive purposes: developing models on site selection and settlement patterns improve analysis.

## ***Thiessen polygons***

This method assumes the sites as set of points in a plan without dimensions, hierarchies or characterizations. It divides the space geometrically in areas belonging to each point. Polygons are composed by a series of lines equidistant from the two closest points and perpendicular to the lines which joins the same points. The result is an ideal model of the zones of influence for individual points: it does not evaluate the geomorphological differences of the areas and

considers centres of the same type and size. To create models closer to reality, it is possible to get some corrections taking into account other factors, or improve the model by the use of polygons "weighed", according to the importance of the site (economic, demographic, etc.).

### ***Viewshed analysis***

It is the analysis of the part of a territory that is visible from one or more given points. Taking into account the terrain's morphology, it is useful to select part of the landscape particularly suitable for strategic settlements and to study inter-visibility among sites.

[A.P.]

## **.B.4 SOFTWARE**

### ***Software useful in archaeology***

**BASP:** The Bonn Archaeological Software Package, since the late 70s provides a set of tools for managing archaeological records through database systems, statistical analysis, mapping facilities and low-level remote sensing algorithms. OS: Windows; <http://www.uni-koeln.de/~al001/basp.html>

**MeshLab:** a software developed by the ISTI-CNR (Pisa, Italy), for the advanced elaboration of 3d Scanner data. It is a mesh processing system, for user assisted editing, cleaning, filtering and rendering of large unstructured 3D triangular meshes (typical 3D scanning meshes). It relies on the `gpl` VCG library ([vcg.sf.net](http://vcg.sf.net)); OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS. <http://meshlab.sourceforge.net>

**ARC3D** webservice: It is a web service allowing to create a 3D model from a series of digital pictures uploaded by the users. OS: Any; <http://www.arc3d.be>

**Blender:** is a 3D object creating suite, for 3D modelling and advanced editing. OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS; <http://www.blender.org>

**3D Studio Max:** is a three-dimensional vector graphics and animation. It has strong modelling capabilities and is mostly used by video game developers, TV studios and architectural visualization. OS: Win. <http://usa.autodesk.com/adsk/servlet/index?siteID=123112&id=5659302>

**Maya:** is a powerful, integrated 3D modelling, animation, visual effects, and rendering solution. Is based on an open architecture and for this reason is used in different fields OS: Win, MacOS (cinema, television, game development, and design projects). <http://usa.autodesk.com/adsk/servlet/>

**Cinema 4D:** is a commercial, cross-platform, high-end 3-D graphics application. It can operate with solid modelling or 3D mesh surfaces and is very popular due to its simple interface and



speed. It is mainly devoted to post-movie for the creation of special effects, but is also appreciated in the world of graphics and animation, thanks to integration with the most widely used software. OS: Win, MacOS, Linux <http://www.maxon.net/>

**AutoCad:** is the first CAD software (computer aided design) developed for PC. It is mainly used to produce 2D/3D drawings in engineering, architectural, mechanical, etc. The product is a vector and it also allows to create three-dimensional models of geometric objects in vector mode. OS: Windows. <http://usa.autodesk.com/adsk/servlet/index?siteID=123112&id=2704278>

## ***Game engines***

A List of game engines, authoring tools and 3d toolkits is available at: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_game\\_engines](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_game_engines)

**Delta 3D:** It's an open source game engine suitable for a wide range of modeling and simulation applications. OS: Win, Linux <http://www.delta3d.org/>

**OGRE:** is currently one of the most powerful open source rendering engine. OS: Win, MacOS, Linux <http://www.ogre3d.org>

**Unity 3D:** is a multiplatform game development tool, with a high compatibility both in terms of file formats and hardware applications. OS: Win, MacOS <http://unity3d.com>

**VirTools Dev:** is a development and deployment platform with an innovative approach to interactive 3D content creation. It facilitates prototyping and robust development up to large-scale and the immersivity. OS: Windows. <http://a2.media.3ds.com/products/3dvia/3dvia-virttools>.

## ***GIS, webGIS, Remote Sensing***

A lists of available mapping software is available at: MapTools (<http://maptools.org/>) or GFoss (<http://www.gfoss.it/drupal/software>).

**ARK** (The Archaeological Recording Kit) is a web-based 'toolkit' for the collection, storage and dissemination of archaeological data. It includes data-editing, data-creation, data-viewing and data-sharing tools, all of which are delivered using a web-based front-end. OS: Any. <http://ark.lparchaeology.com>

**ENVI:** it is a powerful software joining GIS and image processing/analysis features. OS: Win <http://www.itvis.com/>

**ErMapper:** It is the a rich software for remote sensing and advanced multispectral image analysis OS: Win <http://www.ermapper.com>

**ESRI ArcGIS** is a leader services company providing Geographic Information System and geodatabase management applications. Its products, as ArcGIS, are affordable, easy-to-learn desktop mapping tool. OS: Win <http://www.esri.com>

**GRASS:** is the most famous and powerful Open Source GIS suite. It allows all kind of GIS analysis, on raster and vector data, as well as advanced geoimage processing. The referring site includes links to OSGeo4W Project. OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS. <http://grass.itc.it>

**Idrisi:** one of the earliest GIS software, still preserves the feature of very impressive and pleasant graphic outputs. OS: Win <http://www.clarklabs.org>

**MapInfo:** one of the earliest GIS software, for geo-spatial data visualization and analysis. OS: Win <http://www.mapinfo.com>

**OpenEV:** Is an open source graphic library and application for viewing and analyzing raster and vector geospatial data. OS: Windows, Linux. <http://openev.sourceforge.net>

**OSGeo4Win:** Project is a binary distribution of a broad set of open source geospatial software for Win32 environments (Windows XP, Vista, etc). It includes many of the most useful geographic libraries and applications. OS: Win (GDAL/OGR, GRASS, MapServer, OpenEV, uDig, QGIS etc.) <http://trac.osgeo.org/osgeo4w/>

**QGIS:** is a simple and very easy-to-use Open Source GIS allowing to visualize, manage, edit, analyse data, and compose printable maps. OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS. <http://www.qgis.org>

## ***Terrain Generators***

For a complete list of terrain generators the most updated document is:  
[http://www.tec.army.mil/research/software/TD/tvd/survey/vendors\\_web\\_alpha.html](http://www.tec.army.mil/research/software/TD/tvd/survey/vendors_web_alpha.html)

**OSGdem:** it is a part of the OSG (OpenSceneGraph) package for terrain generation. It is a command-line tool which allow to create a paged terrain starting from DTM and geoimage data. OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS. <http://www.openscenegraph.org>

**Presagis Tools:** Presagis has acquired and developed some of the earliest suites for terrain and 3d environment generation, such as TerraVista and Multigen Creator. The software still keep an intuitive interface and realistic immersive outputs. OS: Win, MacOS, Linux. <http://www.presagis.com>

**Visual Nature Studio:** VNS is a terrain generator which allows to create highly realistic geocoded landscapes from GIS data. It has a wide range of output formats in terms of raster/vector layers, movies and pictures, and terrain/3d environments. OS: Win <http://www.3dnature.com>

**VTP:** Open Source suite for viewing, creating, editing 3D environments, to be browsed or exported for web publishing. OS: Windows, Linux. <http://www.vterrain.org>

## ***Terrain (2d- 3d) web-viewer***

**MapServer** is a webGIS, an Open Source platform for publishing on the web spatial data and

interactive mapping applications to the web in a 2d space. OS: Windows, Linux, MacOS. <http://mapserver.org>

**OSG4WEB** is the result of a CINECA and ITABC-CNR effort to provide a framework for in-browser OpenGL-based application wrapping. The projects started in 2004 to fill the need of web-enabled 3d terrain and geo-spatial data browsing in a pre-Google-Earth time. The plug-in allows run-time loading of different application cores at the web page opening, allowing the same installed plug-in to brows pages that require different application codes. OS: Win, Linux, MacOS. [http://3d.cineca.it/storage/demo\\_vrome\\_ajax/osg4web.html](http://3d.cineca.it/storage/demo_vrome_ajax/osg4web.html)

**3d Via Player** is the free on line viewer developed by VirTools Dev for real time on line experience. <http://dl.3dvia.com/software/3dvia-player/>

**Unity web player** is the free on line viewer developed by Unit 3D engine. It enables to view 3D content created with Unity directly in the web browser. <http://unity3d.com/unity-web-player-2.x.html>

[A.P.]

