

THE IN A HURRY SERIES

Lost Cities

in a Hurry

Found, forgotten, and still missing

Max Brocklesby

BOOKSINAHURRY.COM

Contents

The Whole Thing in One Page 4

Why You Should Care 5

The Core Ideas 7

How It Actually Works 21

What People Get Wrong 30

Use It 36

Terms 40

Go Deeper 44

Notes and Sources 45

Bibliography 53

The Whole Thing in One Page

A lost city is usually pictured as a finished city under a cover. Pull away the jungle, sand or ash and the streets are waiting, empty but intact, for the first explorer brave enough to see them. That image has sold expeditions, newspapers and films. It is wrong in almost every useful way.

Cities are lost in stages. First the system fails, shrinks or moves. Water no longer reaches the same districts. Trade follows another route. A court relocates, taxes stop arriving, walls become harder to defend, fields become less reliable, or a government can no longer pay the people who keep the machinery going. Residents do not all vanish together. Some leave early, some stay, some return, and some turn palaces into workshops or temples into shrines for a different age.

Then the place is edited. Departing families carry tools, metal, grain, records and valuables. Neighbours quarry dressed stone. Roofs collapse. Mudbrick becomes soil. Floods lay sediment across streets; roots break walls; later houses cut through earlier floors. A catastrophe such as Vesuvius can preserve a tighter slice of time, but even Pompeii was a damaged, changing town rather than a Roman room sealed for display.

Next memory and place come apart. A name may survive in a poem while its location is disputed, as at Troy. Ruins may remain visible while outsiders refuse to accept who built them, as at Great Zimbabwe. Local people may know and use a site that foreign visitors later describe as discovered, as at Machu Picchu and Angkor. Lost is never a neutral word. It depends on whose map, archive and testimony count.

Recovery is therefore not a sighting. It is an argument assembled from position, layers, objects, dates, inscriptions, environmental evidence and the shape of a wider landscape. Schliemann found gold at Hisarlik and gave it a Homeric owner who had lived, if he lived at all, many centuries later. The treasure was real. The identification was not.

Modern archaeology has changed the object being sought. Early excavators

chased gates, statues and royal rooms. Aerial photography, satellite imagery, geophysics and LiDAR now reveal roads, reservoirs, terraces, fields and thousands of modest house platforms. At Angkor, the temples had never disappeared; what mapping restored was the immense low-density city around them. In Amazonia, recent laser surveys have documented hundreds of earthworks beneath forest and suggested far more across the region. Those features are not a count of cities. Some are ceremonial enclosures, some belong to settlement systems, and some remain uncertain until fieldwork establishes age and function. What comes back first is a pattern. The recovered pattern can be more informative than the monument that first drew attention.

Some capitals still resist us. Agade is famous in ancient texts and absent from the modern map. Itjtawy governed Middle Kingdom Egypt, yet its settlement has not been securely located. Thousands of newly mapped features remain undated or unnamed.

And discovery sends a bill. Publicity can bring scholarship and protection, but also looting, tourism pressure and a second transfer of authority from local communities to distant institutions. Finding a city is not the end of its story. It is the moment responsibility begins.

That is the book.

Why You Should Care

A laser pulse falls through a gap between leaves, strikes the ground and returns to an aircraft. One return means nothing. Millions, measured from slightly different positions, can expose a low platform, a straight causeway, a ditch, a reservoir edge and the faint square of a house compound beneath forest. On the ground, a person might walk across all of it and see only trees. From the air, a city appears.

That is the first reason to care. Lost-city archaeology is one field in which our picture of the human past is changing quickly. The old map favoured stone, dry climates, royal monuments and places already named in texts. It

made dense masonry look normal and low-density settlement look empty. Remote sensing has begun to correct that bias. Maya landscapes in Guatemala, the Casarabe settlements of Bolivia, Angkor's neighbourhoods and waterworks, and earthworks across Amazonia show urban life arranged in forms that older archaeology was poorly equipped to recognise. The new discoveries are not extra dots on the map. They alter the range of settlement forms that archaeologists must test for urban functions, without turning every mapped earthwork or ceremonial centre into a city.

The second reason is that abandonment is an experiment no government would choose to run. A city concentrates dependence. Water must arrive, waste must leave, food must be moved, streets maintained, disputes settled and danger managed. When one connection weakens, others can absorb the strain. When several fail together, the concentration that made the city powerful becomes a liability. Angkor's water network, Maya political competition and the shifting channels of river cities tell different stories. They ask the same question: what keeps a concentrated population worth maintaining?

The answer matters now without forcing an easy lesson. Ancient cities were not models of modern ones, and a drought in the fourteenth century is not a forecast for London or Lagos. Yet their remains separate durable urban functions from the governments, buildings and myths that once seemed permanent. People often survive the end of a city by moving, dispersing or changing how they use the place. The political centre can collapse while communities continue. That distinction is useful whenever headlines announce that a city, institution or society is dying.

The third reason is moral. Discovery stories decide who receives credit and who loses control. Hiram Bingham did not become the first person to see Machu Picchu in 1911. He arrived with local guidance at a place known to farmers and travellers, then brought cameras, institutions and an international audience. European visitors did not reveal Angkor to Cambodians. Colonial researchers changed the scale and language in which it was studied. At Great Zimbabwe, the ruins were visible, but colonial

authorities preferred fantasies of foreign builders to evidence of African achievement. A place can be physically present and intellectually erased.

The fourth reason is that the evidence teaches discipline. A straight line in a satellite image may be a wall, a drainage ditch, a modern vehicle track or a processing artefact. A gold hoard proves that gold was buried; it does not supply the owner named in a poem. A mound beside a river may fit an ancient text and still be the wrong city. Archaeology forces claims through layers, dates, context and repeated tests. It is a useful training ground for any world in which striking images travel faster than verification.

Then there is the pleasure, which should not be apologised for. Somewhere near Baghdad lies the capital from which the Akkadian kings ruled an early territorial empire, and nobody can yet point to it with confidence.

Somewhere near Lisht lay Itjtawy, the residence of Egypt's Twelfth Dynasty. Forests, fields, suburbs and floodplains still contain settlements whose names are unknown and names whose settlements are missing.

The romance survives. It is better once the explorer stops being the hero and the evidence takes over.

The Core Ideas

A City Is a System Before It Is a Ruin

The first mistake is to look for walls. Walls are what survive and what photograph well, so they have trained us to imagine a city as a dense block of buildings. Yet the urban fact comes earlier. For this book, a city is a substantial and persistent concentration of people, institutions and specialised work sustained by connections beyond any single household.

That is a working model, not a universal archaeological threshold.

Specialists disagree about where towns, ceremonial centres and low-density urban systems become cities, and the evidence is often strong enough to show organisation before it is strong enough to justify the label.

Food has to reach people who are not growing it. Water must be collected,

stored or moved. Labour has to be organised. Rulers, councils, temples, markets or other institutions settle claims and concentrate resources. Craftspeople depend on customers they may never meet. Roads, rivers and paths turn distant fields into an urban food system. The city is therefore less like an object than a set of recurring movements.

This explains why urban forms can look so different. A Roman town placed houses, shops and public buildings inside a tight street grid. Angkor spread settlement through a broad landscape of temples, reservoirs, canals, embankments, fields and occupation mounds. Much of its housing was built from perishable material. Seen through a European expectation of stone streets and hard boundaries, the temples appeared to stand in countryside. Seen through the flows of water, labour and authority, they sat inside an immense low-density city.

The distinction matters because a city can fail before its buildings fall. If a court moves, a harbour silts, a river changes course, a road becomes unsafe or a state loses control of grain and labour, the urban concentration becomes harder to support. People may remain among the structures, but the place no longer performs the same work. A palace can become housing. A ceremonial centre can keep its sacred status after administration has gone. A former neighbourhood can turn into fields without crossing a clean line from city to no city.

It also explains why monuments mislead. A temple is designed to last and to claim attention. Houses made from wood, earth and thatch are more numerous and more vulnerable. The surviving city is therefore socially upside down. Rulers and gods retain walls; ordinary residents become stains, postholes, shallow platforms, rubbish deposits and altered soil. If the monument is treated as the whole place, the population that built and maintained it disappears a second time.

Archaeologists have learned to follow urban functions beyond the ceremonial centre. They map ceramic scatters, house mounds, field boundaries, roads, quarries, canals, workshops and cemeteries. They examine pollen, animal bone, seeds, human remains and sediments to

reconstruct provisioning and pressure. A city's edge may be a gradual decline in activity rather than a wall. Its population may move seasonally or occupy several linked centres. Festivals can swell a centre that is quieter for much of the year, while administrative work can bind scattered households into one urban economy. None of those traits alone proves that a site was a city. The label becomes more persuasive when several lines of evidence show sustained concentration, coordination and dependence at a scale beyond ordinary village life.

Every later stage follows from that distinction. When the movements stop, the city becomes a different kind of place. When buildings decay, the larger network may remain impressed on the terrain. And when modern mapping finds roads and reservoirs beneath forest, it is recovering the urban system that the surviving monuments concealed.

A lost city is first a lost pattern of dependence.

Abandonment Is Usually a Process

The word abandonment suggests a last day. Gates close, fires go out and the population leaves in one frightened column. Some places have known sudden flight, but even there the archaeological event is rarely as clean as the story. Most cities thin, shift and change use over years or generations.

Departure has a sequence. Elites may leave when political opportunity moves elsewhere. Merchants follow safer routes. Administrators stop receiving salaries. Households with choices relocate first, while people tied to land, shrines or local networks remain. A district can empty while another grows. The centre can lose authority while villages around it continue. Later settlers may occupy the same ground under different institutions and without thinking of themselves as residents of a dead city.

