In today’s age of ‘post-truth’, Oxford Dictionaries’ word of 2016, scepticism and denial have become the new normal. Traditional battlegrounds such as climate change have broadened to embrace a far wider, more visceral, declamation of scientific opinion and ‘fact’. In this maelstrom no certainties are left unscathed. The very assertion of ‘truth’ has become a political act, the aim not to embrace clear and unequivocal ‘fact’ but rather to commit to a wider ideology in which the primary purpose is the disruption of the neo-liberal consensus. In our ‘post-truth’ world, truth has been replaced by belief (D’Ancona 2017; Sim 2019). The focus of this new paradigm is not simply present or future time; it is also very much engaged with the past (McIntyre 2018). Denial of climate change and the wider implications of what has been termed the ‘Anthropocene’, for example, involves not only a careful rebuking of scientific projections but also a systematic denial of the historical and archaeological record. In announcing the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris Agreement on climate change in 2019, for example, President Trump not only dismissed belief in an environmental crisis; he also rejected both the data and the academic communities on which an understanding of the crisis stands. If you believe the Earth is only 6,000 years old, it is also very possible to deny the vast array of scientific data that underlines mankind’s negative impact on the Earth’s climate, including the landscape degradation and species extinction associated with the more extreme definitions of the Anthropocene (Hamilton, Bonneuil and Gemenne 2015: 1–3).
Although this may seem an extreme example, beneath it lies a growing distrust of expert opinion. Scientific data and academic research are dismissed as either misinformed or, at worst, neo-liberal propaganda (D’Ancona 2017). The root causes of this situation are many and varied, but Fukuyama’s ‘vetocracy’ surely touches on something deeply profound (Fukuyama 2015), namely the perception of disempowerment among individuals and communities created by dysfunctional political and social systems. The lesson for academics is that facts are no longer enough to win the argument; instead, as much attention needs to be given to the means by which those facts are disseminated, validated and comprehended. In the case of archaeology, archaeologists need to see themselves more as ‘participants in conversations’ with the public, as envisaged by Pluciennik (2015: 65). One way this can be taken forward is by thinking of academic and scientific discourse as a set of powerful narratives, a move already underway through what has been termed the ‘linguistic turn’ in archaeology (e.g. see Clark 2004). Davies notes the importance of understanding the Anthropocene, for example, more as ‘a way of seeing’ than an explicit manifesto (2016: 193). Yet this intersection between narrative theory and science-based disciplines is still in its infancy in many areas, including archaeology (Dyke and Bernbeck 2015: 1). Much remains to be done, not only in terms of the mechanics of how these interdisciplinary approaches will develop but also, and perhaps more crucially, with regard to the wider ethical and moral issues that such approaches bring into view. Put simply, doesn’t creative experimentation merely run the risk of adding to the issues and complexities already generated by our post-truth age?

This chapter directly engages with these concerns by offering an account of the outcomes of the research project Walkways and Waterways. At the chapter’s heart is the use of psychogeography as a methodology by which an interdisciplinary synthesis between archaeology and creative practice can be investigated. Drawing upon Alexandra Warwick’s concept of ‘artefactual fictions’ (2012), where archaeological artefacts are primarily understood as discursive entities, the chapter extends this concept in three important ways: first, by engaging with non-textual ‘fictions’, specifically ideas of ‘presence’ within the performative dimension of psychogeography (Giannachi, Kaye and Shanks 2012); second, by examining how technological developments such as mobile technology and Wi-Fi constitute a radical transformation of our media
landscape, fundamentally impacting on the production and consumption of narratives (Jordan 2019); and third, by considering the intertwined notions of ‘performative presence’ and ‘artefactual fictions’ from the perspective of the digitally mediated interplay between textual and spatial practice. If at the heart of the linguistic turn is an understanding of knowledge construction as a kind of dialogue, politically and socially situated, then this chapter also invites consideration of the notion that such a conversation also has spatial, or physical, bounds. In this sense, psychogeography offers a way of perceiving our stories as physical journeys in and of themselves, a methodology that can help explore ways by which archaeologists might reconnect not only with the process of storytelling itself but also the physical remains of our archaeological legacy. The chapter begins by offering an overview of representations of archaeology in contemporary fiction and non-fiction and their relationship to storytelling within archaeology. It then explores how psychogeographical methods might be used to comprehend and to create new archaeological stories, stories which are not simply textual but spatial, performative and technologically enabled.