## **.B.5 Projects**

### ***Geo-spatial 3d viewers***

**Google Earth** is a stand alone software that allows to explore the 3d World at multiple levels, from Space to the streets, identifying maps, directions and various kind of points of interest. It is freely distributed by Google and requires a Microsoft Windows operating system, Mac OS X or Linux and currently has developed a version for iPhone and iPod Touch. Satellite images and photographs of the Earth are displayed with a very high detail (res. 15 mt) and, in some cases, with a resolution less than one meter. <http://earth.google.it/>

**Google Maps** allows to view 2d maps in the web browser. On the base of the location, it is possible to view standard or customized maps and information. Interesting the “StreetView” application recently automatically available after a certain scale. <http://maps.google.com/>

**Google Plug-In** and JavaScript API let embed Google Earth, a true 3D digital globe, into the browsers. Using the API it is possible to draw markers and lines, drape images over the terrain, add 3D models, or load KML files, allowing to build sophisticated 3D map applications. The Google Earth API is a free service, available for any web site that is free to consumers. <http://code.google.com/apis/earth/>

**Google O3D** is an open-source web API for creating rich, interactive 3D graphics applications (games, ads, 3D model viewers, product demos, virtual worlds) in a browser window. It provides a browser plug-in that adds graphics capabilities inside standard web browsers, and a sample COLLADA Converter, which can be used to import files in the COLLADA format, an open standard for 3D assets that is supported by popular content creation applications

**Google SketchUp** is a very simple software to learn and allows to create, edit and share 3D

models. The program is part of the same family of GoogleEarth, which ensures the exchange of information between them in a very simple way. It allows to import and export different formats (DXF, DWG and 3DS, JPG, TIFF, etc.). <http://www.google.com/sketchup/download/gsupwiththankyou.html>.

**Nasa World Wind.** World Wind is a free open source virtual globe developed by NASA. The program overlays NASA and USGS satellite imagery, aerial photography, topographic maps and available GIS data on 3D models of the Earth and other planets. Apart from the Earth there are several worlds in World Wind: Moon, Mars, Venus, Jupiter and imagery of stars and galaxies. <http://worldwind.arc.nasa.gov>

**Microsoft Virtual Earth** allows to visualize geographic and location-based information by combining on-line maps with single users' data. The platform is an integrated set of services and helps to visualize data and provide immersive end-user experiences. The Virtual Earth platform consists of three services: Virtual Earth Map Control that includes immersive imagery; Virtual Earth Web Services; MapPoint Web Service, a programmable Web service hosted by Microsoft to integrate location-based services into software applications and business processes. <http://www.microsoft.com/virtualearth/>

**Skyline**, founded in 1997, is a leading provider of 3D earth visualization software and services. It offers 3D geo-spatial applications, with support for real-time fusion and streaming of massive data sets, open standards and a full API. <http://www.skylinesoft.com/SkylineGlobe/corporate/home/index.aspx?>

[A.P.]

## ***Second Life projects:***

**The Akragas doors**, dedicated to the Archaeological Park of Agrigento Temples Valley, aims at illustrating the defensive structure of the city in the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, through the creation of immersive stereoscopic images and a reconstruction in Second Life. Here visitors can actively participate, also dressing as a soldier, thus entering into history.

**Villa of Livia in Second Life at the UCM Virtual Heritage Island:** UC Merced is experimenting digital learning and research in Second Life. In these experiments of virtual reconstruction of different landscapes (for example the reconstruction of the ancient Villa of Livia) is possible to test feedback, reactions, participation, and informational transmission between users and environments.

**Digital Humanities Island** is a Sim in Second Life developed by King's College of London, under the direction of Prof. Beacham. It has been opened in 2007 and it is currently used for educational activities on ancient theater and Roman architecture.

## ***Active Worlds projects:***

**Quest Atlantis.** QA is an international learning and teaching project that uses a 3D multi-user environment to immerse children, ages 9-15, in educational tasks. QA combines strategies used

in the commercial gaming environment with lessons from educational research on learning and motivation. It allows users to travel to virtual places to perform educational activities, talk with other users and mentors, and build virtual personae. <http://www.questatlantis.org>

### ***Other geospatial projects:***

**Bologna 3D** was developed from maps with the buildings elevation and aerial photos. The 3d model of the city is explorable in Internet through a flight simulator (by Skyline). <http://sit.comune.bologna.it/sit/volo3D/bo.FLY>

**CyArk** is a non-profit entity whose mission is to digitally preserve cultural heritage sites through collecting, archiving and providing open access to data created by laser scanning, digital modelling, and other state-of-the-art technologies. CyArk has developed the Total Process for Digital Preservation. <http://archive.cyark.org/>

**Exhibits 3D**, based on VirTools Dev engine, provides a dynamic virtualization system of historic and cultural reality to organizations, institutions, galleries, museums, both public and private, for the dissemination and promotion of cultural heritage on-line. In a section it is possible to visit the virtual gallery of available projects. <http://www.exhibits.it>

**Fasti on line**. It is a webGIS database of archaeological excavations since the year 2000. It was created by AIAC (International Association for Classical Archaeology) and supported by PHI (Packard Humanities Institute). <http://www.fastionline.org/index.php>

**Florence on Earth** (IT). This project, GoogleEarth-based, regards the visualisation of one century urban archaeological researches in Florence, referred to various periods: Roman, Late Roman, Early Medieval and Medieval. The archaeological finds have been located in GoogleEarth (through the its API) and sub-divided into categories (roads, buildings etc.). <http://florenceonearth.com/>

**Itinera Time Machine** (IT). It is a project developed by Digital Archaeology Laboratory of the University of Foggia, about the archaeological site of Faragola (Ascoli Satriano, FG) and reconstructed using the scientific documentation derived from the field survey. The Time Machine allows the user, through an avatar, to travel in the time and visit both the different virtual reconstructions and the entire stratigraphic process. <http://www.archeologia.unifg.it/ric/lab/Lad/Farlad.asp>

**NuME project** (IT) aims at creating a digital museum of the historical city of Bologna, with a specific interest in the reconstruction of the Medieval period, based on historical sources, archive documents and historical maps. Visitors and scholars may explore the city in different chronological periods and analyse relating historical sources. [http://3d.cineca.it/3d/Nume/nume\\_3d.php](http://3d.cineca.it/3d/Nume/nume_3d.php)

**Pagine Gialle Visual** (IT) by Seat Yellow Pages integrates into a Shockwave-based multimedia tool the Italian territory. 103 cities can be explored and queried with high spatial graphic detail (resolution of 20 cm ), accuracy and richness of contents. <http://www.visual.paginegialle.it/3d>

**Sardegna 3d (IT)** is an application which enable to explore Sardinia in three dimensions, offering a complete geographic information of the island (cultural, historical and environmental heritage are constantly update on the base of a regional GIS), through a tool designed to strengthen the government and management of the territory and to promote sustainable development. <http://www.sardegna3d.it/>

**Virtual Archaeologist Educational Environment.** This project is a virtual, immersive, multi-user, spatially oriented, 3D educational environment that simulates the real world conditions of an archaeology excavation (developed by the Archaeology Technologies Laboratory of the North Dakota State University). This environment allows students in archaeology to enter in the role of an archaeologist, encouraging them to evaluate and solve scientific problems. The project permits students to think like archaeologists, creating an active and educational space that promote exploration and problem-solving. <http://fishhook.cs.ndsu.nodak.edu/>

**XVR project and Piazza dei Miracoli (Pisa, IT).** XVR (eXtreme Virtual Reality) is an innovative development environment dedicated to virtual reality and augmented reality applications, created by VR Media, a spin-off company of “S. Anna School of advanced studies” in Pisa. The website allows multilevel access with guided tours for the simple user. <http://www.vrmedia.it/Xvr.htm>, <http://piazza.opapisa.it>

**Virtual Rome**, coordinated and directed by CNR ITABC in collaboration with CINECA, aims at studying and reconstructing the archaeological and potential landscape of ancient Rome (21<sup>st</sup> century - 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD) and at enabling its distributed and interactive visualization through a web-based Virtual Reality application, based on Open Source libraries, on Remote Sensing and GIS data and on 3d models and through a OSG based plug-in, OSG4WEB. Detailed exploration is possible in three areas: via Flaminia, via Appia and Roman Imperial Fora. The project has also developed a 3D CMS, with the goal of creating an on-line cooperative laboratory for landscape interactive reconstruction. <http://www.virtualrome.net>

[V. V.]

## Appendix C

### Bibliographic references

AA.VV. 1999

*Open Sources: Voices from the Open Source Revolution*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, O'Reilly Media.

AA.VV. 2008

*Survey of terrain visualization software*. U.S. Army Topographic Engineering Center Topography, Imagery and Geospatial Research Division Data Representation Branch, (703) 428-6838. 23 January 2008 (<http://www.tec.army.mil/TD/tvd/survey>).