What people do while leaving shapes everything archaeologists later find. A planned departure allows families to carry tools, vessels, grain, textiles, metal and portable valuables. Roof beams and doors can be removed. Storage jars may be emptied. Heavy or broken objects are left behind. If people expect to return, they may seal rooms, hide goods or leave more

equipment in place. If they flee, useful possessions can remain, but fleeing bodies still select what can be carried quickly. An abandoned house is not an average house. It is the residue of a decision.

Pompeii has become the model because the eruption of Vesuvius in AD 79 shortened the interval. The city was struck while occupied, and many objects remained where daily life had placed them. Yet even Pompeii is not a perfect still image. Earthquakes had damaged buildings in the preceding years. Repair was under way. Some residents escaped, some removed property, roofs and upper floors failed, and later tunnellers disturbed deposits. Catastrophe preserved a narrow and powerful sample, not a complete Roman day.

Angkor supplies the opposite correction. Older accounts preferred a dramatic fifteenth-century collapse, often tied to invasion. Sediments from the urban core instead indicate declining land-use intensity from the early fourteenth century, before the conventional terminal event. Political gravity and trade shifted towards the Mekong and routes closer to the sea. Infrastructure became harder to maintain. The administrative city dispersed. Angkor Wat itself continued to be occupied, visited and revered. One system ended while several forms of life persisted.

This pattern appears across urban history. A city can undergo an urban diaspora, with residents and functions moving through a region rather than vanishing. Political failure may create demographic redistribution. Ecological pressure may intensify existing conflict without acting as a single cause. Conquest may redirect taxes and labour while leaving neighbourhoods intact. The search for one date and one reason often turns a long reorganisation into a theatrical ending. Drought, warfare, disease, trade and political rivalry usually act through institutions and household choices. A stress becomes decisive when the urban system can no longer distribute its costs.

Abandonment also has an afterlife. Fields are planted between walls. Shrines attract pilgrims. Squatters occupy public buildings. Kilns move into former courtyards because open space and rubble are useful. Later

communities may know exactly what the place was while using it for something else. The archaeological layers record these choices, though early excavators sometimes cleared them away to reach the period they valued.

The useful question is therefore not, “Why did everyone leave?” It is: which functions stopped, who moved, who stayed, what did they take, and what new use followed? That set of questions produces a history. The single word collapse often produces a poster.

The Ground Rewrites What Is Left

A city does not enter the earth as a model placed in storage. It is broken down, sorted and recombined by people, weather, water, plants, animals and later construction. Archaeologists call the result site formation. Without it, every ruin is misread.

Begin with materials. Fired brick and stone can survive for millennia, but both are tempting building supplies. Timber rots, burns or is removed. Roof tile slides and shatters. Mudbrick is especially deceptive: rain rounds the walls, wind works loose particles into surrounding soil, and a building gradually becomes a mound made from itself. Plaster flakes, floors crack and metal corrodes. What looks like natural ground may contain an entire neighbourhood rendered back into earth.

Then movement begins. Floods lay silt across streets and can bury lower structures while cutting away others. Wind fills rooms with dust. Tree roots open joints and disturb deposits; burrowing animals move objects between layers. Slopes carry soil downhill. In wet conditions, organic matter decays quickly; in waterlogged, frozen or dry settings, it may survive with startling detail. Preservation is never a general quality of a site. It is a local chemical and physical outcome.

Human beings continue the edit. Stone is quarried from old walls because a cut block is cheaper than a new one. Graves are dug through houses. Farmers plough shallow remains and spread artefacts. Robbers follow the same signs as archaeologists and remove objects without recording

relationships. Antiquarian excavators cut tunnels towards statues and painted rooms. Modern roads, drains and foundations slice through older strata. Every later use creates evidence and destroys some of what came before.

The vertical sequence produced by these actions is stratigraphy. In its cleanest form, a later deposit lies above an earlier one. Real sites are full of cuts, pits, collapses, redeposited soil and material that remained in circulation for centuries. A coin struck in one year gives the earliest possible date for the deposit containing it, not an automatic date for every wall nearby. A piece of old pottery can be dug up and buried again in a younger layer. Context is the set of recorded relationships that lets an object carry historical meaning. Absence is equally difficult. A room with no metal tools may show planned removal, later scavenging, poor preservation or an excavation that failed to record small finds. Silence has formation processes too.

This is why early treasure hunting did such damage. At Herculaneum, excavators entered buried buildings through shafts and tunnels from 1738, seeking sculpture, painted walls and objects suitable for a royal collection. Pompeii followed in 1748. The work revealed extraordinary material, but rooms were approached as containers and the route through them as expendable. An object without an exact find spot, layer and association may remain beautiful while losing much of its explanatory power.

Catastrophe is one formation process among many. Vesuvius buried, burned, crushed and preserved. The same eruption created different deposits at Pompeii and Herculaneum because ash fall, surges, building collapse and local topography differed. The event did not press a universal pause button. It produced a complex archive through violence.

The ground is therefore not a passive cover waiting to be removed. It is an editor with no interest in fairness. Durable elite architecture is overrepresented. Portable wealth is removed. Organic labour disappears. Later occupants leave louder marks in some areas and erase earlier ones in others. Archaeology begins by asking how the evidence came to look like

evidence.

A ruin is what happened to a city after urban life, as much as what urban life left behind.

Lost to Whom?

In July 1911, Hiram Bingham was led up a steep Peruvian slope to Machu Picchu. The expedition photographs, institutional backing and later publicity changed the site's international career. They did not make Bingham the first person to know the place existed. Families farmed nearby, names and paths circulated locally, and earlier travellers had recorded knowledge of ruins in the area. Bingham's achievement was to connect a locally known place to a global scholarly and tourist network.

That difference is routinely collapsed by the word discovery. The verb gives one arrival the power to cancel every earlier relationship with the site. It turns guidance into background, residence into ignorance and international recognition into first sight. The lost city story then becomes a contest between a solitary outsider and an empty landscape.

Angkor was never lost in that sense either. Its stone monuments remained visible, used and revered. Cambodian memory did not require a French naturalist to switch it on. What colonial scholarship did was document inscriptions, classify architecture, clear vegetation, construct chronologies and attach the site to European institutions. Later aerial survey and LiDAR transformed understanding again by revealing the broad urban landscape around the temples. Different kinds of knowledge were added, but none justifies saying that the place had ceased to exist for everyone.

Great Zimbabwe exposes a harsher version. The walls were visible and known. The colonial problem was not absence of evidence but refusal to accept its implication. European writers proposed Phoenicians, biblical figures and other foreign builders because a large African city contradicted their racial account of the continent. Early excavations searched for exotic origins and damaged deposits. The site had been found physically and lost intellectually inside an explanation designed to exclude its makers.

Archaeology's later recognition of African authorship did more than identify a builder. It removed a colonial fiction that had organised the evidence.

Local knowledge is not automatically complete or unchanging. Communities can forget names, reinterpret ruins, avoid places, preserve sacred associations without preserving chronology, or arrive after an earlier population has gone. Nor does oral memory replace excavation when the question is date, extent or sequence. The correction is narrower and stronger: knowledge has forms, and "lost" must name which connection is broken.

A place may be lost to written history but present in oral tradition. Its name may survive while its location is unknown, as with Agade. Its location may be obvious while the historical name is uncertain. A monument may remain active while the surrounding urban system is no longer recognised. Scholars may know a site while the public does not. A government may promote one period and allow later occupation to disappear from the official story. Modern cadastral maps can rename land, move people or turn a lived sacred landscape into a bounded archaeological park. Recognition may preserve a site while narrowing who is allowed to define it.

Credit follows these distinctions. Guides, workers, landowners, descendant communities, local scholars and national archaeological services have often been reduced to assistants in stories centred on a foreign expedition leader. Objects and records then move into museums whose labels begin with the collector's name. The discovery tale is not innocent decoration. It can determine ownership, tourism income, legal authority and whose account appears credible.

Ask "lost to whom?" and the romance does not disappear. It changes target. The impressive achievement becomes the work of connecting types of evidence without erasing the people who kept other connections alive.

Discovery Is an Argument, Not a Sighting

A mound is not a city name. A straight wall is not a palace. A hoard is not the possession of the famous king whose story brought the excavator there. Archaeological discovery begins when something is observed. It becomes knowledge only when an identification survives competing explanations.

The first task is to establish that traces are human. Regular geometry, modified soil, artefacts, cut stone and patterned topography can all indicate construction, but natural processes also produce lines, circles, terraces and mounds. Modern farming, forestry, drainage and military activity can imitate older features. Investigators compare shapes across images, inspect historical maps, walk the ground and test deposits. The image proposes; fieldwork disposes.

The second task is chronology. A city may occupy the same place for centuries, moving streets, rebuilding walls and reusing older objects. Pottery styles, coins and inscriptions provide relative or historical dates.

Radiocarbon dating measures the decay of carbon in once-living material, within limits and with calibration. Tree rings can give exact years where suitable timber and regional sequences exist. Layers establish before and after. No single method dates “the city” as one event because cities are sequences.

The third task is identity. Texts may describe distances, rivers, neighbouring towns, rulers and temples. Inscriptions found on site can be decisive, though even royal texts travel and can be reused. Place names change, migrate and survive in altered forms. Geography narrows candidates. Material culture may connect a site to a political system without proving its ancient name. A secure identification usually rests on convergence rather than one spectacular object. It must also survive sampling. Excavation exposes a minute share of most urban sites, so a missing inscription or palace may reflect where trenches happened to fall rather than what the city lacked.

Troy shows the danger and the value of a strong prior story. Hisarlik had long been proposed as the site of ancient Ilion. Heinrich Schliemann arrived

convinced that Homer could guide excavation. He helped demonstrate that the mound held a deep sequence of major settlements, which was an extraordinary result. He also cut a vast trench through later layers. He assigned a gold-rich hoard from Troy II to Priam, although that settlement was many centuries earlier than any plausible horizon for a Late Bronze Age Trojan War. The poem directed attention to the right mound and the wrong treasure.