The new archaeological imperative

Like all the stories in Jon McGregor’s 2012 collection This Isn’t The Sort of Thing That Happens to Someone Like You, ‘The Remains’ has the subtitle of a town or village in the East of England, in this case, Friskney, a Fenland village midway between Boston and Skegness (Lea 2017: 238). The story is delivered through a terse, declarative syntax, in which ‘The Remains’ are the unwritten first two words of each sentence, as in the story’s opening sentences: ‘Are believed to still be intact. Are understood to be within an area of approximately seventeen square miles. Are believed to have been concealed’ (McGregor 2012b: 188). At this point the story appears to be relating the details of a murder in which the remains of an unidentified victim have been found buried in the fenland peat. However, it quickly becomes something else: ‘May be wrapped in a silken winding sheet and buried with jewellery and other possessions pressed neatly into the folded hands’ (McGregor 2012b: 189). ‘The Remains’ are made deliberately ambiguous, existing as both the consequence of contemporary murder and ancient sacrificial or ritualistic death, revealed through an
unsetting passive narratorial voice. Neither period takes precedence, forming instead a shifting narrative that finally dissolves into the endless repetition of a single sentence, ‘Have yet to be found’ (McGregor 2012b: 192), across the story’s entire final page. This meditation on landscape as both a contemporary and also archaeological construct runs throughout McGregor’s collection of short stories. In ‘We Wave and Call’, the narrator comes across an old fort while on holiday abroad; the story ‘Supplementary Notes to the Testimony of Appellants B & E’ purposely locates the narrative within an archaeological context, close to ‘the remains of what is believed to be a former manor or grange, with a series of raised earthworks’ (McGregor 2012c: 148–9); ‘In Winter the Sky’, a story told through prose and poetry, refers to ‘No dramatic finds of Saxon villages/No burial mounds or hidden treasure’ (McGregor 2012a: 31). This overt sensitivity to the archaeological record is also found in Sarah Hall’s short story collection, *The Beautiful Indifference* (2012a), where the historical heritage of the Cumbrian landscape is never far away: in ‘Butcher’s Perfume’, ‘there were two main roads from town – the old toll road, and the Roman’ (2012: 22); in ‘She Murdered Mortal He’, the unnamed central character manages a company that arranges ghost tours; and in ‘Vuotjärvi’, the central setting is the brooding waters of an ancient lake.

While ancient landscapes and ruined buildings have been the mainstay of folk tales and the Gothic for hundreds of years, what is new about contemporary literary representations of the archaeological such as these is their use of the ‘realist’ tradition of the short story (March-Russell 2009: 235–45). Although this tradition is most clearly associated with writers such as Anton Chekhov, Ernest Hemingway and Raymond Carver, its influence is evident in contemporary short story writing such as that of McGregor and Hall. Their stories are set in real places, are about ordinary events (although often with tragic or extraordinary outcomes) and are told in an economical style. The ‘realism’ then, is as much an affect of the story’s subject, as it is of form (May 2002: 83–106). In both McGregor’s and Hall’s stories, the archaeological is represented in a realistic manner, with little of the romanticization or exaggeration of Gothic fiction. As this chapter will show, if this archaeological imperative has a function, I would suggest that, at least in part, it is to encourage us to look at the world in new ways. Yet the archaeological also has a deep connectivity to the very form of the realist short story, with its buried subtext,
poking through the placid surface of the story’s quotidian detail. Hemingway called this ‘the iceberg effect’, where much of the story remains off the page, and yet whose presence is nevertheless felt by the reader (Scofield 2006: 140). To make this work, the realist writer has to use external detail to infer the hidden psychological complexity of the characters (May 2002: 94). The representation of landscape within McGregor’s and Hall’s stories then, with its historical and archaeological layering, mirrors that of the very form they are deploying. The archaeological not only operates metaphorically as a key part of the setting but is also a playful synecdoche for the entire narrative structure of the story itself. In Hall’s short story, ‘Voutjärvi’ (2012d), for example, the dark depths of the eponymous lake, timeless in its ‘benthic silence’ (172), foreshadows the tragedy about to unfurl as well as acting as a powerful metaphor for the ancient Finnish landscape in which the story is set (Lea 2017: 187–8). Like most of Hall’s stories in the collection, ‘Voutjärvi’ relies on subtextual meaning and implication. Yet place as a historicized concept is also important for Hall; indeed, as Lea notes, ‘[Hall’s] vocabulary is firmly rooted in the quiddity of turf, water, and Cumbrian rock, emerging from it as smooth or jagged as if found’ (2017: 155). The archaeological is therefore never just metaphorical for Hall; it is both implicit and explicit in the landscape, language and people of her stories.