ADAMS, W. Y. 1987

Three Perspectives on the Past: The Historian, the Art Historian, and the Prehistorian. In: Hdgg, T. (ed.), *Nubian Culture Past and Present*. 285–291. Stockholm.

ADKINS, L. – ADKINS, R. A. 1989

*Archaeological Illustration*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

AGUGIARO, G. – KOLBE, T.H. 2009

Definition of a transition surface with the purpose of integration between laser scanner 3d model and a low resolution DTM. In: Remondino, F. –El-Hakim, S. – Gonzo, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ISPRS International Workshop 3D-ARCH 2009*. Int. Arch. of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, Vol. XXXVIII-5/W1.

AKENINE-MÖLLER, T. – HAINES, E. 2002

*Real-Time Rendering Second Edition*. 477–479. A K Peters Natick, Massachusetts US.

ANNUNZIATO, M. – BONINI, E. – PIERUCCI, P. – PIETRONI, E. 2008

Cultural mirrors: an epistemological approach to artificial life for cultural heritage communication. In: *DMACH 2008, Digital Media and its Applications in Cultural Heritage*, University of Petra, Jordan, 3-6 November '08.

ANTINUCCI, F. 2004

*Comunicare nel Museo*. Laterza, Milano.

ARISTOTLE

*Prior Analytics*. Hugh Tredennick (trans.), In: *Aristotle*, Vol 1, 181–531. Loeb Classical Library, William Heinemann, London, UK, 1938

ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVELD, A. 2003

*I Suoli di Roma*. Comune di Roma, Dipartimento X – II U.O. Sviluppo Sostenibile. Roma.

ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVELD, A. 2007

Le trasformazioni dell'ambiente naturale della pianura grossetana. In: Citter, C. – Arnoldus-Huyzendveld, A. (eds), *Archeologia urbana a Grosseto. Origine e sviluppo di una città medievale nella Toscana delle città deboli. Le ricerche 1997 - 2005*. Vol. I, Firenze, all'Insegna del Giglio.

ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVEL, A. – POZZUTO, E. P. 2009

Una lettura storica del paesaggio attuale: il territorio di Castel di Pietra tra Antichità e Medioevo. In: Citter, C. (ed.), *Dieci anni di ricerche a Castel di Pietra. Edizione degli scavi 1997-2007*. 15–39

- ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVEL, A. – VOLPE, R. 2004  
Geomorfologia e Suoli. In: Gioia P. –Volpe R. (eds.), *Centocelle I, Roma S.D.O. le indagini archeologiche*. 177–183. Sovrintendenza ai Beni Culturali del Comune di Roma, Rubbettino.
- ARON, J.L. – PATZ, J. 2001  
*Ecosystem change and public health: a global perspective*. JHU Press.
- ARTIOLA, J.F. – PEPPER, I. – BRUSSEAU, M. 2004  
*Environmental monitoring and characterization*. Academic Press.
- ASHBEE, P. 1972  
Field Archaeology: Its Origins and Development. In: Fowler, P.J. (ed.), *Archaeology and the Landscape*. 38–74. London.
- ASHMORE, W. – KNAPP, A. B. (eds.) 1999  
*Archaeologies of Landscape*. Malden and Oxford.
- ATTEMA, P. A. J. 2000  
Landscape Archaeology and Livy: warfare, colonial expansion and town and country in Central Italy of the 7th the 4th c. BC. In *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving*, 75. 115-126.
- ATTEMA, P. A. J. – BURGERS, G.-J. – VAN JOOLEN, E. – VAN LEUSEN, M. (EDS.) 2002  
New developments in Italian landscape archaeology. Theory and methodology of field survey, land evaluation and landscape perception, pottery production and distribution, BAR International Series 1091. Oxford. Archaeopress
- ATTEMA, P. – VAN JOOLEN, E. – VAN LEUSEN, M. – BURGERS, G.-J. – MATER, B. (EDS.) 2002  
New Developments in Italian Landscape Archaeology. In: *Proceedings of a 3-day conference held at the University of Groningen, April 13-15, 2000: theory and methodology of field survey, land evaluation and land perception, pottery production and distribution*. BAR International Series 1091. Oxford. Archaeopress
- BAIGRIE, B. S. (ed.) 1996  
*Picturing Knowledge*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- BARAB, S. – DODGE, T. – TUZUN, H. – JOB-SLUDER, K. – JACKSON, C. – ARICI, A. – JOB-SLUDER, L. – CARTEAUX JR., R. – GILBERSTON, J. – HEISELT, C. 2007  
The Quest Atlantis Project: a socially-responsive play space for learning. In: Shelton, B. E. – Wiley, D. (eds.), *The Educational Design and Use of Simulation Computer Games*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands, Sense Publishers.
- BARD, K. A. – FATTOVICH, R. – MANZO, A. – PERLINGIERI, C. 2007  
Archaeological investigations at Bieta Giyorgis (Aksum), Ethiopia. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 24, 387–403.
- BARKER, G. 1985  
*Prehistoric farming in Europe*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- BARKER, G. 1991  
Approaches to archaeological survey. In: Barker, G. –Lloyd, J. (eds.), *Roman Landscapes: Archaeological Survey in the Mediterranean Region*. 1–9. London.
- BATESON, G. 1972  
*Steps To An Ecology of Mind*. San Francisco, Chandler Press.



- BATESON, G. 1979  
*Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. Bantam Books.
- BEEK, K. J. – BENNEMA, J. 1972  
*Land evaluation for agricultural land use planning. An ecological methodology*.  
 Department of Soil Science and Geology. Agricultural University, Wageningen.
- BELL, J. 1994  
 Interpretation and testability in theories about prehistoric thinking. In: Renfrew, C. – Zubrow, E. B. W. (eds.), *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology*. 15–22. Cambridge.
- BENKLER, Y. 2005  
 Sharing nicely: on shareable goods and the emergence of sharing as a modality of economic production. *Yale Law Journal* 114, 273–358.
- BERNARDI, M. (ed.) 1992  
*Archeologia del paesaggio*. Firenze.
- BEWLEY, R. H. – RACZKOWSKI, W. 2002  
*Aerial Archaeology: Developing Future Practice*. IOS Press.
- BIETTI SESTIERI, A. M. 1981  
 Economy and Society in Italy between the late Bronze Age and the early Iron Age. In: Barker, G. –Hodges, R. (eds.), *Papers in Italian Archaeology: Archaeology and Italian Society. Prehistoric, Roman and Medieval Studies*. 115–131. BAR International Series 102. Oxford. Archaeopress.
- BINFORD, L. 1968  
*New Perspectives in Archaeology*. Aldine Transaction.
- BLASI, C. – CARRANZA, M. L. – FRONDONI, R. – ROSATI, L. 2000  
 Ecosystem classification and mapping: a proposal for Italian landscapes. *Applied Vegetation Science* 3, 233–242.
- BONDESAN, A. – BONETTO, J. – BUSANA, M. S. – KIRSCHNER, P. – MIOLA, A. – MOZZI, P. – PESCARIN, S. – VILLANI, M. C.  
 20,000 years of landscape evolution at Ca' Tron (Venice, Italy): palaeoenvironment, archaeology, VR webGIS. In: *Proceedings of "Hidden Landscapes of Mediterranean Europe: Cultural and methodological biases in pre- and protostoric landscape studies"* Collegio S. Chiara, University of Siena, May 25–27, 2007. in print.
- BOURGEOIS, J. 2005  
*Aerial photography and archaeology 2003: a century of information ; papers presented during the conference held at the Ghent University, December 10th - 12th, 2003*. Academia Press.
- BRIDGES, E. M. – DAVIDSON, D. A. 1982  
*Principles and applications of soil geography*. Longman, London and New York
- BRÜCKNER, H. 1986  
 Man's impact on the evolution of the physical environment in the Mediterranean region in historical times. *Geojournal* 13, 7–17.
- BUOL, S.W. – HOLE, F. D. – MCCracken, R. J. 1973  
*Soil genesis and classification*. Ames Iowa State University Press.