The error is more than comic. A famous name changes the standard of proof. Every gate becomes the gate from the story; every burning layer becomes its war. Contradictory evidence is treated as a detail because the identification is emotionally complete before the chronology is built. Once museums, guidebooks and national narratives adopt the name, revision becomes harder.

Now reverse the problem. Agade was the capital of the Akkadian Empire and appears repeatedly in ancient texts, yet its site has not been securely located. Itjtawy was the royal residence of Egypt's Twelfth Dynasty, probably near the pyramid fields at Lisht, but no identified settlement yet matches the capital known from documents. In both cases the name is certain enough and the ground remains elusive. Text without location is no easier than location without text.

Discovery is best understood as a graded claim. We may have a possible feature, a probable settlement, a securely dated urban landscape, or a strong identification with a historical name. The language should preserve those levels. "Potential pyramid" and "pyramid" are different statements. So are "newly mapped earthwork" and "lost city".

The discipline advances by making the argument vulnerable to the next trench, date, inscription or image.

The Myth Arrives Before the Evidence

Lost cities rarely begin as empty questions. They begin with a name.

Atlantis, El Dorado, Troy, the cities of the plain, a vanished capital in a chronicle: the story supplies a destination before the landscape supplies a site. That can mobilise money and attention. It can also turn research into a hunt for confirmation.

Plato placed Atlantis in two philosophical dialogues written in the fourth century BCE. The island power is presented through a chain of reported narration and used within an argument about ideal and corrupted states. Later readers treated its destruction as a field report. Since then, candidates have been placed across the Mediterranean, Atlantic and beyond. A flood deposit, circular feature or volcanic island becomes persuasive because the name has already gathered every desirable quality: ancient, advanced, destroyed and concealed.

The method fails because the target can move. If a proposed site lacks one feature, the story is reinterpreted. If the date does not fit, the chronology is loosened. If the geography conflicts, a copying error or metaphor is invoked. A claim that can survive every contradiction cannot be tested. The city remains permanently almost found.

Troy was different because Hisarlik contained a large, long-lived settlement at a location that fit ancient geographical tradition, and excavation produced evidence that could be dated independently of Homer. Yet even there the myth compressed nine major layers and many rebuildings into one dramatic city. Schliemann's "Priam's Treasure" shows how quickly a label can outrun the evidence. The successful identification did not validate every Homeric detail or every object named after a character.

Myths also influence what receives funding. A suspected royal tomb attracts more attention than a field system. A city associated with gold or a famous war promises objects, headlines and visitors. Searchers may overlook ordinary settlements that lack a literary name, even when those settlements would transform understanding of population, agriculture or political

organisation. The old archaeology of lost cities was biased towards places already imagined by literate outsiders. Publicity reinforced the bias. A dramatic claim attracted patrons, permits and readers, which funded another season and generated stronger claims. The treasure story became an economic system around the search.

False certainty has a recognisable grammar. A remote image is described as unmistakable. A geometric feature is said to be impossible by nature. A local legend is treated as unchanged testimony from deep time. Several weak clues are stacked as though quantity creates independence, though each depends on the same desired conclusion. Refusal by specialists becomes evidence of a closed establishment. The last move protects the claim from the people best placed to test it.

There is a better use for myth. Treat it as historical evidence about the people who told, copied and believed it. Ask whether it preserves a place name, route, political memory or environmental event, and then test each element separately. Let the story generate hypotheses without granting it authority over dates and layers. Homer can lead researchers to Hisarlik while radiocarbon, ceramics and stratigraphy decide which settlement is being examined.

The attraction of the lost city is not a defect to be purged. Curiosity starts work. The danger comes when the desired ending chooses the evidence allowed to count.

A responsible search must be willing to find an unnamed city, or no city at all.

The Network Becomes the Map

The history of lost-city discovery has moved outward. Early excavators opened a mound to reach a room. Modern surveys begin by asking how the room connected to a settlement, and how the settlement connected to a landscape. The change repays the first idea: because a city is a system, its broadest and most durable signature may lie outside its monuments.

Aerial photography supplied the first large shift. Differences in soil moisture and crop growth can mark buried ditches and walls. Low sunlight throws shallow earthworks into relief. Images taken years apart preserve features later levelled by ploughing or construction. Satellites expanded the view, adding repeated coverage and spectral information that can distinguish soils, vegetation and moisture invisible in an ordinary photograph.

Geophysics looks below the surface without removing it. Magnetometry measures small variations caused by fired structures, ditches and disturbed soils. Electrical resistance responds to how readily current passes through wetter or drier ground. Ground-penetrating radar sends pulses into the earth and records reflections from changes in material. Each method has conditions in which it works well and conditions in which geology, moisture, depth or modern clutter overwhelms the signal.

LiDAR has become the emblem because forest once seemed to set a hard limit. An aircraft emits laser pulses and measures their return time. Many strike leaves and branches, but some reach the ground through gaps in the canopy. After classification and processing, those returns form a digital terrain model. Subtle platforms, ditches, causeways and reservoir banks can appear across hundreds or thousands of square kilometres.

At Angkor, mapping revealed that famous temples were nodes inside a vast low-density settlement tied together by water infrastructure. In northern Guatemala, a 2016 airborne laser survey covering 2,144 square kilometres mapped more than 60,000 Maya structures, along with roads, fortifications and agricultural works. In Bolivia, LiDAR exposed Casarabe centres with monumental platforms, pyramidal structures, canals, reservoirs and raised causeways. These findings did not create vanished civilisations. They changed the scale at which existing evidence could be connected.

The frontier remains active. In 2024, researchers flew 4,430 kilometres of airborne laser survey lines covering 4,497 square kilometres of Acre and Amazonas. A Nature paper published in July 2026 documented 432 earthworks, only 36 of which had been previously known. Its systematic sample and earlier data supported models of roughly 24,000 to 30,000

earthworks across the wider study area, with only a subset attributed to the earlier Aquiry tradition. The 432 observed features are measurements. The regional total is an extrapolation, and neither number is a city count.

No sensor announces “city”. Processing choices can create or hide features. Roads, forestry lines and drainage works can resemble ancient construction. LiDAR supplies shape, not date. Satellite colour supplies contrast, not ownership. Ground truth remains necessary: walking the feature, sampling soil, recording artefacts, excavating selected deposits and obtaining dates. Remote sensing makes fieldwork more targeted. It does not abolish it. Machine-learning systems can screen enormous image sets and rank likely features, but their training data inherit older survey biases. Automation accelerates selection; it does not supply historical judgement.

Finding at scale also creates risk at scale. A published coordinate can guide a research team, a developer or a looter. Newly public sites may receive protection, or they may be damaged before protection arrives. Descendant and local communities may gain evidence for heritage claims, or watch outsiders convert their landscape into data and tourism. Some databases therefore restrict precise locations.

The old hero returned with an object. The modern task is to recover relationships while preserving the place that carries them. Roads, canals, fields and house platforms bring the city back into view, but they also reveal that discovery is a form of power.

The network becomes the map. What happens next depends on who controls it.

How It Actually Works

When the city stops paying for itself

A canal silts by degrees. One missed clearance leaves less capacity for the next wet season. Water backs into the wrong district or fails to reach the last fields. Repair now costs more labour while the harvest supports fewer workers. A ruler can order another clearance, but only if the state can still gather food, tools and people. Infrastructure does not fail alone. It fails inside an argument about who must pay.

That is one route from city to former city. Others begin with a harbour, road, border or court. A river shifts away from quays. A new trade route makes an old market peripheral. War turns the farms around a capital into contested ground. Disease reduces households and tax receipts. Political rivals move the royal residence and its demand for scribes, guards, servants and luxury goods. None of these forces has to empty the place. It has to make concentration less rewarding than dispersal.

Urban systems contain buffers. Granaries cover a bad harvest. Reservoirs smooth rainfall. Walls and garrisons reduce danger. Markets draw food from several regions. Kinship and patronage move resources between households. The same complexity can transmit trouble. A state that depends on distant tribute suffers when roads become unsafe. A water network designed for one rainfall pattern can spread flood damage when maintenance weakens. A capital built around court consumption loses work quickly when the court leaves.

The end begins when enough households answer the same practical question in the same way: life is now easier elsewhere.

The leaving

Departure is labour. People decide what can travel, what can be sold, what should be hidden and what is too heavy to matter. A loom may be dismantled. Metal fittings are prised from doors. Roof beams are valuable enough to remove if time allows. Storage jars are emptied or broken. Grinding stones remain because they are heavy and replaceable. Sacred objects may be carried, buried, smashed or left in place according to belief and urgency.

The sequence produces different archaeological signatures. A household planning to move strips a building and leaves a depleted assemblage. A household expecting to return may close doors and cache goods. Flight leaves more possessions, though later scavengers can erase the difference. Officials departing a palace may remove archives and precious materials while leaving bulk records, broken sealings and administrative rubbish. Conquerors may take displayable wealth but ignore food remains, workshops and drains, which later become better evidence of urban life than the captured treasure.

Cities rarely leave together. Wealthier families have transport and contacts. Poorer residents may inherit empty rooms and abandoned materials. Rural workers who supplied the centre can stop coming without moving house. Soldiers disappear when pay ends. Priests may remain because sacred authority survives political change. Traders can use a smaller market long after royal demand has gone.

At Angkor, the shift was neither one evacuation nor one date. Land-use evidence from the core points to a decline beginning in the early fourteenth century. Political and commercial attention moved south-east towards river and maritime networks. Some infrastructure ceased to receive the labour it required. Yet occupation and ritual use continued at Angkor Wat. The metropolis lost coherence before the landscape lost people.

What enters the ground is therefore the material left after choices, not the full inventory of the living city.

Buildings become resources

Once maintenance stops, a building changes category. It is no longer a house, granary or council hall. It is shelter, quarry, field boundary, animal pen, kiln site, shrine, landmark or obstacle.