This renewed interest in the archaeological is also evident in contemporary creative non-fiction. A good example is Charlotte Higgins’s Under Another Sky: Journeys in Roman Britain (2014) in which the author sets out to explore how ‘the idea of Roman Britain has resonated in British culture and still forms part of the texture of its landscape’ (2014: xx). Although posing as an objective account of a journey, Higgins constructs a story using creative techniques that would be familiar to any writer of fiction, including characterization, setting and emplotment. In fact, a growing number of non-fiction writers continue to demonstrate an interest in the textual representation of contemporary journeys across an historicized British landscape, including John Higgs’s Watling Street: Travels through Britain and Its Ever-Present Past (2017), Tom Chesshyre’s From Source to Sea: Notes from a 215-Mile Walk along the River Thames (2017) and James Canton’s Ancient Wonderings: Journeys into Prehistoric Britain (2017). Ian Sansom suggests that ‘it now seems to be a rite of passage for the middle-class, middle-aged Englishman to go off on a long walk
and then to write a book about it’ (2017: 32). Yet he overstates the gendered bias. Lauren Elkin’s Flâneuse: Women Walk the City in Paris, New York, Tokyo, Venice and London (2016) and Rebecca Solnit’s Wanderlust: A History of Walking (1999) remind us that women have also engaged in these long, topographical walks. As Solnit contends, walking creates ‘an odd consonance between internal and external passage, one that suggests that the mind is also a landscape of sorts and that walking it is one way to traverse it’ (Solnit 1999: 6). For Solnit, then, walking creates a symbiotic relationship between the physical and emotional. Indeed, for Solnit, it is the emotional and subjective that is the real arena of exploration, the physical passage providing the means by which the internal landscape is traversed.

This encroachment of creative and performative practice into the domain of archaeology has not been a one-way process. It is not so much that creative writing has had to break down the ramparts of archaeological research, as reach out to a discipline already highly attuned to literary and creative potential. The archaeologist Gavin Lucas, for example, has emphasized the importance of creative engagement within archaeological study and the rootedness of any interpretation in the present: ‘archaeology is a materialising activity – it does not simply work with material things, it materializes. It brings new things into the world; it reconfigures the world’ (Lucas 2004: 117). Michael Shanks is even more emphatic, stating the need for archaeologists to ‘look beyond the academic discipline of archaeology through memory practices, tradition and innovation to a (modern) human condition’ (2012: 149). Crucially, storytelling, as both Lucas and Shanks confirm, is at the heart of this.

Psychogeography 2.0

This chapter argues that psychogeographical literature, with its emphasis on a physical journey across what I term an ‘hyper-archaeologicalized’ landscape, provides an effective analytical focus through which the literary–archaeological nexus can be examined. Critically, it expands the corpus of contemporary texts usually considered to be psychogeographical, to argue for an approach in which the interpenetration of psychogeographical ideas across textual forms and genres is amorphous and fluid. Traditionally, psychogeography
is often viewed as something of an enigma with no agreed definition about what the term actually means. Perhaps Robert Macfarlane has come closest to describing the strange playfulness that lies at its heart:

Unfold a street map of London, place a glass, rim down, anywhere on the map, and draw round its edge. Pick up the map, go out into the city, and walk the circle, keeping as close as you can to the curve. Record the experience as you go, in whatever medium you favour: film, photograph, manuscript, tape. Catch the textual run-off of the streets: the graffiti, the branded litter, the snatches of conversation. Cut for sign. Log the data-stream. (2005: 3)

Coverley calls psychogeography a ‘meeting point’ of concepts and ideas, each with separate, though interconnected, histories and traditions (2010: 11). Yet despite this undoubted fuzziness, there still remains a central methodological core to psychogeography that can be traced back to its beginnings in post-war Paris and the Lettrist Group, a forerunner of what would become the Situationist International. For the Situationists, led by Guy Debord, psychogeography was ‘the study of the specific effects of the geographical environment, consciously organized or not, on the emotion and behaviour of individuals’ (1955: 8). In broad terms, then, psychogeography started life as the study of the interplay between psychology and geography. Central to its development was Debord’s notion of the dérive, ‘a technique of rapid passage through varied ambiences’, an open, aimless drift through the city (1958: 62). In the 1950s, this activity was an end in itself and the idea that written accounts of the dérive might be the principal output was not seriously considered by the Situationists. They tended to avoid making connections with other disciplines that might have extended or deepened their work (Sadler 1999: 160), and by the early 1960s the movement imploded under the weight of its own internal rivalries. Psychogeography and the concept of the dérive were quietly forgotten.