- BURGERS, G.-J. L. M. 1998  
*Constructing Messapian landscapes. Settlement dynamics, social organization and culture contact in the margins of Graeco-Roman Italy*. Gieben, Amsterdam.
- CALORI, L. – CAMPORESI, C. – FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. 2008  
Virtual Rome. In *International Conference on Computer Graphics and Interactive Techniques, SIGGRAPH 2008*. Los Angeles, California, 11-15 August 2008, ACM pub.
- CALORI, L. – CAMPORESI, C. – PESCARIN, S. 2009  
Virtual Rome: a FOSS approach to WEB3D. In *Web3d International Symposium 2009*.
- CALORI, L. – FORTE M. – PESCARIN S. 2005  
Real-time interactive reconstruction of archaeological landscapes. An opensource approach: from GIS to Virtual Reality. In: *Workshop Italy- Canada 2005 3D Digital Imaging and Modeling: Applications of Heritage, Industry, Medicine and Land*. Padova.
- CAMBI, F. – TERRENATO, N. 2004  
*Introduzione all'archeologia dei paesaggi*. Carocci.
- CAMPANA, S. – FRANCOVICH, R. 2006  
*Laser Scanner e GPS. Paesaggi archeologici e tecnologie digitali 1*. Firenze.
- CAMPANA, S. – PIRO, S. (eds.) 2008  
*Seeing the Unseen. Geophysics and Landscape Archaeology*. Taylor and Francis.
- CAMPANA, S. – SORDINI, M. 2006  
Laser Scanner e GPS in archeologia: geografia dei servizi e delle risorse in Internet. In: Campana, S. – Francovich, R. (eds.), *Laser Scanner e GPS. Paesaggi archeologici e tecnologie digitali 1*. Firenze: 327-333.
- CAMPORESI, C. – PALOMBINI, A. – PESCARIN, S. 2007  
La documentazione digitale: GIS e 3D WebGIS. In: Forte, M. (ed.), *La Villa di Livia, un percorso di ricerca di archeologia virtuale*. 111–120. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Roma.
- CARDARELLI, A. – CATTANI, M. – GIORDANI, N. – LABATE, D. – PELLEGRINI, S. 2000  
Valutazione del rischio archeologico e programmazione degli interventi di trasformazione urbana e territoriale. In: S. Gelichi (ed.), *Dalla carta di rischio archeologico di Cesena alla tutela preventiva in Europa*. 31–40 e 97–102. Edizioni all'insegna del giglio, Roma.
- CARDARELLI, A. – CATTANI, M. – LABATE, D. – PELLEGRINI, S. 2004  
Archeologia e geomorfologia. Un approccio integrato applicato al territorio di Modena. In: Mazzeri, C. (ed.), *Per un Atlante Storico Ambientale Urbana*. 65–77. Modena.
- CARLSTEIN, T. 1982  
*Time resources society and Ecology*. Vol I, *Preindustrial societies*. London
- CARTER, J. R. 1988  
Digital representations of topographic surfaces. *Photogrammetric Engineering and Remote Sensing* 54, 1577–1580.
- CAVALLI SFORZA, L. – CAVALLI SFORZA, F. 2007  
Scienza e umanesimo oltre le due culture. In: Dionigi, I. (ed.), *I Classici e la Scienza. Gli antichi, i moderni, noi*. 55–65. BUR, Milano.
- CHEVALLIER, R. 1978  
Preface. In: Dufournet, P.: *Pour une archéologie du paysage*, 5–7. Paris.

- CHIUSOLI, A. 1985  
*Elementi di paesaggistica*. Clueb, Bologna.
- CHIUSOLI, A. 1999  
*La scienza del paesaggio*. Clueb, Bologna.
- CIGNONI, P. – SCOPIGNO, R. 2008  
Sampled 3D Models for CH Applications: a viable and enabling new medium or just a technological exercise? In: *ACM Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage*, Vol. 1, No.1, Art.2, June 2008
- CLARK, S.C. 1996  
Mediterranean ecology and the ecological synthesis of the field sites. In: Brandt and Thornes (eds.), *Mediterranean desertification and land use*. John Wiley and Sons, England.
- CLARKE, D. L. (ed.) 1977  
*Spatial Archaeology*. London - New York - San Francisco
- COHEN, J. – VARSHNEY, A. – MANOCHA, D. – TURK, G. – WEBER, H. – AGARWAL, P. – BROOKS, F. – WRIGHT, W. 1996  
Simplification Envelopes. In: *Proceedings of Siggraph '96*.
- CONOLLY, J. – LAKE, M. 2006  
*Geographical Information Systems in Archaeology*. Cambridge University Press.
- CORTELLAZZO, M. – ZOLLI, P. 1999  
*DELI: Dizionario etimologico della Lingua Italiana*, Zanichelli, Bologna.
- CREMASCHI, M. – BARONI, C. 2000  
*Manuale di geoarcheologia*, Laterza.
- CREMASCHI, M. – RODOLFI, G. (eds.) 1991  
Il suolo. Pedologia e scienza della terra e nella valutazione del territorio. La Nuova Italia Scientifica..
- D'AGOSTINO, B. 1992  
Introduzione. In: Bernardi, M. (ed.), *Archeologia del paesaggio*, vol. I, 17–21. Firenze.
- DE FELICE, G. – INTRONA, A. – MORO, A. – VOLPE, G. 2007  
ITINERA Project – Information Technologies for Valuation, E-Learning and Research in Archaeology. In: Arnold, D. –Chalmers, A. –Niccolucci F. (eds.), *VAST2007 – Future Technologies to Empower Heritage Professionals*, EPOCH Publication. Short and Project Papers from VAST2007. 123–118. Archaeolingua, Budapest.
- DELL'UNTO, N. – FORTE, M. – PIETRONI, E. – PESCARIN, S. – RUFA, C. 2006  
Dal laser scanner alla realtà virtuale: metodologie di ricostruzione per il paesaggio archeologico. In: Campana, S. – Francovich, R. (eds.), *Paesaggi Archeologici e Tecnologie Digitali. Laser Scanner e GPS*. 93–106. Firenze, All'Insegna del Giglio.
- DEVEREUX, B. J. – ARNABLE, G. S. – CROW, P. – CLIFF, A. D. 2005  
The potential of airborne lidar for detection of archaeological features under woodland canopies. *Antiquity* 79, 648–660.
- DI FIDIO, M. 1990  
*Architettura del paesaggio*, Pirola.
- DI GENNARO, F. – BARBINA, P. – DE FILIPPIS, M. – DELL'ERA, F. – FRATIANNI, G. –

TOGNINELLI, P. 2005

Il liberto Faonte, il notabile Marco Claudio Ponzio Ponziano Marcello e i loro vicini. In: Santillo Frizell, B. –Klynne, A. (eds.), *Roman villas around the Urbs. Interaction with landscape and environment. Proceedings of a conference held at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 17–18, 2004*. The Swedish Institute in Rome. Projects and Seminars, 2, Rome.

DIMBLEY, G. W. (ed.) 2007

*The domestication and exploitations of plants and animals*. Duckworth, London.

DIONIGI, I. 2007

*I Classici e la Scienza*. Milano.

DONEUS, M. – BRIESE, C. 2006

Full-waveform airborne laser scanning as a tool for archaeological reconnaissance. In: Campana, S. – Forte, M. (eds.), *From Space to Place. Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Remote Sensing in Archaeology*. 99–106. BAR International Series 1568. Oxford, Archaeopress.

DRAMSTAD, W. E. – OLSON, J. – FORMAN, R. 1996

*Landscape Ecology Principles*. Washington, DC, Island Press.

EDDINGTON, A. S. 1929/1935

*The nature of the physical world*. New York, MacMillan.

EDMUND, N. W. 2005

*End the Biggest Educational and Intellectual Blunder in History*. Scientific Method Publishing.

EL-HAKIM, S. F. 2001

A flexible approach to 3D reconstruction from single images. In: *ACM Proceedings of SIGGRAPH '01, Technical Sketches*, Los Angeles, California, 12th to 17th August 2001. 186

FABECH, C. – RINGTVED, J. (eds.) 1998

*Settlement and Landscape*. Proceedings of a conference in Århus, Denmark, May 4-7, 1998. Jutland Archaeological Society, Moesgård, Denmark.

FAO 1976

A framework for land evaluation. *Soil Bulletin* 32. 1976–1981. Rome, Food and Agricultural Organisation, Rome.

FAO 1977

*Guidelines for soil profile description* (2nd edition), FAO pub., Rome.

FAO 1985

Guidelines: land evaluation for irrigated agriculture. In *Soils Bulletin* 55, Rome.

FAO 1988

World Soil Resources. In *Report*, 60, FAO, Rome.

FEDELI, P. 1990

*La natura violata. Ecologia e mondo romano*. Sellerio Editore Palermo

FISH, S. 1980

*The authority of Interpretative Communities*. Harvard University Press.

FLECHSIG, P. 1960

*Gehirnphysiologie und Willenstheorien*. En. trad. In: Von Bonin, G.: *Some paper on the cerebral cortex*. 75-89. Thomas, Springfield 1960.