Stone cities often survive as fragments because later builders were efficient. Columns become lime. Blocks move into fortifications, churches, mosques, farmhouses and road foundations. Decorative stone may be turned inward, its carved face hidden because shape matters more than image. Roof tiles and bricks travel shorter distances. Mudbrick walls melt into platforms that later occupants level and build upon. Timber disappears fastest unless it burns, becomes waterlogged or leaves postholes and stains.

Reuse can preserve as well as destroy. A temple kept sacred may retain walls and access routes. A palace converted into housing receives repairs that keep part of it standing. A Roman arch incorporated into a later wall survives because it has work to do. At the same time, later occupation cuts pits, floors and drains through earlier deposits. The site becomes a palimpsest in which one period protects, edits and obscures another.

This is why an empty-looking ruin can have a crowded afterlife. Farmers cultivate former plazas because the ground is level. Workshops move into abandoned public buildings where walls and space are available. Graves cluster around remembered sacred places. Travellers camp beside wells. A district may lose urban density yet remain economically useful for centuries.

Early excavators often treated these later layers as contamination. They wanted the age named in scripture, classical literature or royal inscriptions and cleared subsequent occupation quickly. The damage was intellectual as well as physical. Removing the afterlife made abandonment look cleaner than it had been and hid the communities that carried memory across the supposed gap.

A city is rarely followed by nothing. It is followed by cheaper uses of expensive remains.

Burial, exposure and the making of a mound

Some cities become tells, the rounded settlement mounds common across the Near East. They are built by repetition. Houses of earth and brick are repaired, demolished, levelled and replaced. Rubbish fills hollows. Streets rise. Across centuries, occupation produces height. When the settlement ends, erosion softens walls and the mound can resemble a natural hill to anyone who does not know what patterned debris looks like.

Other sites are buried by events. Vesuvius covered Pompeii and Herculaneum through different combinations of ash, pumice and hot surges. Rivers bury districts beneath alluvium, then shift again. Dunes move across structures. Landslides seal slopes. Earthquakes collapse walls but often leave them exposed to later salvage. In tropical settings, vegetation can conceal surface form without depositing a thick blanket of soil.

Burial is selective. A flood preserves one bank and scours the other. Deep deposits protect lower floors while pressure crushes upper rooms. Wet soil can preserve wood by excluding oxygen, yet destroy metal or bone under other chemical conditions. Dryness preserves textiles and plant matter that disappear in temperate soils. Fire consumes timber and can bake clay hard enough to survive.

Exposure is equally active. Rain cuts channels through mounds. Roots open masonry. Burrowing animals move seeds, charcoal and small artefacts. Ploughing drags material from walls into fields and can reduce a settlement to a low scatter visible only after rain. Modern construction removes deposits wholesale while creating rescue excavations that reveal what is about to be lost.

The result is not a buried plan but a transformed sample. A high wall may mark strong construction, favourable burial or the fact that later builders did not need its stone. A missing district may have been lightly built, washed away, quarried or never excavated. The physical site has to be explained before the historical city can be reconstructed.

Names without places, places without names

Memory travels on a different timetable from masonry. A city's name can remain in king lists, tax records, poems, religious texts and later histories long after its location is uncertain. Agade, also called Akkad, gave its name to an empire and a language. Ancient writers knew it. Modern archaeologists do not know its secure position. Proposals cluster around the region near the Tigris and Diyala, but the capital itself is still absent from the map.

Itjtawy presents a similar inversion. Egypt's Twelfth Dynasty was governed from a residence whose name means, in conventional translation, that the seizer of the two lands is Amenemhat. Texts place it in the political geography of the Middle Kingdom, and royal pyramids at Lisht make the surrounding area the leading candidate. Yet no excavated settlement can be identified confidently as the capital.

Elsewhere the place survives and the name slips. A large settlement may be known only by a modern village or mound name. Inscriptions can reveal ancient names, but a tablet may have been imported, archived or reused. Ancient geographers give distances that depend on routes and units open to interpretation. Rivers migrate, coastlines change and place names pass from one site to another.

Troy joined name and place through accumulation. Hisarlik fit the geography of ancient Ilion, had a deep urban sequence and produced material matching the broad periods in question. That convergence supports the identification. It does not identify one destruction layer as the war described by Homer, nor turn a Troy II hoard into the property of Priam.

This middle state is common. Archaeologists may know that a site was a major city, date its occupation and map its economy while lacking its ancient name. They may know a capital from texts while lacking its site. Lostness survives in the gap between the two records.

From extraction to context

The first major excavations of buried cities were often mining operations with antiquarian goals. At Herculaneum, work from 1738 proceeded through shafts and tunnels beneath modern settlement. Crews pursued sculptures, bronzes, painted walls and rooms likely to reward a royal collection.

Pompeii, excavated officially from 1748, offered easier open access, but valuable objects and dramatic interiors still set priorities.

The methods made sense to patrons who wanted possessions and spectacle. They were poor at preserving context. Tunnels cut through walls. Objects were removed with limited positional records. Unattractive material was discarded. Open rooms deteriorated after exposure. The excavation became a second destructive event.

Nineteenth-century work in Mesopotamia followed imperial and museum competition. Austen Henry Layard and the locally born archaeologist Hormuzd Rassam helped bring Assyrian palaces, reliefs and cuneiform tablets to international attention. Their work opened a lost political world and fed European collections. It also operated inside Ottoman territory under systems in which objects, labour and scholarly credit were distributed unequally.

At Troy, Schliemann's large trench answered one question by damaging evidence for others. He wanted the city of Homer and cut through later phases to reach the early levels he associated with it. Modern archaeology inherited both the result and the wound: Hisarlik's importance became undeniable, while parts of its sequence were irretrievably removed.

The disciplinary change was not the replacement of adventure by perfect science. It was the recognition that excavation is unrepeatable. Once a layer is removed, only the record remains. Plans, sections, photographs, samples, coordinates, context sheets and retained finds are therefore part of the evidence, not clerical additions. Small bones, seeds, slag and broken pottery can answer questions that gold cannot.

A city is reconstructed from relationships: which floor meets which wall,

which deposit filled which pit, which objects were used together, and which date belongs to which phase. The trench became a controlled test rather than a route to the object.

Seeing the city from above

Excavation gives depth and detail at a brutal price: it destroys the deposit it explains. Survey gives breadth. Archaeologists walk fields, count artefacts, map earthworks and compare distributions. Aerial and satellite images then extend the field of view far beyond what feet can cover.

A buried ditch often holds more moisture than surrounding soil, so crops above it grow differently. A buried wall can restrict roots and produce the opposite effect. Bare soil may show colour changes. Low-angle light throws slight banks and hollows into shadow. Historical photographs preserve landscapes before motorways, suburbs and intensive agriculture altered them.

Satellite sensors add repeated observation and wavelengths beyond human vision. Radar can respond to roughness and moisture and operates through cloud. Thermal images can register differences in heating and cooling. None sees through all ground. Instead, each records a physical contrast from which an archaeological cause may be inferred.

LiDAR changed forest archaeology by recording elevation at high density. At Angkor, it linked temples to neighbourhoods, roads, ponds and waterworks. In the Maya lowlands, a 2016 survey of northern Guatemala shifted the unit of analysis from individual centres to a connected landscape of households, routes, defences and cultivated ground. In the Bolivian Amazon, LiDAR revealed Casarabe settlement centres connected by raised causeways and organised around monumental platforms, canals and reservoirs.

The newest surveys make scale itself the finding. The 2026 southwest Amazon study did not expose one stone capital. It documented hundreds of geometric earthworks across survey lines and used their distribution to estimate a far larger archaeological landscape. Some features may belong to ceremonial or political centres, others to later settlements, and their

functions cannot be read from shape alone. The discovery is a population of features and the possibility of relationships among them, not a newly counted chain of cities.

This creates a new temptation: replacing the heroic excavator with the heroic sensor. The screen image can look complete long before its date and function are known.

Testing the image on the ground

A possible feature begins a chain. Analysts first check whether it repeats across data sets and whether modern maps explain it. Roads, logging tracks, drainage grids, bomb craters, geological fractures and processing errors can all produce convincing shapes. The best targets are ranked by pattern, setting, association and the likelihood that another cause fits better.

Field teams then locate the feature with survey equipment. They inspect surface form, vegetation, soil and artefact scatters. A core or small test pit may establish whether a bank is built, whether a ditch contains cultural material and how deposits accumulated. Larger excavation is reserved for questions that cannot be answered less destructively.

Dating follows the material available. Charcoal can be radiocarbon dated if its context is secure, but old wood and redeposited fragments can mislead. Pottery provides ranges based on established sequences. Soil chemistry and microscopic remains indicate activity. Pollen, phytoliths and starch can reveal plants. Human and animal remains record diet, mobility, disease and labour. Inscriptions may supply names and offices, though they rarely explain the whole settlement.

The process loops. Ground results refine the image interpretation. Features once classified as natural may prove built; apparent platforms may be geological. A model trained on verified examples can scan new terrain, but new regions require new caution. Archaeology advances through correction between scales.

Verification can also change the category. A cluster first announced as a city

may become a ceremonial landscape with dispersed residence. A “road” may be a boundary. An isolated monument may turn out to sit inside dense habitation. The honest result is sometimes smaller than the headline and more important than it.

Ground truth is where the lost-city story loses its certainty and gains a history.

Still missing

The remaining map is not a blank edged by known civilisations. It is a patchwork of well-excavated centres, sampled regions, inaccessible terrain, built-over deposits, unprocessed archives and places never surveyed for the right kind of evidence.

Some cities sit beneath modern cities. Excavation is limited to construction sites, cellars, service trenches and rare open spaces. Some lie in floodplains where river sediment is deep and settlement positions changed. Others are in conflict zones or areas where fieldwork is unsafe. Forest can be mapped from above, but dense canopy, steep terrain and cost still constrain coverage. Deserts preserve visibility yet cover immense areas.