However, things began to change in the 1990s, which witnessed a resurgence of interest in psychogeographical concerns. Stewart Home’s Neoism, Plagiarism and Praxis (1995), Iain Sinclair’s Lights Out for the Territory (1997) and Rebecca Solnit’s Wanderlust: A History of Walking (1999) are just three examples from a much longer list of autobiographical works of non-fiction with psychogeographical influences. Iain Sinclair opens Lights Out
for the Territory (1997) with preparations for a journey in what becomes a sardonic take on the classic adventure tale: ‘The notion was to cut a crude V into the sprawl of the city, to vandalize dormant energies by an act of ambulant signmaking (I had developed this curious conceit while working on my novel Radon Daughters: that the physical movements of the characters … might spell out the letters of a secret alphabet)’ (1997: 1). Alongside these works, a parallel corpus of fiction emerged which also drew on psychogeographical ideas. Such fiction includes Peter Ackroyd’s Hawksmoor (1985), Geoff Nicholson’s Bleeding London (1997), W. G. Sebald’s Rings of Saturn (1998) and, more recently, Zadie Smith’s NW (2013). The latter novel is set mainly in Willesden and is experimental both in its chronological and also spatial structuring. Indeed, Knepper goes as far to say that NW deploys an ‘interactive experience of worldly/textual navigation and re-routing … to prompt its readers to remap known relations to place and explore the contested production of localities in a globalising world’ (2013: 116). The characters spend the novel journeying across their locality, metaphorically beating the bounds of the spatial limits of their lives. In the centre of Willesden, one of the characters sets off to find an old shrine in a church: ‘Another twenty yards and the full improbability of the scene is revealed. A little country church, a medieval country church, stranded on this half-acre, in the middle of a roundabout’ (Smith 2013: 69). Chapter nine even parodies the instructions offered by Google Maps, finally ending with, ‘These directions are for planning purposes only. You may find that construction projects, traffic, weather, or other events may cause conditions to differ from the map results’ (Smith 2013: 38). Willesden is at the confluence of a number of Roman roads and was famous as a site of pilgrimage to the Shrine of Our Lady (Knepper 2013: 120). The titles of the novel’s four sections, ‘Visitation’, ‘Guest’, ‘Host’ and ‘Crossing’, play with this idea of a revelatory journey. NW embraces some of the classic tropes of the psychogeographical novel but deploys them in innovative and unexpected forms. Smith offers the reader a multicultural interpretation of locality, space and place. There is very little nostalgia here; indeed, the usual story arc of psychogeography, with the narrator finally reaching some kind of insight or emotional harmony, is subverted at every stage in NW. The past, when it exists at all, such as the Black Madonna in the shrine of Our Lady of Willesden, is indifferent and unspeaking. Characters wander aimlessly and unbidden across
this small patch of London. In the section ‘Crossing’, chapter titles chart the drifting progress of one of the central characters, traumatized, incapable of navigation and yet drawn back into the physical spaces of her past: ‘Willesden Lane to Kilburn High Road’, ‘Shoot Up Hill to Fortune Green’ and so on. The effect is neither comforting nor nostalgic: rather, it is deliberately unsettling, an experimental remapping of locality in a world transformed by globalization and transcultural immigration (Loh 2013: 171).

While this is very much in keeping with the general philosophy of psychogeography, in particular the acute sensitivity to the relationships between physical and subjective journeys, it is also clear from works such as NW that psychogeography has undergone significant changes from its inception by Debord, creating what I term a psychogeography 2.0. Where the Situationists were concerned with the overt politicization of the dérive and, with it, its focus on the industrial cities of Western capitalism, by the 1990s writers had developed a much stronger interest in the forgotten and overlooked historical legacies of place, that contrasted ‘a horizontal movement across the topography of the city with a vertical descent through its past’ (Coverley 2010: 14). In psychogeography 2.0, the landscape becomes ‘hyper-archaeologicalized’, permeated by undiscovered artefacts and historical latency. In Smith’s ‘immersive’ recreation of Willesden, Sinclair’s excavations into London’s ‘secret history’ and Sebald’s haunting journey along East Anglia’s coastal path, time is compressed through a slow collapsing between past and present, a move which is also echoed in the short fictions of writers such as McGregor and Hall.