- FONSECA, C.D. – ROUBIS, D. – SOGLIANI, F. 2007  
*Jure Vetere. Ricerche archeologiche nella prima fondazione monastica di Gioacchino da Fiore (indagini 2001-2005)*. Rubettino, Cosenza.
- FORNI, G. 1989  
Questioni di storia agraria pre-romana: le quattro fasi dell'agricoltura etrusca. In: *Secondo Congresso Internazionale Etrusco III: 1501-15*. Rome, 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider.
- FORNI, G. 1990  
*Gli albori dell'agricoltura*. Reda, Roma.
- FORSER, K. – MAZZUCCO, K. 2002  
*Introduzione ad Aby Warburg e all'«Atlante della memoria»*, Milano 2002.
- FORTE, M. 2000  
About Virtual Archaeology: disorders, cognitive interactions and virtuality. In: Barcelo, Forte M. – Sanders D. (eds), *Virtual Reality in Archaeology*. BAR International Series 843. Oxford, Archaeopress.
- FORTE, M. 2003A  
Mindscape: ecological thinking, cyber-anthropology, and virtual archaeological landscapes. In: Forte, M. – Williams, P. R. (eds.), *The Reconstruction of Archaeological Landscapes through Digital Technologies*. Proceedings of the 1st Italy-United States Workshop (Boston, Massachusetts 2001), 95–108. BAR International Series 1151, Oxford, Archaeopress.
- FORTE, M. 2003B  
The Remote Sensing project for the archaeological landscape of Aksum (Ethiopia). In: Forte, M. – Williams, P. R. (eds.), *The Reconstruction of Archaeological Landscapes through Digital Technologies*, 81–93. BAR International Series, Oxford, Archaeopress.
- FORTE, M. 2007  
Introduzione. In: Forte, M. (ed.), *La villa di Livia: un percorso di ricerca di archeologia virtual*. 1–36. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Roma.
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. 2005  
Integrated real-time visualisation of archaeological landscape. In: Piro, S. (ed.), *Proceedings of 6th International Conference on Archaeological Prospection* (Rome Sept. 14-17, 2005), 231–236. ITABC CNR, Roma.
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. 2006  
The virtual museum of landscape. In: *Virtual Museums and Archaeology*, Archeologia e Calcolatori Special Issue, N.17, Dec. 2006. All'insegna del Giglio.
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S.  
Behaviors, Interactions and Affordance in Virtual Archaeology. In: *Advanced ICT Methods Guide*, in print.
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. – PIETRONI, E. 2005  
The Appia Antica Project. In: Forte, M. (ed.), *The reconstruction of Archaeological Landscapes through Digital Technologies*, Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Italy-USA Workshop, Rome, Nov. 3-5 2003, Berkeley, USA, May 2005. 79–92. BAR International Series 1379, Oxford, Archaeopress.
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. – PIETRONI E. – RUFA, C. 2006  
Multiuser interaction in an archaeological landscape: the Flaminia project. In: *Proceedings*

of the 2nd Int. Conference on Remote Sensing in archaeology "From Space to Place", Rome 4-7 Dec. 2006. 189–196. BAR International Series, Oxford, Archaeopress.

- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. – PIETRONI, E. – RUFA C. 2007  
Multiuser Virtual Reality museum application for Cultural Heritage: the Ancient via Flaminia project. In: Arnold, D. – Niccolucci, F. – Chalmers A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage VAST (2007) Project Papers*. 90-98
- FORTE, M. – PESCARIN, S. – PUJOL TOST, L. 2006  
VR applications, new devices and museums: public's feedback and learning. A preliminary report. In: *VAST 2006 Proceedings, Short Presentations* 64-69.
- FORTE, M. – PIETRONI, E. 2008  
Virtual Reality Web Collaborative Environments in Archaeology. In: *VSMM 2008, 20-25 october 2008, Cyprus, Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia Vol III*. 74–78.
- FORTE, M. – PIETRONI, E. – DELL'UNTO N. 2008  
3D Multiuser Domain and Virtual Ecosystems for Transmission and Communication of Cultural Heritage. In: *DMACH 2008, Digital Media and its Applications in Cultural Heritage*, College of Architecture and Arts, University of Petra, Jordan, 3–6 November, 2008. University of Petra, Amman.
- GABBA, E. – PASQUINUCCI, M. 1998  
*Strutture Agrarie e Allevamento Transumante nell'Italia Romana*. 79–182. Pisa, Giardini.
- GAFFNEY, V. – STANCIC, Z. 1991  
*GIS approaches to regional analysis: a case study of the island of Hvar*. Ljubljana.
- GESER, G. HAZAN, S. KARPP, C. KASTEREN, V. SINAZZÈ, A. STEEMSON, M. AND WOOD, H. 2004  
*Digicult . Thematic Issue 5, Jan. 2004*, Salzburg Research. Salzburg
- GIACOMINI, V. – FENAROLI, L. 1958  
*La Flora. Conosci l'Italia. vol. II*. Touring club italiano, Milano.
- GIBSON, J. 1979  
*The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Hillsdale NJ
- GILLINGS, M. – MATTINGLY, D. – VAN DALEN, J. (eds.) 1999  
*Geographical Information Systems and Landscape Archaeology*, Oxford.
- GIOIA, P. – VOLPE, R. 2004  
*Centocelle I. Roma S.D.O. le indagini archeologiche*. Soveria Mannelli.
- GIORDANO, G. 1999  
*Pedologia*, Torino: 312.
- GAFFNEY, V. – STANCIC, Z. 1991  
*GIS approaches to regional analysis: a case study of the island of Hvar*, Znanstveni institut Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana
- GOBBETTI, E. – MARTON, F. 2005  
Far Voxels - A Multiresolution Framework for Interactive Rendering of Huge Complex 3D Models on Commodity Graphics Platforms. In: *Proceedings of Acm Siggraph 2005*.

- GOLDBERG, P. – MACPHAIL, R. 2006  
*Practical and theoretical geoarchaeology*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- GRANELLI, A. – SARNO, L. 2007  
*Immagini e linguaggi del digitale. Le nuove frontiere della mente*. Milano.
- GREGORY, R. L. 1973  
The Counfounded eye. In: Gregory R. L. – Gombrich E.H.: *Illusion in nature and art*. 49–96. Duckworth, London.
- GROGER, G. – KOLBE, T. – CZERWINSKI, A. – NAGEL, C. 2008  
OpenGIS City Geography Markup Language (CityGML) Encoding Standard, Version 1.0.0, *International OGC Standard. Open Geospatial Consortium, Doc. No. 08-007r1*.
- GRUN, A. 1978  
Accuracy, reliability and statistics in close-range photogrammetry. In: *Proceedings of the Symposium of Comm. V of the ISP*. Stockholm, August 14–17.
- GRÜN, A. 2000  
Semi-automated approaches to site recording and modelling. *International Archives of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing* 33. (5/1), 309–318.
- GUIDAZZOLI, A. – BONFIGLI, M. E. 1999  
The creation of the Nu.M.E. Project. In: *ACM SIGGRAPH 99, Conference abstracts and applications*. 31–32. ACM, Los Angeles, California.
- GUIDAZZOLI, A. – PESCARIN, S. – FORTE, M. – FELICORI, M. – GROSSELE, R. 2004  
From Gis to Landscape Virtual Museums. In: Forte, M. (ed.), *Archaeological Landscapes through Digital Technologies: Proceedings of the 2nd Italy-United States Workshop, Rome, Italy, November 3-5, 2003 Berkeley, USA, May 2005*. BAR International Series, Oxford, Archaeopress
- GUIDI, G. – FRISCHER, B. – DE SIMONE, M. – CIOCI, A – SPINETTI, A. – CAROSSO, L. – MICOLI, L. – RUSSO, M. – GRASSO, T. 2005  
Virtualizing Ancient Rome: 3D acquisition and modeling of a large plaster-of-Paris model of imperial Rome. In: Beraldin, E-H., Gruen, W. (eds.), *Videometrics VIII*. 18-20 jan 2005, S.Josè, California, SPIE, Vol. 5665. 119–133.
- GUIDI, G. – REMONDINO, F. – MORLANDO, G. – DEL MASTIO, A. – UCCHEDDU, F. – PELAGOTTI, A. 2007  
Performance evaluation of a low cost active sensor for cultural heritage documentation. In: Gruen/Kahmen (eds.), *VIII Conference on Optical 3D Measurement Techniques*. Vol.2. 59–69, July 2007, Zurich, Switzerland.
- HARRIS, D. – FAIRCHILD RUGGLES, D. 2007  
*Sites Unseen: Landscape and Vision*. University of Pittsburgh Press.
- HAZAN, S. 2004  
Weaving Community Webs: a position paper. In: Geser, G. (ed.), *Digicult . Thematic Issue* 5. Jan. 2004, 47–10. Salzburg Research, Salzburg.
- HERMON, S. – NICCOLUCCI, F. 2003  
La logica fuzzy e le sue applicazioni alla ricerca archeologica. In: *Archeologia e Calcolatori XIV*, Edizioni All'Insegna del Giglio, Firenze. 97–110.
- HIGGS, E.S. (ed.), 1975