Agade and Itjtawy remain the clean famous examples: named capitals without secure sites. Many other missing places are unnamed. Their existence is inferred from roads, agricultural capacity, administrative texts or gaps between known centres. A survey may detect a settlement whose language, political affiliation and ancient name remain unknown.

There are also thousands of candidates between discovery and understanding. LiDAR features await field checks. Known mounds have never received modern excavation. Museum drawers contain objects whose original context was poorly recorded but may be partly recovered through archives. Old aerial photographs hold traces since destroyed. New dating can divide what was once treated as one occupation into several.

The next lost city may therefore arrive as a spectacular image. It may also emerge from a notebook, a soil sample, a farmer’s report, a rescue trench or

the reanalysis of data collected for forestry. The frontier is less a line across the world than a difference in resolution.

How we know

Lost cities are reconstructed from biased survival and incomplete sampling. Stone and fired clay endure better than timber, fibre and food. Elite buildings receive more excavation and publicity than ordinary housing. Early work removed objects and layers without modern records. Written sources favour states that kept archives and periods later copyists chose to preserve.

Confidence rises when independent evidence converges: stratigraphic sequence, radiometric dates, diagnostic artefacts, inscriptions, environmental samples, topography and regional survey. Remote sensing is strongest when features repeat coherently across a landscape and fieldwork verifies selected examples. Population and total-site estimates remain models, not counts, and should be presented with their assumptions.

Local and descendant knowledge can identify places, names, uses and meanings absent from formal archives. It must be treated as evidence with its own history rather than as either infallible memory or colourful assistance.

The record improves as methods change, but excavation cannot restore what earlier excavation, looting, erosion or construction destroyed. Every account is therefore a best-supported reconstruction of a changing city from a record changed again after it ended.

What People Get Wrong

“A lost city vanishes in one disaster”

Pompeii supplies the public template: one date, one catastrophe, one buried town. It is compelling because a disaster gives a city an ending that fits on a plaque. Most urban endings are less cooperative.

Cities usually lose functions at different speeds. A royal court moves before

the last market closes. Waterworks deteriorate unevenly. Rich households leave while poorer residents reuse vacant buildings. Rural settlement may continue after monumental construction stops. Angkor's administrative core was declining before the military event once used as its final date, while Angkor Wat retained occupants and worshippers.

Even rapid destruction is followed by selection. Survivors return, looters dig, useful stone moves and later buildings cut the deposit. Pompeii itself had earthquake damage, repairs and people escaping before burial. The eruption created an exceptional archive, not the universal model of abandonment.

The correction matters because a single-cause story hides adaptation. It treats people who moved, stayed or changed livelihood as a vanished population. It also encourages modern readers to search for one drought, invasion or epidemic when urban decline usually emerges from several pressures passing through institutions and household choices.

“The jungle swallowed it whole”

The phrase makes vegetation an active conqueror and the city a complete object beneath it. Tropical plants do cover sightlines quickly. Roots damage walls, leaf litter accumulates and timber structures disappear. Yet a forest does not usually lay a uniform sealed blanket over intact streets.

Most of the transformation began before dense vegetation returned. Residents removed materials. Earth walls eroded. Farmers reused clearings. Water shifted sediments. Later communities travelled through, worshipped at or lived near surviving monuments. At Angkor, stone towers stayed visible while shallow residential mounds and waterworks became hard to read. In Amazonia, many earthworks remained as small changes in ground height rather than buried architecture.

The myth became persuasive because early explorers described hacking through vegetation towards a sudden view. The narrative cropped out guides, paths, occupied villages and everything beyond the monument. Photographs then framed the ruin against forest and made concealment

look total.

The correction changes the research question. Archaeologists do not remove jungle to reveal a frozen plan. They model how human modification, regrowth, erosion and continued use produced the present terrain. The forest can preserve earthworks from ploughing while concealing them from ground observation. It is part of the site's history, not a curtain.

“An explorer found a place nobody knew”

This is the standard discovery sentence because it supplies a named hero and a clean before-and-after. It often confuses international attention with first knowledge.

Hiram Bingham reached Machu Picchu with local guidance in 1911. Farmers lived nearby, and evidence of prior visits and knowledge existed. His expedition photographed, cleared, studied and publicised the site through powerful institutions. Those were consequential acts. They were not the first human encounter with the ruins.

Angkor's monuments remained within Cambodian religious and historical life before French colonial scholarship. Great Zimbabwe was known locally before European investigators arrived and then denied that Africans had built it. The erasure can therefore occur after a place is seen: outsiders recognise stone but refuse local authorship, terminology or authority.

The myth persists because “made legible to a foreign academy and press” lacks the emotional speed of “discovered”. It also serves ownership. The discoverer's name can attach to collections, archives and tourist history while guides, workers and descendant communities become anonymous.

The correction does not require pretending that local knowledge answered every archaeological question. It requires naming the kind of discovery involved and crediting the people who made it possible.

“The monument is the city”

Stone temples, palaces, walls and pyramids dominate because they survive, attract excavation and carry official inscriptions. They are also the part of a city least representative of where most people lived.

Angkor Wat is a monument. Greater Angkor was a settlement landscape of neighbourhoods, fields, reservoirs, canals, roads and smaller religious sites extending far beyond the famous enclosure. Maya centres similarly included extensive low-density residence, agriculture and connecting infrastructure. At Great Zimbabwe, the stone walls drew attention while surrounding houses, production and exchange made the centre work.

The mistake has a material cause. Ordinary buildings were often made from wood, thatch and earth. Their traces are postholes, shallow platforms, compacted floors, artefact scatters and altered soils. Early excavators preferred sculpture and architecture; tourist routes reinforced the preference. A ceremonial centre could then be described as isolated in empty wilderness.

The correction matters for scale and politics. It restores labour, provisioning and ordinary households to the urban account. It can turn a temple complex into one node of a much larger city and replace the fantasy of a small priestly enclave with evidence of dense regional organisation. The city is the system that made the monument possible.

“A famous name proves the identification”

A literary name gives a ruin significance before excavation begins. That is why it is dangerous. Troy, Atlantis and biblical cities have attracted claims in which resemblance becomes proof.

Hisarlik is securely identified with ancient Ilion because geography, settlement sequence, later inscriptions and historical tradition converge. Schliemann's gold hoard did not strengthen that case by belonging to Priam. It came from Troy II, centuries earlier than the Late Bronze Age setting normally considered for a historical background to Homer's war. The label

made the object memorable and chronologically false.

A site can fit one clue by chance. A destruction layer is common in long-lived cities. A large wall does not identify a king. A place name can migrate. An inscription may have travelled. Strong identification requires several independent lines of evidence and a chronology that works without stretching.

The reverse is equally important. Agade and Itjtawy are well-attested names whose exact sites remain missing. Textual certainty does not force the ground to disclose a location.

The correction protects archaeology from becoming illustration. A famous story may guide the search, but the site must be allowed to contradict it.

“A satellite image is an archaeological discovery”

Remote images are powerful because they show patterns a person cannot see from the ground. They are also easy to overread. A square, circle or straight line feels designed, and a processed image can make contrast look like certainty.

Satellites, aerial photographs and LiDAR record physical signals. They do not date them, name their builders or decide their function. A line may be an ancient road, modern drainage, a logging track, geology or an artefact of data processing. LiDAR can model ground form beneath vegetation, but classification choices determine which returns are treated as ground.

Professional work checks several data sets, historical maps and modern land use, then sends teams to inspect selected targets. Soil, artefacts, stratigraphy and datable material test whether the feature is archaeological and when it formed. Geophysics adds another layer of physical contrast, not an automatic answer.

The myth grew with press images captioned as hidden cities. The image is often the beginning of years of verification.

The correction does not diminish remote sensing. It explains why the

method is trustworthy. A potential feature becomes a discovery when its interpretation survives contact with the ground.

“There are no lost cities left”

Most famous ruins are on maps, which creates the impression that the age of discovery ended with pith helmets. The remaining work is supposed to be detail.

Agade and Itjtawy show otherwise. Both were major capitals known from texts, and neither has a securely identified urban site. Modern cities cover ancient ones. Floodplains bury settlements under metres of sediment. Forest, conflict, cost and access leave large regions lightly surveyed. Known mounds may never have received modern excavation.

Remote sensing is adding evidence faster than field teams can test it. The 2026 LiDAR survey in southwest Amazonia documented 432 earthworks across its coverage, most previously unrecorded, and modelled a far larger regional total. That result expands the archaeological landscape without making 432 claims of urban status. Maya and Casarabe surveys have likewise converted apparent gaps into connected landscapes. Many features are found in one sense and still missing in another: undated, unnamed and unexcavated.

The misconception survives because discovery is imagined as one spectacular city with gates and treasure. Much of the frontier consists of modest settlements, field systems, roads and house platforms whose combined pattern changes history.

There are fewer blank spaces on the map. There are still enormous gaps in what the marks mean.

Use It

Follow the flows

When a ruin, abandoned district or failing city is presented as a collection of buildings, ask what movements kept it working. Where did water come from? Which routes brought food and fuel? Who organised maintenance? What work drew people into the centre, and what made them remain close enough to depend on it?

This lens changes causation. A cracked wall is visible; a lost tax base is not. A dry reservoir may reflect weather, neglected repair, political conflict or all of them in sequence. A court moving fifty miles can remove demand from workshops without destroying a house. A harbour silting can make excellent buildings irrelevant.

It also corrects scale. The city may extend into fields, roads, canals, quarries and satellite settlements that do not look urban. If those connections are ignored, the monument appears self-sufficient and collapse becomes mysterious. Follow the flows and the city becomes a working system whose strengths and failure points can be named.

Separate place, name and memory

Treat these as three records rather than one. A physical site can survive while its ancient name is unknown. A name can survive in texts while the site is missing. Memory can preserve use, sacred association or a route without preserving a modern historical chronology.