In thinking more critically about these characteristics, it is insightful to draw on Warwick’s typology of nineteenth-century literature which separates archaeological fiction into two categories – the ‘stratigraphic’ and the ‘artefactual’ (Warwick 2012). The former attempts to take the reader back in time, to render the past whole again in a simplistic, straightforward way that emphasizes authenticity. It is stratigraphic in the sense that this vision of the archaeological draws on the notion of the past as layered and distant, as something remote that can be pulled back into the light and revealed (Warwick 2012: 85). Conversely, what Warwick terms artefactual fiction examines the process by which archaeological artefacts can be understood as discursive entities first and foremost. As Warwick notes, in artefactual fictions, ‘the
object is not part of a stratum, at home with others in its period, but out of the context of its first existence’ (2012: 88). Such artefactual fictions are necessarily disruptive and transgressive, as the archaeological object becomes a discursive construct of the present rather than an authentic fragment from the ‘past’. I contend that this concept of artefactual fiction provides an effective way of theorizing not only nineteenth-century literature but also psychogeographical literature, particularly in its representation of archaeological traces. I suggest that three important aspects of psychogeography are specifically illuminated by this application. First, that psychogeography, as with artefactual fiction, is fundamentally ‘situated’, in the sense that the experience occurs within a particular socio-economic context, both spatially and temporally. Second, that the artefact is conceived as a disturbance, a spatial and temporal anomaly. Third, such archaeological traces say nothing of the past. Instead, they act as signifiers to our entrapment within the ‘present’. As Warwick notes in her analysis of artefactual fiction, ‘[t]he disturbance produced by archaeological objects is not the horror of the past, but of the recognition of the conditions of the present’ (2012: 94).

Yet an engagement with artefactual disturbances may not be simply textual. As already discussed, psychogeography, in its original incarnation, was a performative experience, woven around Debord’s concept of the dérive. This performative aspect of psychogeography is very much under-researched, which is curious given the growing synergy between archaeology and performance theory (Parker Pearson 2010; Parker Pearson and Shanks 2001). As Giannachi, Kaye and Shanks (2012) point out, theories of ‘presence’ within performance studies have strong connections with wider archaeological questions of ‘the performance and construction of the past in memory, narrative … in the experience of place’ (2012: 2). Giannachi in particular notes the opportunity offered by what she calls ‘ubiquitous computing’ for performative works created through improvisation, in real time and in situ (Giannachi 2012: 60). This digitally enhanced landscape is still a relatively unexplored terrain, especially in regard to performative exploration. Yet it is clear that there exists both exciting potential and pitfalls when it comes to utilizing augmented and immersive technologies within more traditional performative practices, such as psychogeography. It is towards a consideration of these issues that this chapter now turns.
Digital storytelling

Digital technology is transforming every facet of our lives. Even the dusty domain of archaeology has experienced a technological revolution through the use of geophysical imagery, laser scanners, 3D modelling, augmented reality systems and, most recently, 3D printing. As Rose Ferraby (2017: 6) notes, technologies such as geophysics have not only impacted the working practices of archaeologists but have fundamentally reconfigured what she calls 'the archaeological imagination.' More widely, technological advances such as the mobile phone and pervasive broadband connectivity have introduced nothing short of a revolution in how individuals engage with each other and their environment. According to Ofcom, in 2016, 93 per cent of adults in the UK owned a mobile phone, 71 per cent of UK adults had a smartphone and 73 per cent of UK adults were users of social media sites, percentages which are likely to keep on rising (Ofcom 2017). There now exists a new kind of 'space', what Scott McQuire calls *relational space*, generated by technological speed and instantaneous connectivity, breaking down previous restraints of place and time, 'in which the global is inextricably imbricated with the face-to-face' (McQuire 2008: 23).