- Palaeoeconomy*, 111–175. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- HIGGS, E. S. – VITA FINZI, C. 1970  
Prehistoric Economy in the Mount Carmel Area of Palestine: Site Catchment Analysis. In: *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*, XXXVI.1–37.
- HODDER, I. (ed.) 2001  
*Archaeological Theory Today*, Cambridge.
- HUGUE B. N. – LOADER B.D. (eds.) 1999  
*Digital Democracy: Discourse and Decision Making in the Information Age*. London-New York, Routledge.
- HUNT, C. – MALONE, C. – SEVINK, J. – STODDART, S. 1990  
Environment, soils and early agriculture. *Apennines Central Italy. World Archaeology*, Vol 22, nr. 1, 34–44.
- ISAGER, S. – SKYDSKAARD, J.E. 1992  
*Ancient Greek Agriculture. An Introduction*. London and New York.
- GOLVIN, J. C. 1999  
*Voyage en Egypte ancienne*, Ed. Errance.
- GOLVIN, J. C. 2007  
*Ancient Cities Brought to Life*. Thalamos Publishing, Paris.
- JONES, S. 1998  
*Cybersociety 2.0: revisiting computer-mediated community and technology*. London, Sage Publication.
- KAMERMANS, H. 2000  
Land evaluation as predictive modelling: a deductive approach. In: Lock, G. (ed.), *Beyond the Map. Archaeology and Spatial Technologies*. NATO Science Series, Series A: Life Sciences, vol. 321. 124–146. IOS Press, Ohmsha, Amsterdam.
- KAREL, W. – KRAUS, K. 2006  
Quality parameters of digital terrain models. In: Hohle, J. (ed.), *Seminar on Automated Quality Control of Digital Terrain Models*. Aalborg, Denmark. EuroSDR.
- KASSER, M. – EGELS, Y. 2002  
*Digital Photogrammetry*. CRC Press.
- KAUFFMAN, S. 1995  
*At Home in the Universe*. Oxford University Press.
- KEITH, A. M. 2000  
*Engendering Rome: women in Latin epic*. Cambridge University Press.
- KENNETT, D. J. 1996  
The Scientific Method in Archaeology. In: Fagan, B. M. (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Archaeology*. 629–631. Oxford University Press, New York.
- KLINGEBIEL, A. A. – MONTGOMERY, P. H. 1961  
*Land-capability classification*. Agricultural handbook 210. USDA. Soil Conserv. Serv., Washington, DC.
- KOLLER, D. – TURITZIN, M. – LEVOY, M. – TARINI, M. – CROCCIA, G. 2004



*Protected Interactive 3D Graphics Via Remote Rendering*, Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH 2004.

KORZYBSKI, A. 1933

*Science and Sanity*. Lakeville: Institute of General Semantics.

KUEHNE, B. – MARTZ, P. 2007

*OpenSceneGraph Reference Manual ver. 2.2*. Skew Matrix Software and Blue Newt.

.B.6

LANGTON, C. 1989

**.B.7** *Artificial Life: proceedings of an interdisciplinary workshop on the Synthesis and Simulation of Living Systems*. Los Alamos, 1987. Addison-Wesley.

LASER, 2005

*Il Sapere liberato. Il movimento dell'open source e la ricerca scientifica*. Milano, Feltrinelli.

LAURINI, R. 1998

Spatial multi-database topological continuity and indexing: a step towards seamless GIS data interoperability. *International Journal on Geographical Information Science*, Vol. 12, N.4. 373–402.

LESSING, L. 2001

*The Future of Ideas. The fate of the commons in a connected world*. Vintage Book, New York, Random House.

LEUG, C. – FISHER, D. 2003

*From UseNet to CoWebs: interacting with social information spaces*. Amsterdam, Springer.

LEVEAU, P. ET ALII (eds.) 1999

*Environmental Reconstruction in Mediterranean Archaeology*, Oxford.

LOADER, B. D. 1998

*Cyberspace Divide: Equality, Agency and Policy in the Information Society*. 3–16. London-New York, Routledge.

LOCK, G. 2000

*Beyond the map: archaeology and spatial technologies*. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Scientific Affairs Division, IOS Press.

LOCK, G. 2003

*Using Computers in Archaeology: Towards Virtual Pasts*. Routledge.

LOCK, G. STANČIČ, Z. (EDS.) 1995

*Archaeology and Geographical Information Systems: A European Perspective*. London.

LOGOTHETIS, N.K. ET ALII, 1995

Shape representation in the inferior temporal cortex of monkey. *Current Biology* Vol 5. 552–565.

LOOMIS, R. S. – CONNOR D. J. 1992

*Crop Ecology: Productivity and Management in Agricultural Systems*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

LUEBKE, D. P. 2003

- Level of Detail for 3D Graphics: application and theory.* Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- LUEBKE, D. P. – REDDY, M. – COHEN, J. D. – VARSHNEY, A. – WATSON, B. – HUEBNER, R. 2002  
*Level of Detail for 3D Graphics.* Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.
- LUKE, R. – CLEMENT, A. – TERADA, R. – BORTOLUSSI, D. – BOOTH, C. – BROOKS, D. – CHRIST, D. 2004  
 The Promise and Perils of a Participatory approach to developing an Open Source community learning network. In: *Proceedings Participatory Design Conference 2004*,. Toronto Canada.
- MACEDONIO, G. – COSTA, A. – LONGO, A. 2005  
*A computer model for volcanic ash fallout and assessment of subsequent hazard.* Computer & Geosciences, 31, N.7. 837–845.
- MANZOTTI, R. – TAGLIASCO, V. 2008  
 L'esperienza: più estesa del sistema nervoso. *Sistemi Intelligenti*, n.3, Il Mulino, Bologna
- MATURANA, H. R. – VARELA, F. G. 1980  
*Autopoiesis and Cognition*.. Dordrecht, Netherlands, Reidel.
- MATURANA, H. R. – VARELA, F. G. 1999  
*L'albero della conoscenza.* (Orig. *El árbol del conocimiento*, 1984) Garzanti.
- MELLET-DHUART, D. 2006  
 A Model of (En)Action to approach Embodiment: A Cornerstone for the Design of Virtual Environments for Learning. In: Win W. & Hedley N. (eds.), *Journal of Virtual reality, special issue on education*. Vol 10, Numbers 3-4 / December, 2006. 253–269. Springer, London.
- MERRY, P. 2000  
*Open Source Learning: a key to multiculturalism, citizenship, and the knowledge of society.* 1–22. Engage, Utrecht. ([www.engage.nu/interact/](http://www.engage.nu/interact/))
- MOGENSES, P. H. – SHAPIRO, D. 1998  
*When Survival is an Issue: PD in Support to Landscape Architecture.* Computer Supported Cooperative Work 7. 187–203.
- MOORE, I. D. – GRAYSON, R. B. – LADSON, A. R. 1991  
 Digital terrain modeling: a review of hydrological, geomorphological, and biological applications. *Hydrological Processes* 5, 3–30.
- MOORE, P. D. – WEBB, J.A. 1978  
*An illustrated guide to pollen analysis.* Hodder & Stoughton, London.
- MUELLER, P. ET ALII 2006  
 Procedural Modelling of Buildings. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGGRAPH 2006 / ACM Transactions on Graphics*
- MUSCO, S. – PETRASSI, L. – PRACCHIA, S. 2001  
*Luoghi e paesaggi archeologici del suburbio orientale di Roma*.. 149–251. Roma.
- NIJBOER, A.J. 1998  
*From household production to workshops. Archaeological evidence for economic transformation, pre-monetary exchange and urbanisation in central Italy from 800 to 400 BC.* Donkel & Donkel, Drachten, The Netherlands.

ODIFREDDI, P. 2007

La Guerra dei due mondi. In: Dionigi I. (ed.), *I Classici e la Scienza*. 45–54. Milano.

PALOMBINI, A. – VASSALLO, V. 2007

Il Paesaggio archeologico, l'ambiente e il contesto. In: Forte M. (ed.), *Villa di Livia, un percorso di ricerca di archeologia virtuale*. 54–68. L'Erma di Bretschneider, Roma.

PARCAK, S. H. 2009

*Satellite Remote Sensing for Archaeology*. Taylor & Francis.

PANIZZA, M. 2005

*Manuale di geomorfologia applicata*, Franco Angeli.