This distinction prevents false discovery claims. Before saying a place was lost, ask who knew the location, who used it, who recorded it and which audience lacked the connection. “Unknown to European scholarship”, “not securely identified with its ancient name” and “unrecognised as a large urban landscape” describe different situations.

The lens works beyond archaeology. Institutions often confuse loss from an official database with loss from the world. A practice can persist in local

memory after records vanish; an archive can preserve a name after the living system has gone. Accuracy begins by naming the broken connection instead of declaring total absence.

Look past the monument

The object that survives best is rarely the object that represents life best. Stone walls, royal inscriptions and tomb goods pull attention towards rulers, ritual and exceptional materials. Ask what had to exist around them.

A temple required food, transport, crafts, cleaning, repair and people who knew the calendar and rites. A palace required kitchens, stores, guards, records, animal fodder and routes for tribute. A city wall required labour and a reason to defend what lay inside. The ordinary evidence may be a spread of pottery, a drain, a worn threshold, seeds in a hearth or chemical changes in soil.

This lens makes impressive sites more impressive by showing their cost. It also prevents the ceremonial centre from swallowing the city. Whenever a discovery report leads with one building, look for the survey map. The map may show that the building was the visible tip of a settlement whose houses have become almost nothing.

Ask what survival selected

Evidence is a filtered remainder. Before drawing conclusions from what is present, identify the filters.

Portable valuables are removed during planned departure and targeted by looters. Stone is reused. Wood and textiles decay in many soils. Fire preserves some plant remains while consuming others. Early excavators kept displayable objects and discarded plain pottery, bone and sediment. Museum collections preserve what laws, patrons and shipping allowed to travel.

Then ask what the missing material would have shown. An apparent shortage of tools may reflect removal rather than lack of craft. Few ordinary houses may reflect perishable construction rather than a small population. A

silent archive may reflect writing on decayed material. The question is not an invitation to invent what is absent. It is a brake on treating the surviving sample as neutral.

This habit improves any analysis based on records. Survival has causes. Those causes can imitate the historical pattern you think you have found.

Follow the discoverer's incentives

Lost-city claims are produced inside systems of reward. Expedition leaders need patrons, permits and attention. Newspapers need a recognisable name. Museums prefer objects that draw visitors. Governments may want proof of national antiquity, tourist income or control over land. Local communities may seek protection, jobs, recognition or privacy.

None of those interests makes a claim false. They change which claims are likely to be made loudly. A “palace” travels further than a domestic platform. A famous biblical or classical name attracts more funding than an unnamed settlement. A remote-sensing team may be rewarded for scale, while a heritage authority must worry about publishing exact coordinates.

Read the headline, then inspect the institutional chain. Who paid, who owns the data, who issued the permit, who receives objects, who appears as author, and who bears the cost of tourism or restriction? Discovery is knowledge, publicity and allocation at once.

The best research makes those arrangements visible rather than pretending the evidence arrived without people.

Demand ground truth

A striking image should increase curiosity and lower confidence at the same time. Ask what physical signal produced it, what else could produce the same pattern, and what test reached the ground.

For LiDAR, find out whether the feature is a classified terrain form or a verified archaeological structure. For satellite imagery, ask which wavelength and contrast mattered. For geophysics, ask about soil, depth

and modern interference. Then look for field survey, artefacts, stratigraphy and dates.

Ground truth is not a ceremonial visit after the discovery. It can overturn the interpretation. A road becomes a boundary, a mound becomes geology, or a supposed isolated temple becomes one part of a dense settlement. The correction is evidence that the method is working.

Use graded language while the chain is incomplete: anomaly, possible feature, probable human construction, dated site, identified city. Strong claims should be the end of verification, not the caption placed under the first image.

The limits

Lost cities do not offer a clean manual for saving modern ones. Ancient populations, technologies, states and climates were different.

Archaeological evidence often resolves sequence more securely than motive. A decline in maintenance can be measured without revealing every political calculation behind it. Population estimates may depend on assumptions about house use, household size and contemporaneity.

The language of resilience can also become cruel. People adapting after a city fails may have survived through displacement, hunger, violence or loss of status. Calling the wider society resilient does not describe their experience. Nor does continued occupation prove that political collapse was mild.

Remote sensing expands coverage but does not remove bias. Wealthy projects map some regions at exquisite resolution while others remain under-studied. Algorithms learn from previously labelled sites and can reproduce the forms archaeologists already expect. Excavation remains destructive, and publication can expose locations to looting.

Finally, “lost city” is a public category, not a precise archaeological type. It can gather attention for valuable work and distort that work towards spectacle. Use the phrase, but make it answerable to the evidence.

The one thing to keep

Keep the broken connection.

When a city is called lost, do not picture a complete object waiting in darkness. Ask which connection failed. Did people stop maintaining the urban system? Did buildings decay into terrain? Did a name become detached from its place? Did official history ignore local knowledge? Did investigators see monuments but miss the settlement around them?

That question changes what counts as finding. The discovery may be a dated layer that separates two occupations, a road linking distant house mounds, a farmer's place name, a canal visible in elevation data, or proof that a famous identification is wrong. None needs a golden room.

It also changes the moral order. A site is not ownerless because an international audience has not heard of it. Mapping creates obligations to protect context, credit knowledge and share authority. The moment a lost city becomes legible is the moment it becomes vulnerable to a new set of interests.

Cities disappear as systems before they disappear as stone, and they return as relationships before they return as stories. Look for the relationships. The city has been there all along in what connected the remains.

Terms

Abandonment. The reduction or ending of occupation or use at a place. It may be sudden, planned, partial, temporary or spread across generations, so it should never be assumed from emptiness alone.

Aerial archaeology. The study of archaeological traces from aircraft or airborne images. Crop growth, soil colour, shadows and relief can reveal buried or slight features invisible at ground level.

Anthrosol. Soil substantially altered by human activity. Dark earth, nutrients, charcoal, ceramics and microscopic remains can preserve evidence of settlement and cultivation after buildings have disappeared.

Archaeological context. The recorded relationship between an object, deposit, feature and surrounding evidence. Context supplies date, function and association; an unrecorded object may be attractive while historically mute.

Archaeological survey. Systematic search and recording across a landscape, often by walking, mapping, sampling and remote sensing. Survey reveals settlement distribution and connections beyond the excavated trench.

Artefact. A portable object made, modified or used by people. Pottery, tools, ornaments and coins are artefacts, but their meaning depends on context rather than rarity or price.

Assemblage. A group of objects or remains treated together because they share a context, period or activity. Patterns across an assemblage usually explain more than one exceptional find.

Chronology. The ordering and dating of events, deposits and occupation phases. Archaeologists combine relative sequence with absolute dating to prevent several centuries of urban life becoming one invented moment.

Cultural layer. A deposit formed or substantially altered by human activity, such as floor build-up, demolition rubble or occupation soil. Layers can represent repeated use rather than one event.

Dendrochronology. Dating by matching patterns of annual tree-ring growth to established regional sequences. Where preserved timber and reference data exist, it can identify the exact year a tree was felled.

Excavation. Controlled removal and recording of deposits to answer defined questions. Because excavation destroys the context it exposes, plans, sections, samples, photographs and records become the surviving evidence.

Feature. A non-portable trace of human activity, such as a wall, pit, ditch, hearth, posthole or road. Features are understood through shape, fill, relationships and associated material.

Geographic information system. Usually shortened to GIS, software that stores and analyses spatial data in linked layers. It allows sites, terrain, water, routes and finds to be compared across scale.

Geophysics. Non-invasive measurement of physical properties below the ground. Magnetism, electrical resistance and radar reflections can map buried contrasts, though interpretation depends on soil, geology and modern disturbance.

Ground truth. Field evidence used to test an interpretation made from imagery, models or geophysical data. Inspection, artefacts, cores, samples and excavation can confirm, refine or reject the proposed feature.

Ground-penetrating radar. A method sending electromagnetic pulses into the ground and recording reflections from material boundaries. It can estimate depth and shape but performs poorly in some wet or conductive soils.

LiDAR. Light detection and ranging, which measures laser return times to build dense three-dimensional models. Airborne LiDAR can recover ground topography through canopy gaps without identifying age or function by itself.

Magnetometry. Measurement of small magnetic variations in soil. Burning, ditches, kilns and disturbed deposits can produce patterns, but metal clutter and geology may obscure archaeological signals.

Midden. An accumulation of discarded food remains, broken objects, ash and other household waste. Middens are valuable records of diet, craft, trade and repeated ordinary activity.

Palimpsest. A surface or deposit containing traces from several periods that overlap, erase and reuse one another. Urban sites are often palimpsests rather than clean snapshots.

Photogrammetry. The creation of scaled three-dimensional models from overlapping photographs. It records trenches, buildings and landscapes accurately and allows measurements after the physical exposure has changed.

Provenance. The documented ownership and collecting history of an object after discovery. Provenance helps establish legality, authenticity and movement through dealers, museums and private collections.

Provenience. The precise archaeological find location and context of an object. The distinction from provenance matters because lawful ownership history cannot recover a deposit destroyed by looting.

Radiocarbon dating. Estimation of age from the decay of carbon-14 in once-living material. Results require calibration, appropriate samples and secure context; they date the sampled organism, not automatically a nearby wall.

Remote sensing. Gathering information without direct physical contact, using aerial photographs, satellites, LiDAR or geophysical instruments. It expands coverage and guides fieldwork but produces interpretations rather than self-verifying discoveries.

Resistivity. A geophysical method measuring resistance to electrical current in the ground. Stone, voids, wetter ditches and soils can differ, creating patterns that may reflect buried structures.

Site formation processes. The human and environmental actions that create, move, preserve or destroy archaeological evidence. Abandonment, reuse, erosion, flooding, roots, looting and excavation all alter the record.