These social and technological changes necessitate a radical overhaul of the theoretical and practical assumptions of psychogeography. At the very least, there now exists the very real opportunity to explore psychogeography as both a spatial and performative experience, collapsing the divide between writer and reader (Jordan 2019). The use of 'technology' within the field of psychogeography is not entirely without precedent. It was the Situationists themselves who described the use of walkie-talkies in a hypothetical dérive across Amsterdam (Anon. 1960). Yet the use of mobile technology in particular as a means of transforming spatial encounters is still very much in its early stages. *Ghosts in the Garden* (2012), *City Strata* (2012) and *I Tweet Dead People* (2012), all funded through REACT (Research and Enterprise in Arts and Creative Technology, an AHRC-funded Knowledge Exchange Hub), are just three examples of creative projects that have examined the interplay between digital technology, place and storytelling. Such projects have tended to fall into discrete areas, such as digital heritage including *Linking the Chain: A Network for Digital Heritage in Wales* (2010); narrative and storytelling such as *These*
Pages Fall Like Ash (2013) by Tom Abba and Duncan Speakman, in which readers are invited to visit certain areas of Bristol, locating digital fragments and uploading their own responses; and historical and spatial exploration such as Hackney Hear (2012), Bristol’s Hello Lamp Post (2013) and Shadowing (2014). Koehler (2013) analyses how Twitter stories such as Rick Moody’s ‘Some contemporary characters’ (2010) and Jennifer Egan’s ‘Black box’ (2012) explore what he calls ‘new ways of understanding craft as a synthesis of readers’ affect and participation in an unfolding narrative’ (Koehler 2013: 387). In their exploration of location-based interactive narratives, Paay and Kjeldskov note the immersive nature of ‘augmented reality’ when played out across a city (2011: 271). They end their essay with a call for further work to be done on the use of ‘user-generated story content that enable … urban citizens to participate in the media content creation side’ (2011: 271).

This chapter reports on a digital project that takes up this challenge. Walkways and Waterways (2013), funded by Creative Exchange Wales Network (CEWN), was a collaborative project involving Cardiff Metropolitan University, the University of South Wales and the digital media start-up, Fresh Content Creation. The purpose of the project was to lead a technologically enabled psychogeographical walk through the Welsh capital, Cardiff. Previous projects, such as Chris Speed’s ‘Walking through Time’, showed what could be done in terms of the real-time tracking of individuals across historical maps (Speed 2015). As Speed states, ‘being “in” the map and being located on a street that no longer exists offers new methods of understanding our surroundings’ (Speed 2015: 177). Walkways and Waterways wanted to extend this approach by using Twitter to capture the creative responses of participants as they progressed across the city. Walkways and Waterways was therefore much more focused on the relationship between narrative, place and walking. More crucially, it sought to explore this interaction in real time.

The event itself consisted of a digitally mediated journey, retracing the last two miles of the Glamorganshire Canal, from Cardiff Castle to the Bay (previously known as Tiger Bay). The Canal itself fell into ruin soon after the Second World War and has long since been built over. Only memories and topographical scars remain. Retracing it through the centre of the city involved traversing a variety of terrains, including a large modern shopping
The event was advertised through social media. Twenty participants attended, ranging from young children to the retired. While the physical journey was led by project members, exploration was digitally augmented by Twitter through which further guidance and information was given in real time. The smartphone allowed each participant to upload photographs and commentary to #GlamCan, providing a shareable forum through which every individual itinerary could be recorded. Embedded within the walk were twelve ‘treasures’, forming, what was described as, a ‘treasure trail’. In this way, the project employed real-time gaming and ‘play’ as a way of enhancing participation and engagement. Tweets sent by the project team such as ‘What do you want to learn about the Glamorganshire canal today?’ prompted participants to both find and then record the next ‘treasure’. Sometimes, as in the case of a marooned paddle post in the subway beneath the A470, participants were invited to discuss its function, ‘What do you think made the marks to the left of jack head/paddle post?’ Participants then uploaded their responses to Twitter. Sometimes team members responded to particular replies; occasionally participants themselves would engage in a fleeting online discussion, ‘A crane / Yes, but what for?’

Specific directions sent through Twitter guided the participants across the city: ‘Walk through the old tunnel, follow the guides. Turn to your right at Hilton and look up / Go into the arcade opposite, take stairs on the left, walk down & follow guides; this is tricky water to navigate!’ Old photographs were tweeted to the participants at key locations, asking them to compare the existing topography with what was recorded in the photograph: ‘Can you see a building in this image that is still there now?’; ‘See if you can spot what is missing from the picture we just sent? What is still the same?’ Participants were encouraged to respond through their own tweets which were then shared in real time across the group. Sometimes these responses were simple factual responses to the questions: ‘old tunnel’; ‘custom house unchanged’; ‘rope’. At other times a more abstract, creative response was forthcoming that captured the participant’s fleeting emotional responses: ‘Dark, cold, wet. Voices echo in tunnel / swimming along the canal through tides of shoppers’. And just
occasionally, memories suddenly surfaced: 'Remember canal as a child. Memories of swimming in it / Met my husband here – 40 years ago!' ”