PEIRCE, C. S. 1903

*Lectures on Pragmatism*, Cambridge, MA, March 26 – May 17, 1903. In the version: Peirce Edition Project (eds.), *The Essential Peirce, Selected Philosophical Writings*, Vol 2 (1893–1913), 133–241. Indiana University Press, Bloomington, IN, 1998 .

PESCARIN, S. 2000

Historical and geo-archaeological research in urban context: the example of Bologna city. In: *VAST2000 Euroconference, proceedings of the Meeting of Virtual Archaeolog, Arezzo 24-25 Novembre 2000*. BAR International Series, Oxford, Archaeopress.

PESCARIN, S. 2002

GIS contribution to urban history and to the reconstruction of ancient landscape. In: Burenhult, G. (ed.), *Archaeological Informatics: pushing the Envelope: CAA2001, Proceedings of the 29<sup>th</sup> Conference, Gotland, April 2001*. 125–128. BAR International Series 1016. Oxford, Archaeopress.

PESCARIN, S. 2006

Open source in archeologia : nuove prospettive per la ricerca. In: *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, Vol.17, 137–155. All'insegna del Giglio.

PESCARIN, S. 2007

Reconstructing archaeological landscape. Interpretation and integration in spatial and real-time open system. In: Keeler, D. – Salisbury, R. (eds.), *Space - Archaeology's Final Frontier? An Intercontinental approach*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Cambridge.

PESCARIN, S. 2007

Il paesaggio archeologico di Bononia GIS e Realtà Virtuale tra ricerca e comunicazione. In: *Cisalpina*, Bologna, in print

PESCARIN, S. 2008B

Archeologia Preventiva. In: D'Andrea, D. – Guermandi, M. P. (eds), *Strumenti per l'archeologia preventiva : esperienze, normative, tecnologie*. 59–71. Budapest, Archaeolingua.

PESCARIN, S. in print

Explicit theoretic pipeline: GIS analysis and data integration for archaeological landscape reconstruction. In: *CAA2008 Budapest*.

PESCARIN, S. – CALORI, L. 2005

Verso il VR-WebGIS. Il caso del Distretto Culturale della Valle dell'Esaro: un sistema open-source per le risorse culturali, turistiche e ambientali. In: *MondoGIS N.51*, Roma.

PESCARIN, S. – CALORI, L. – CAMPORESI, C. – DI IOIA, M. – FORTE, M. – GALEAZZI, F.

- IMBODEN, S. – MORO, A. – PALOMBINI, A. – VASSALLO, V. – VICO, L. 2008  
Back to II AD. A VR on-line experience with Virtual Rome Project. In: Ashley, M. – Hermon, S. – Proenca, A. – Rodriguez-Echavarria, K. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage VAST (2008)*.
- PESCARIN, S. – CALORI, L. – CAMPORESI, C. – FORTE, M. 2005  
Interactive landscapes reconstruction: a Web 2D and 3D opensource solution. In: Mudge, M. – Ryan, N. – Scopigno, R. (eds.), *The 6th International Symposium on Virtual Reality, Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, VAST'05 Short Presentations*. 33–38. STAR, Pisa.
- PESCARIN, S. – CALORI, L. – CAMPORESI, C. – FORTE, M. – GUIDAZZOLI, A. – IMBODEN S. 2005b  
Open Heritage: an Open Source approach to 3d real-time and web-based landscape reconstruction. In *VSMM 2005, Proceedings of XI International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia: Virtual Reality at work in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Oct. 3-7 2005 Ghent Belgium*, (Thwaites Ed.) Budapest. 313–320.
- PESCARIN, S. – FORTE, M. – GUIDAZZOLI, A. – MAURI, M. – BONFIGLI, M. E. 2007  
Bologna in età romana dal GIS alla realtà virtuale. In: *Ut Natura Ars. Virtual Reality e archeologia. Studi e Scavi*. 115–122. University Press Bologna, Imola.
- PESCARIN, S. – RUZZA, R. 2004  
Un Museo Virtuale per valorizzare il paesaggio del Delta del Po. In: *MondoGIS* n. 42.
- PICARRETA, F. 1987  
*Manuale di fotografia aerea: uso archeologico*. L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- PIGGOTT, S. 1978  
*Antiquity Depicted: Aspects of Archaeological Illustration*. Thames and Hudson, London and New York.
- PIGNATTI, S. 1979  
I piani di vegetazione in Italia. In: *CNR Collana del Progetto Finalizzato "Promozione della Qualità dell'Ambiente"*. 411–428. Firenze, Estratto da Giornale Botanico Italiano 113.
- POLANYI, M. 1990  
*La conoscenza personale. Verso una filosofia post-critica*. 248–252. Rusconi, Milano.
- POPPER, K. 1934  
*The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. 2.
- PREECE, J. – MALONEY-KRIHMAR, D. – ABRAS, CH. 2003  
History of Emergence of Online Communities. In: Wellman (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Community*. London, Sage.
- PRICE, T. D. 2000  
*Europe's first farmers*. Cambridge University Press, U.K.
- RAYMOND, E. S. 2001  
*The Cathedral and the Bazaar: Musings on Linux and Open Source by an Accidental Revolutionary*. Sebastapol, CA, Paperback Ed. Rev. O'Reilly.
- REILLY, P. 1990  
Towards a virtual archaeology. In: Lockyear, K. – Rahtz, S. (eds.), *Computer Applications in Archaeology*. 133–139. BAR International Series 565. Oxford. Archaeopress

- REINGOLD, H. 1994  
*Virtual Community: finding connection in a computerized world*. Ebury Vintage  
([www.rheingold.com/vc/book/](http://www.rheingold.com/vc/book/))
- REMONDINO, F. – EL-HAKIM, S. 2006  
Image-based 3D modelling: a review. *The Photogrammetric Record*, Vol.21 (115), 269–291.
- REMONDINO, F. – EL-HAKIM, S. – GIRARDI, S. – RIZZI, A. – BENEDETTI, S. – GONZO, L. 2009  
3D Virtual reconstruction and visualization of complex architectures - The 3D-ARCH project. In: Remondino, F. – El-Hakim, S. – Gonzo L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ISPRS International Workshop 3D-ARCH 2009*, International Archaeology of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences, Vol. XXXVIII-5/W1.
- RENFREW, C. 1994  
Towards a cognitive archaeology. In: Renfrew, C. – Zubrow (eds.), *The Ancient Mind: Elements of Cognitive Archaeology* 3–13. Cambridge.
- RENFREW, C. 2003  
*What are we? Where do we come from? Figuring it out. The parallel visions of artists and archaeologists*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- RENFREW, C. – BAHN, P. 1991  
*Archaeology, Theories, Methods and Practice*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- ROBERTS, B. K. 1987  
Landscape Archaeology. In: Wagstaff, J. M. (ed.), *Landscape and Culture*. 77–95. Oxford and New York.
- ROSSITER, D. G. – VAN WAMBEKE, A. R. 1997  
*Automatic Land Evaluation System. ALES version 4.65 User's Manual*. Cornell University, Department of Soil, Crop and Atmospheric Sciences, Ithaca, NY, USA.
- ROUBIS, D. – SOGLIANI, F. – GABELLONE, F. – GNESI, D. 2008  
*Archaeological landscapes through GIS and Virtual Reality: A case study on the monastic site of Jure Vetere*
- ROUSSOU, M. 2005  
Can interactivity in virtual environments enable conceptual learning? In: *7th Virtual Reality International Conference*. 57–64. Laval, France.
- RYAN, M. L. 2001  
*Narrative as Virtual Reality: Immersion and Interactivity in Literature and Electronic Media*. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University press. HB. 399.
- SANDERS, D. 2001  
Persuade or Perish: Moving Virtual Heritage beyond Pretty Pictures of the Past. In: *VSM 2001, Seventh International Conference on Virtual Systems and Multimedia*: 236
- SANTORO, S. – MONTI, A. 2003  
*Carta del rischio archeologico della città di Durres*. Durazzo.
- SCHAFERSMAN, S. D. 1994  
*An Introduction to Science Scientific Thinking and the Scientific Method*, Digital article: [www.freeinquiry.com/intro-to-sci.html](http://www.freeinquiry.com/intro-to-sci.html)