Stratigraphy. The study of the sequence and relationships of layers, cuts and structures. Later deposits generally overlie earlier ones, but pits, rebuilding and redeposition make the sequence something to demonstrate.

Tell. A settlement mound created by repeated building, occupation, demolition and levelling, especially where earth construction is common. Its rounded form may conceal many cities stacked through time, each rebuilding the ground for the next.

Taphonomy. The study of what happens to organic remains between death or discard and recovery. Decay, burning, scavenging, chemistry and burial determine which bodies, plants and foods survive.

Go Deeper

The best thematic continuation

Annalee Newitz, *Four Lost Cities: A Secret History of the Urban Age* (W. W. Norton, 2021). Newitz follows Çatalhöyük, Pompeii, Angkor and Cahokia through growth, ordinary life, abandonment and later interpretation. The selection is narrow enough to stay readable and broad enough to break the habit of treating every urban ending as the same collapse. Read it for people inside cities rather than for a catalogue of ruins. Its modern lessons are openly argued, so keep testing where analogy ends and evidence begins. The reward is a rare account in which urban departure belongs to households as well as rulers.

The history of the discipline

Brian Fagan, *A Little History of Archaeology* (Yale University Press, 2018). Forty short chapters move from antiquarian collecting and spectacular excavation towards survey, scientific dating and modern heritage practice. Fagan is especially good on the mixed inheritance of the field: real intellectual advances produced by ambitious, destructive and sometimes admirable people. This is the most inviting next book for a reader who wants to understand how archaeological standards changed. It ranges far beyond cities and moves quickly, which is its purpose rather than a weakness. Use its sequence to see why recording a plain potsherd became as important as recovering a statue.

The technology changing the map

Sarah Parcak, *Archaeology from Space: How the Future Shapes Our Past* (Henry Holt and Company, 2019). Parcak explains satellite archaeology from inside the work, including image selection, pattern recognition, field verification and the gap between a promising signal and a secure interpretation. The book combines method with expedition narrative and gives remote sensing the excitement it deserves without pretending that excavation has become obsolete. Read it after this book's LiDAR examples to see how different sensors, landscapes and research questions alter what can be detected. Parcak also shows the institutional work between a promising pixel and a defensible archaeological claim.

The primary discovery narrative

Austen Henry Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains*, two volumes (John Murray, 1849). Layard's account helped restore Assyria to nineteenth-century historical consciousness and became a publishing sensation. It also displays the expeditionary, biblical and imperial frame in which early Near Eastern archaeology operated. Read it for the immediacy of excavation before modern recording, then ask who supplies labour, knowledge and permission, where the objects go, and which destruction is treated as acceptable. The book is long, dated in language and morally uncomfortable. That is why it belongs here. Pair its confidence with a modern history of archaeology and watch the boundary between recovery and possession move.

Notes and Sources

The notes follow the order of the book. Dates and measurements are stated only where they materially support the argument. Current digital sources and the 2026 Amazonian study were checked on 11 August 2026.

Sources for the opening pages

Cities as systems. The definition used here follows recent comparative urban archaeology rather than a single density or masonry threshold. Manuel Fernández-Götz and Michael E. Smith review cities as concentrations of people, institutions and activities maintained through wider relationships, while stressing the diversity of premodern urban forms. Their account supports the distinction between an urban system and the monumental fabric that survives it.

Abandonment and transformation. Catherine M. Cameron and Steve A. Tomka's edited volume remains a basic treatment of abandonment as a process that changes the material record through planned departure, rapid flight, reuse and later return. Lisa J. Lucero, Roland Fletcher and Robin Coningham develop the related idea of urban diaspora for dispersed agrarian cities. The book therefore avoids using collapse as a synonym for disappearance.

Remote sensing and urban scale. The Maya figures come from Marcello A. Canuto and colleagues' 2018 *Science* paper: a 2016 airborne laser survey over 2,144 square kilometres in northern Guatemala identified more than 60,000 ancient structures and extensive infrastructure. The Casarabe example comes from Heiko Prümers and colleagues' 2022 *Nature* paper on low-density urbanism in the Bolivian Amazon. Angkor is supported by Damian Evans and colleagues' mapping studies of 2007 and 2013.

Agade and Itjtawy. The Metropolitan Museum of Art's *Art of the First Cities* treats Agade as the still-unlocated capital of the Akkadian Empire, probably in the broad Tigris-Diyala region. Nadine Moeller discusses Itjtawy as the unlocated Twelfth Dynasty residence, with the Lisht area the leading geographical context. Neither case justifies a precise point on a modern map.

Sources for the seven Core Ideas

1. A City Is a System Before It Is a Ruin. Fernández-Götz and Smith provide the comparative framework. For Angkor's low-density settlement, water infrastructure and dispersed occupation, see Evans et al. 2007 and 2013. The argument that monuments can invert the social proportions of a city is a synthesis from survey archaeology and site-formation research rather than a claim that perishable housing leaves no evidence.

2. Abandonment Is Usually a Process. Cameron and Tomka supply the general abandonment framework. Dan Penny, Tegan Hall, Damian Evans and Martin Polkinghorne found declining land-use intensity in Angkor's urban core beginning before the conventional fifteenth-century terminal narrative. Alison K. Carter and colleagues found continued occupation and ritual activity at Angkor Wat, supporting the distinction between loss of metropolitan coherence and complete desertion.

Pompeii as an exceptional sample. The eruption date is AD 79. The claim that Pompeii is not a perfect still image reflects pre-eruption earthquake damage, repair, escape, post-eruption disturbance and the selective survival of material. The Archaeological Park of Pompeii dates Bourbon excavation at Pompeii to 23 March 1748. The J. Paul Getty Museum's history of the Villa dei Papiri describes systematic exploration at Herculaneum from 1738 and the use of shafts and tunnels to recover material for royal collections.

3. The Ground Rewrites What Is Left. Michael B. Schiffer's *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record* is the main theoretical source for cultural and environmental processes that create, move, preserve and destroy evidence. The descriptions of erosion, redeposition, reuse, roots, burrowing, corrosion and later construction are standard archaeological applications of that framework. A coin supplies a terminus post quem for a deposit only when its context is secure; it does not date every nearby structure.

4. Lost to Whom? Mark Rice's *Making Machu Picchu* supports the

distinction between Hiram Bingham's international mobilisation of the site in 1911 and first human knowledge of it. The argument does not deny the consequence of his expedition, photography and publicity. For Great Zimbabwe, the UNESCO World Heritage description and the work of Shadreck Chirikure and colleagues support African authorship, occupation between roughly the eleventh and fifteenth centuries, and the damage caused by colonial-era assumptions and excavation. The wording about Angkor is supported by Carter et al.'s evidence for continued life at Angkor Wat and by the documented place of the monuments in Cambodian religious history.

5. Discovery Is an Argument, Not a Sighting. Donald F. Easton's analysis of Schliemann's discovery and presentation of "Priam's Treasure" supports the warning about a real hoard receiving a false Homeric owner. The treasure belongs to Troy II and predates the Late Bronze Age contexts normally discussed in relation to a possible historical background to the Trojan War. The identification of Hisarlik with ancient Ilion rests on convergence among geography, settlement sequence, inscriptions and later tradition, not on that hoard or on proof of every Homeric episode.

Agade and Itjtawy again. Their inclusion reverses the Troy problem: securely attested names do not guarantee securely identified sites. Moeller is the principal source used for Itjtawy; the Metropolitan Museum synthesis is used for Agade.

6. The Myth Arrives Before the Evidence. Atlantis enters the record in Plato's *Timaeus* and *Critias*. The book treats it as a literary and philosophical construction that later searchers converted into a geographical target. This does not require deciding that every proposed natural event behind the story is impossible. It requires separating a source text from the later catalogue of candidate locations.

7. The Network Becomes the Map. Airborne LiDAR measures return times and can produce digital terrain models through gaps in vegetation. It does not date, name or interpret a feature by itself. Historic England's guidance on airborne LiDAR and archaeological mapping supports the operational

account. The Angkor, Maya and Casarabe examples are drawn from the field studies listed above.

Southwest Amazonia in 2026. Martti Pärssinen and colleagues reported 432 earthworks in new LiDAR documentation, of which only 36 had been previously known. Their 2024 airborne campaign flew 4,430 kilometres of survey lines covering 4,497 square kilometres. Modelling from the systematic sample and earlier evidence produced estimates of roughly 24,000 to 30,000 earthworks across the wider study area; the paper separately identifies a smaller estimated share with the earlier Aquiri tradition. The manuscript therefore treats 432 as directly documented features, the regional total as extrapolation, and urban status as a further archaeological interpretation rather than a property supplied by LiDAR. The paper was published online by *Nature* on 29 July 2026.

Sources for the operating sequence

Urban failure and household choice. No universal sequence is claimed. The discussion combines abandonment archaeology with the urban-diaspora model: maintenance can weaken, institutions can move and households can respond at different times. Climate, conflict, disease, trade and political rivalry are therefore treated as pressures working through institutions rather than as automatic single causes.

Formation and stratigraphy. Schiffer supports the general account. Stratigraphy records relationships among deposits, cuts and structures, not a simple stack untouched by later action. Excavation is destructive because removal cannot be reversed; documentation and retained samples become the means by which exposed relationships remain available for scrutiny.

Names and places. The conventional translation of Itjtawy's name is given cautiously because Egyptian royal names admit grammatical discussion. Its exact location remains unconfirmed. Agade is also called Akkad in modern English usage; the capital and the later geographical-linguistic label should not be treated as identical evidence.

From extraction to context. The Getty account documents the tunnelling

and collecting priorities at Herculaneum. The Archaeological Park supplies the 1748 date for Pompeii and describes the restricted recording culture of early Bourbon excavation. Austen Henry Layard's *Nineveh and Its Remains* is used as a primary discovery narrative. Brian Fagan's history of archaeology provides the broader disciplinary sequence. Hormuzd Rassam's contribution is retained because Assyrian archaeology was not the work of a single British excavator, though this book does not attempt a full history of museum acquisition under the Ottoman Empire.