In other situations, the limitations of a tweet (short textual responses of up to 140 characters, including spaces) might be considered unnecessarily restrictive. Yet, out on the street, this imposed concision became a strength. Each tweet offered the opportunity to add up to four photographs taken on the smartphone. The tweets therefore gave participants the opportunity to explore the interplay between text and image as they progressed along the path of the canal, a simple yet powerful augmentation of their creative output. Each tweet became part of a single, collective narrative, a real-time amalgamation of over twenty stories that each participant could access alongside their own individual record. In the written feedback, one participant called this ‘cataloguing the joint experience via social media’. It was this ‘joint experience’ that seemed to be a key part of the event’s popularity. When asked what they enjoyed about the event, over half stressed its communality: ‘companionship of other walkers’; ‘meeting new people’; and ‘enjoyable group experience’. For almost all the participants, the event’s success had also been the way it had encouraged them to see the city in a new way: ‘looking at Cardiff in a different light’; ‘seeing things that I’ve passed every day but not noticed’; and, perhaps more interestingly, ‘going back in time’. Yet the group experience also threw up issues. When asked about how the event could be improved, a third suggested the pace of the walk. There were certainly moments when the group had to wait for everyone to arrive and engage with an activity. Some of the older participants also highlighted the need for more support for those who weren’t so confident with social media. Overall, however, the feedback was positive.

The smartphone was able to support the event in a number of ways that a more traditional non-digital format could not. First, the technology allowed real-time mapping across the city using the phone’s global positioning system (GPS). GPS ensured that the position of each participant was always known in relation to the surrounding city space, thereby providing a physical mapping of each individual journey. Second, it provided a means of geographically triggering audio, video and images, augmenting the physical experience of the contemporary city with historical photographs, records and testimony. Are you standing under the dual carriageway? You made it! Tweet a selfie of you in front of the graffiti. The smartphones were able to digitally map stories to the
historical legacies of specific sites. Third, the phones allowed each participant to record and post their own creative responses through Twitter and then to read one another’s, as the journey progressed. Neuhaus (2014) notes how his own mapping of Twitter activity across a number of smart cities, including New York City and London, produced parallel virtual landscapes, created through the narrative activity of the cities’ populations. In *Waterways and Walkways* stories emerged on Twitter but they were also generated verbally as the participants moved along the route. At one point, beside the extant post of a crane on what would have been the Sea Lock Pound, one of the participants began to sing a sea shanty, evoking the life of the stevedores and bargemen who had worked on the canal. By the end of the journey the participants had engaged with each other both physically and digitally, remapping their relationship to the spaces of the city and its citizens.

### Conclusion

In 2012 Shanks declared that ‘we are all archaeologists now’ (2012: 21). By this he didn’t mean that we are all digging away with our trowels but rather that what he termed the ‘archaeological imagination’ had become a fundamental means of engaging with who we are. I would certainly concur with this, but would also suggest that if we are all archaeologists, then we are also all psychogeographers, active participants in what has come to be known as ‘placemaking’ (Thomas 2016). The intimate relationship between writing and physical journeying is nothing new; Robert Macfarlane reminds us that the verb ‘to write’ derives from the Old English *writan*, meaning ‘to incise runic letters in stone’, in other words ‘drawing a sharp point over and into a surface – by harrowing a track’ (Macfarlane 2013: 105). In this sense, the underpinnings of psychogeography 2.0 are as much indebted to a ‘hyper-archaeologicized’ past as they are to the present.

However, the affordance offered by ubiquitous mobile technology has the potential to dramatically extend how we might understand Warwick’s concept of ‘artefactual fictions’ (2012). Online, real-time engagement with both text and image, utilizing augmented and virtual realities, has the potential to radically democratize our engagement with place. No longer is the psychogeographic
journey something one reads vicariously in a book; and no longer does it have to be an avant-garde dérive in the manner of the Situationists’ early forays across Paris. Instead, the smartphone offers the opportunity for anyone, at any time, to undertake a physical exploration. This idea of performance is central to psychogeography; indeed, like psychogeography, theories of site-specific performance stress a particular focus on the very ‘absences of place’ and the constructedness of meaning (Parker Pearson 2010; Giannachi 2012). In this sense then, both psychogeography and contemporary theatre practice have significant overlap. Giannachi defines presence as the medium through which an individual actively engages with their environment (Giannachi 2012: 52). Importantly, this concept of presence is not uncontested; as Giannachi, Kaye and Shanks say, it is not ‘a function of unity and synthesis’ (2012: 11), but rather the ‘traversal of difference’ between ‘self’ and ‘other’ (2012: 10). This notion of ‘traversal of difference’ seems especially apt for psychogeography too, embracing as it does the central idea of a transgressive journey, leading to some kind of transformative encounter with absences and gaps, as in the case of *Walkways and Waterways*.