- SCHOPENHAUER, A. 1819  
*Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Brockhaus, Leipzig 1859
- SCHULZ, J. 1975  
Michelangelo's unfinished works. *Art Bulletin* Vol. 58., 366–373.
- SEVINK, J. 1985  
Physiographic soil surveys and archaeology. In: Malone, C. – Stoddart, S. (eds.), *Papers in Italian Archaeology IV*. 41–52. BAR International Series 243. Oxford. Archaeopress.
- SHANKS, M. 2001  
Culture/Archaeology. The Dispersion of a Discipline and its Objects. In: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*. 284–306. Cambridge.
- SMITH, M. – KOLLOCK, P. 1999  
*Communities in Cyberspace*. London, Routledge.
- SODDU, C. 1991.  
Simulation tools for the dynamic evolution of town shape. In: *Global change and local problems*. Oxford Polytechnic.
- SOGLIANI, F. – GABELLONE, F. – DANESE, M. – GNESI, D. in print  
Archaeological Landscapes through GIS (Cost Surface Analysis) and Virtual Reality. A case study on the monastic site of Jure Vetere (Calabria – Italy). In: *On the Road to Reconstructing the Past. CAA 2008, Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, Proceedings of the 36th Conference, Budapest, Archaeolingua.
- SOIL SURVEY STAFF 1975  
*Soil Taxonomy. A basic system of soil classification for making & interpreting soil surveys*. In: *Agriculture handbook* no. 436
- SPURR, M. S. 1986  
Arable cultivation in Roman Italy, c. 200 B.C. - c. A.D. 100. *Journal of Roman studies*. Monographs, no. 3.
- STALLMAN, R. 2002  
*Free as in Freedom. Richard Stallman's Crusade for Free Software*. By Sam Williams
- STALLMAN, R. – LAWRENCE 2002  
*Free Software, Free Society: Selected Essays of Richard M Stallman*, GNU Press, Edited by Joshua Gay, Boston.
- STEINER, G. 2007  
Le due culture: cause e forme di dicotomia. In: Ivano Dionigi (eds.), *I Classici e la Scienza*. 21–32. Milano.
- SURMAN, M. – REILLY, K. 2003  
*Appropriating the Internet for Social Change. Towards the Strategic Use of Networked Technologies by Transnational Civil Society Organizations*, Study commissioned by the Social Science Research Council, Nov. 2003, Ed. SSRC,  
[www.ssrc.org/programs/itic/civ\\_soc\\_report/](http://www.ssrc.org/programs/itic/civ_soc_report/)
- SZABÓ, P. – MÜLLEROVÁ, J. in print  
Ancient Woodland, Landscape Archaeology and GIS: Towards an Integrated Approach. In: *On the Road to Reconstructing the Past. CAA 2008, Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, Proceedings of the 36th Conference, Budapest, Archaeolingua.

- TAYLOR, J. R. 1999  
An Introduction to Error Analysis: The Study of Uncertainties. In: *Physical Measurements*. 128–129. University Science Books.
- THOMAS, J. 2001  
Archaeologies of Place and Landscape. In: Hodder, I. (ed.), *Archaeological Theory Today*, 165–186. Cambridge.
- TILLEY, C. 1994  
*A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford.
- TLAUKA, M. – WILSON, P. N. 1996  
Orientation-free representations from navigation through a computer-simulated environment. *Environment and Behaviour*. 25(8), 647–664.
- TOMASELLI, R. 1973  
Note illustrative della carta della vegetazione potenziale d'Italia (prima approssimazione). *Collana Verde* 27, 1970: 1-64.
- TORVALDS, L. – DIAMOND, D. 2001,  
*Rivoluzionario per caso: come ho creato Linux (solo per divertirmi)*. Milano, Garzanti.
- TRAINA, G. 1990  
*Ambiente e paesaggi di Roma antica*. NIS, Roma.
- TURKLE, S. 1997  
*La vita sullo schermo (Life on the Screen, 1996)*. Apogeo, Milano.
- UCKO, P. – DIMBLEBY, G. – TRINGHAM, R. 1972  
*Man, settlement and urbanism*. London
- UNESCO / FAO 1963  
*Bioclimatic map of the Mediterranean zone. Explanatory notes. Arid Zone Research XXI*. Paris
- VAN ANDEL, T.H. – ZANGGER, E. – DEMITRACK, A. 1990  
Land use and soil erosion in prehistoric and historical Greece. *Journal of field Archaeology*, 17, 379–396.
- VAN DER LEEUW, S. 1994  
*L'Homme et la dégradation de l'environnement*. Actes des rencontres 20-21-22 octobre 1994. 115-141. APDCA, Sophia Antipolis.
- VAN JOOLEN, E. 2003  
*Archaeological land evaluation. A reconstruction of the suitability of ancient landscapes for various land uses in Italy focused on the first millennium BC*. PhD dissertation at University of Groningen.
- VAREL F., – THOMPSON, E. – ROSH, E. 1991  
*The Embodied Mind. Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- VASSALLO, V. – PALOMBINI, A. in print  
Between Virtual Reality and Spatial archaeology: The Via Flaminia landscape reconstruction. In: *On the Road to Reconstructing the Past. CAA 2008, Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology*, Proceedings of the 36th Conference, Budapest, Archaeolingua.

- VASSALLO, V. – VICO, L. – MORO, A. 2006  
The importance of the relief and the sources to interpret and communicate the Cultural Heritage. In: *From Space to Place* 2006.
- VERMEULEN, F. – DE DAPPER, M. 2000  
*Geoarchaeology of the landscapes of classical antiquity. International Colloquium Ghent, 23-24 October 1998.* 49–70. Leiden, Stichting BABESCH, Supplement 5.
- VITA-FINZI, C. 1969  
*The Mediterranean Valleys. Geological changes in historical times.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- VITA-FINZI, C. – HIGGS, E. 1970  
Prehistoric economy in the Mount Carmel area of Palestine: site catchment analysis. In: *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 36. 1-37
- VOLPE, R. – ARNOLDUS-HUYZENDVELD, A. 2005  
Interpretazione dei dati archeologici nella ricostruzione storica e ambientale del paesaggio suburbano: l'area di Centocelle nel suburbio sudorientale. In: *Roman villas around the Urbs. Interaction with landscape and environment. Proceedings of a conference at the Swedish Institute in Rome, September 17-18, 2004;* Rome.
- VORREN, K.-D. 1986  
The impact of early agriculture on the vegetation of Northern Norway, a discussion of anthropogenic indicators in biostratigraphical data. In: Behre, K.-E.: *Anthropogenic Indicators in Pollen Diagrams.* Balkema, The Netherlands.
- WAGSTAFF, J. M. 1987  
*Landscape and Culture.* Oxford and New York.
- WALSH, K. 1999  
Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology and Environmental Reconstruction. In: Leveau, P. et al. (eds.), *Environmental Reconstruction in Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology.* 1–8. Oxford .
- WEIBEL, R. – HELLER, M. 1991  
A framework for digital terrain modelling. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Spatial Data Handling.* 219–229. Zurich, 1.
- WEST, D. M. – TRAVIS, L. E. 1991  
From Society to Landscape: Alternative Metaphors for Artificial Intelligence. *AI Magazine*, Vol. 12, No 2.
- WHEATLEY, D. – GILLINGS, M. 2002  
*Spatial technology and archaeology: the archaeological applications of GIS.* CRC Press
- WHITE, K. D. 1970  
*Roman Farming.* Thames and Hudson, London.
- WIENER, N. 2001  
*Introduzione alla cibernetica.* Universale Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- WILCOX 1904  
*Farmer's cyclopedia of Agriculture: a compendium of agricultural science and practice on field..* New York.



- WILLIAMS, S. 2002  
*Free as in Freedom: Richard Stallman's Crusade for Free Software*, Sebastapol. CA, O'Reilly Media.
- WILLIAMS, M. A. J. – DUNKERLEY, D. L. – DECKKER, P. DE – KERSHAW, A. P., – STOKES, T. J. 1993  
*Quaternary environments*. Edward Alnold, London.
- WILSON, D. R. 2000  
*Air Photo Interpretation for Archaeologists*. Tempus, Stroud.
- WILSON, J. P. – GALLANT, J. C. 2000  
Digital Terrain Analysis. In: Wilson, J. P. – Gallant, J. C. (eds.), *Terrain Analysis: Principles and Applications*. 1–27.
- WISEMAN, J. – EL-BAZ, F. 2007  
*Remote Sensing in Archaeology*. Springer.
- WRIGHT, H.E., JR. – KUTZBACH, J.E. – WEBB, T.III. – RUDDIMAN, W.F. – STREET-PERROTT, F. A. – BARTLEIN, P.J. 1993  
*Global climates since the last glacial Maximum*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 569 ss.
- YOUNG, A. 1973  
Rural land evaluation. In: Dawson, J.A. –Doornkamp, J.C. (eds.), *Evaluating the human environment*. 5–33. Arnold, London.
- ZEUNER, F. E. 1963  
*A history of domesticated animals*. Hutchinson, London. 560 ss.
- ZOHARY, D. – SPEGEL-ROY, P. 1975  
Beginnings of fruit growing in the old world. *Science*, 187. 319–327.