Seeing from above. Sarah Parcak explains satellite archaeology, image interpretation and field verification from within the discipline. Historic England provides technical guidance on aerial survey and airborne LiDAR. The book uses “ground truth” in its ordinary archaeological sense: testing an image-derived or model-derived interpretation through field observation, artefacts, cores, samples, geophysics or excavation.

Still missing. Agade and Ijtawy are named examples because their textual importance is high and their positions remain insecure. The wider point is that remote sensing can find features without supplying a date, language, political affiliation or ancient name. An anomaly, a probable human feature, a dated settlement and an identified historical city are different evidential states.

How we know. The evidence hierarchy in the closing passage is methodological rather than absolute. A text can outweigh a surface pattern for one question and mislead for another. The strongest reconstructions combine independent lines of evidence and make uncertainty explicit where it changes identity, chronology or causation.

Sources for the misconceptions

Sudden disappearance. Pompeii is retained as the exceptional archive, not a universal model. The correction draws on Cameron and Tomka, Lucero et al., Penny et al. and Carter et al.

The jungle as curtain. The forest can conceal slight relief from ground observers and protect it from some kinds of disturbance. It can also be an

inhabited, managed and historically changing landscape. The Angkor and Amazonian studies support the shift from isolated monuments to settlement networks. The wording deliberately avoids presenting tropical landscapes as empty before archaeological detection.

Discovery and credit. Rice supports the Machu Picchu case. UNESCO and the Great Zimbabwe scholarship support the distinction between seeing ruins and accepting African authorship. Local knowledge is not treated as automatically complete or archaeologically sufficient; it is treated as evidence and labour that must not be erased from the discovery account.

Monument versus city. Angkor and the Maya lowlands are the central cases. The stone monument survives by material and institutional selection, while ordinary settlement may survive as platforms, postholes, artefact scatters and altered soils.

Famous names. Easton supports the Priam's Treasure correction. Plato supplies the primary Atlantis texts. Agade and Itjtawy demonstrate the reverse problem of names without identified ground.

Remote images. Parcak and Historic England support the claim that imagery produces candidates and spatial evidence, not self-authenticating discoveries. Modern roads, drainage, geology, forestry and processing effects can imitate archaeological regularity.

Work still remaining. The 2026 Pärssinen study is the current quantified example. Its authors restrict exact locations in some Indigenous territories, illustrating why a known feature may properly remain absent from a public map.

Sources for the practical lenses

The six lenses are editorial deductions from the evidence rather than archaeological rules claimed by one source. “Follow the flows” derives from comparative urbanism. “Separate place, name and memory” follows the contrast among Troy, Agade, Itjtawy, Machu Picchu and Great Zimbabwe. “Ask what survival selected” derives from formation-process research. “Follow the discoverer's incentives” draws on the history of excavation, collecting and publicity. “Demand ground truth” follows remote-sensing practice.

Protection and confidentiality. Archaeological context is non-renewable. Looting can preserve an object while destroying the relationships that make it evidence. The United States National Park Service's summary of the Archaeological Resources Protection Act notes that precise locational information may be withheld when disclosure risks harm. The Society for American Archaeology's ethical principles and UNESCO's 1970 Convention supply the wider professional and international framework. These sources do not settle every ownership dispute, but they support the duties to document, protect and avoid creating a looting map.

Terminology

The technical definitions follow standard archaeological usage.

“Provenience” means an object's precise find location and context; “provenance” describes its later ownership and collecting history. “LiDAR” is retained in the familiar mixed-capital form used in the manuscript. “Tell” is used for a settlement mound produced through repeated construction and levelling, not for every archaeological mound. Radiocarbon dating is described as dating the sampled once-living material, because association with a wall or event must be established separately.

Further reading

Publication details for all four recommendations were checked against publisher or library records. Layard's two-volume 1849 edition is recommended as a primary narrative, not as a reliable modern synthesis. Its value lies partly in reading its confidence, assumptions and acquisition context against Fagan's later disciplinary history.

Bibliography

Primary sources and original research

Canuto, Marcello A., Francisco Estrada-Belli, Thomas G. Garrison, Stephen D. Houston, Mary Jane Acuña, Milan Kováč, Damien Marken, Philippe Nondédéo, Luke Auld-Thomas, Cyril Castanet, David Chatelain, Carlos R. Chiriboga, Tomáš Drápela, Tibor Lieskovský, Alexandre Tokovinine, Antolín Velasquez, Juan C. Fernández-Díaz and Ramesh Shrestha. "Ancient Lowland Maya Complexity as Revealed by Airborne Laser Scanning of Northern Guatemala." *Science* 361, no. 6409 (2018): eaau0137. doi:10.1126/science.aau0137.

Carter, Alison K., Miriam T. Stark, Seth Quintus, Yijie Zhuang, Hong Wang, Piphal Heng and Rachna Chhay. "Temple Occupation and the Tempo of Collapse at Angkor Wat, Cambodia." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, no. 25 (2019): 12226-12231. doi:10.1073/pnas.1821879116.

Chirikure, Shadreck, Mark Pollard, Munyaradzi Manyanga and Foreman Bandama. "A Bayesian Chronology for Great Zimbabwe: Re-Threading the Sequence of a Vandalised Monument." *Antiquity* 87, no. 337 (2013): 854-872. doi:10.1017/S0003598X00049516.

Chirikure, Shadreck and Innocent Pikirayi. "Inside and Outside the Dry Stone Walls: Revisiting the Material Culture of Great Zimbabwe." *Antiquity* 82, no. 318 (2008): 976-993. doi:10.1017/S0003598X00097726.

Easton, Donald F. "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': Two

Enigmas." *Antiquity* 55, no. 215 (1981): 179-183.
doi:10.1017/S0003598X00044215.

Evans, Damian H., Christophe Pottier, Roland Fletcher, Scott Hensley, Ian Tapley, Anthony Milne and Michael Barbetti. "A Comprehensive Archaeological Map of the World's Largest Preindustrial Settlement Complex at Angkor, Cambodia." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104, no. 36 (2007): 14277-14282. doi:10.1073/pnas.0702525104.

Evans, Damian H., Roland J. Fletcher, Christophe Pottier, Jean-Baptiste Chevance, Dominique Soutif, Boun Suy Tan, Sokrithy Im, Darith Ea, Tina Tin, Samnang Kim, Christopher Cromarty, Stéphane De Greef, Kasper Hanus, Pierre Bâty, Robert Kuszinger, Ichita Shimoda and Glenn Boornazian. "Uncovering Archaeological Landscapes at Angkor Using Lidar." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110, no. 31 (2013): 12595-12600. doi:10.1073/pnas.1306539110.

Layard, Austen Henry. *Nineveh and Its Remains*. 2 vols. London: John Murray, 1849.

Pärssinen, Martti, et al. "Over 20,000 Precolonial Earthworks in the Southwest Amazonia." *Nature* (published online 29 July 2026).
doi:10.1038/s41586-026-10835-7.

Penny, Dan, Tegan Hall, Damian Evans and Martin Polkinghorne. "Geoarchaeological Evidence from Angkor, Cambodia, Reveals a Gradual Decline Rather than a Catastrophic 15th-Century Collapse." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, no. 11 (2019): 4871-4876.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1821460116.

Plato. *Timaeus and Critias*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Introduction and notes by Andrew Gregory. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Prümers, Heiko, Carla Jaimes Betancourt, José Iriarte, Mark Robinson and Martin Schaich. "Lidar Reveals Pre-Hispanic Low-Density Urbanism in the Bolivian Amazon." *Nature* 606 (2022): 325-328.
doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04780-4.

Modern works

Cameron, Catherine M., and Steve A. Tomka, eds. *The Abandonment of Settlements and Regions: Ethnoarchaeological and Archaeological Approaches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Fagan, Brian. *A Little History of Archaeology*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Fernández-Götz, Manuel, and Michael E. Smith. "The Archaeology of Early Cities: 'What Is the City but the People?'" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 53 (2024): 231-247. doi:10.1146/annurev-anthro-041222-094823.

Historic England. *Using Airborne Lidar in Archaeological Survey*. Swindon: Historic England, 2018.

Lucero, Lisa J., Roland Fletcher and Robin Coningham. "From 'Collapse' to Urban Diaspora: The Transformation of Low-Density, Dispersed Agrarian Urbanism." *Antiquity* 89, no. 347 (2015): 1139-1154. doi:10.15184/aqy.2015.51.

Moeller, Nadine. *The Archaeology of Urbanism in Ancient Egypt: From the Predynastic Period to the End of the Middle Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Newitz, Annalee. *Four Lost Cities: A Secret History of the Urban Age*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2021.

Parcak, Sarah. *Archaeology from Space: How the Future Shapes Our Past*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2019.

Rice, Mark. *Making Machu Picchu: The Politics of Tourism in Twentieth-Century Peru*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018.

Schiffer, Michael B. *Formation Processes of the Archaeological Record*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987.

Institutional sources and guidance

Archaeological Park of Pompeii. "New Excavations in Regio V." 2018. Accessed 11 August 2026.

J. Paul Getty Museum. "Buried by Vesuvius: Treasures from the Villa dei Papiri." Accessed 11 August 2026.

Metropolitan Museum of Art. *Art of the First Cities: The Third Millennium B.C. from the Mediterranean to the Indus*. Edited by Joan Aruz. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2003.

National Park Service. "Legal and Ethical Responsibilities." Updated 9 July 2024. Accessed 11 August 2026.

Society for American Archaeology. "Principles of Archaeological Ethics." Accessed 11 August 2026.

UNESCO. *Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property*. Paris, 1970.

UNESCO World Heritage Centre. "Great Zimbabwe National Monument." Accessed 11 August 2026.