The application of digital technology only strengthens these ideas. As Zubrow reminds us, although archaeology has always been concerned with ‘telling stories about the past’ (2006: 10), such ‘archaeological imagination’ is increasingly mediated through digital technology (Zubrow 2006; Ferraby 2017). *Walkways and Waterways* has indicated how even a simple smartphone can transform spatial exploration, radically overhauling concepts such as the dérive and placemaking. In effect this amounts to a transformation in the relationship between the reader and the writer, foregrounding the role of the former in the creation of knowledge in what Tringham terms ‘recombinant histories’ (Tringham 2015). Pluciennik takes this further, suggesting that archaeologists should act as ‘mediators and facilitators of meaningful conversations’ (2015: 67). The role that digital technology can play in these conversations and recombinations should be apparent from projects such as *Walkways and Waterways*. Yet it is also clear that digital technology goes much further in terms of its impact. The very notion of ‘absence’ and ‘presence’, for example, takes on new and radical meanings within McQuire’s relational space (2008), where the digitally mediated divide between the local and the global, the self and the other is reconfigured. Yet, as Graham, Zook and Boulton
remind us, the notion of a single, all-encompassing augmented reality is itself a fiction. Rather, there are a plurality of augmented realities that are 'enacted and practiced in contingent and relational ways' (2012: 470). In other words, recourse to the digital still does not alter the fundamental fact that at the heart of any experience is a situated human being.

Shanks is equally keen to stress the importance of human experience. He describes how the Greek concept of chora (Khôra) is central to any understanding of the archaeological imagination. Drawing on Heidegger, Shanks describes chora as 'people's inhabitation of a place' (2012: 146; Heidegger 1983). In other words, chora is not simply empty space, but rather space that gives place for being. Central to this idea is what Shanks calls 'engagement with the remains of the past' (2012: 146). Yet chora also captures what Derrida saw as the notion of difference and radical transgression, wavering 'between the logic of exclusion and that of participation' (1995: 89).

It is clear that these ideas resonate strongly with the performative dimension of psychogeography, particularly the concepts of 'presence' and 'traversal of difference'. Locative media, rather than threatening these approaches, offers an exciting enhancement of these more transformative and transgressive elements.

In their discussion of the archaeological imagination, Warwick and Willis note how the rational and the creative have always been irrevocably intertwined in narrative explorations of the past (2012: 1). Yet they sound a note of warning: 'the archaeological imagination is plural and constitutive of new knowledge but equally has the capacity to elide or disguise such knowledge: enhancing fact with fancy, but also relieving fact of its discomfort' (2012: 4). This sense of threat is acknowledged by Shanks when he notes that the archaeological imagination should not be trusted out of hand (2012: 149).

Issues remain around whose voice is being heard and the interrelationship between fact and fiction. Digital technology, especially social media, has been identified as one of the main culprits behind the post-truth phenomenon, the Economist noting that two-thirds of Americans get their news through news filtering platforms such as Facebook (2016: 21). In this context, Pollock's recommendation that writers should never present fiction disguised as fact makes sense (2015: 283). Yet one of the things psychogeography 2.0 has also shown is that we do not necessarily see or understand the world in such a
polarized way. The archaeological imagination is at its very root the stories we tell ourselves and the pathways we choose to take across our landscape. The misinformation behind ‘post-truth’ assertions is to be deplored, but at the same time social media is part of what Carson calls ‘polyvocal’ forms of news that support ‘alternative ways of establishing authority’ through enhanced participation and ‘subjective voice’ (Carlson 2017: 194). Making sure that we are able to utilize stories to help in the understanding of difference and the ‘discomfort’ of fact, to use Warwick and Willis’s term, remains a vital goal for the years ahead.

In his book, Underland: A Deep Time Journey (2019), Macfarlane notes the narrative power of viewing the Earth across the endless eons of geological time: ‘When viewed in deep time, things come alive that seemed inert … A conviviality of being leaps to mind and eye. The world becomes eerily various and vibrant again’ (2019: 15–16). If, as I would argue, the notion of ‘conviviality of being’ is also at the heart of storytelling, then projects such as Walkways and Waterways suggest ways in which new entanglements of embodied exploration and digital technology open up innovative and affective forms of narrative that offer a similar kind of revelatory experience to Macfarlane’s temporal reframing. In this transmedial landscape, the archaeological object becomes part of a transformative encounter that is both situated and embodied, and in which physical and emotional interconnectedness, Shanks’s notion of chora (2012), become overt parts of the story.
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