PART I

HISTORY AND PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER 1

Historical antecedents to archaeological resource management

A definitive – or indeed reasonably complete – history of archaeological resource management (ARM) that goes beyond the specifics of individual territories has yet to be written. So far as broader histories of archaeology are concerned (e.g., Daniel 1978; Daniel and Renfrew 1988; Trigger 1989; 2006; Schnapp 1996), the management and preservation of remains generally form a minor element in a broadly evolutionary intellectual history. ARM appears more prominently in national stories of archaeological endeavour as well as forming the content of more focused research. Useful – albeit brief – overviews often preface discussions of national ARM practice (see, e.g., papers in Cleere 1984a; papers in Pickard 2001b; Pugh-Smith and Samuels 1996, 3–7) and occasionally form complete contributions in others (e.g., Boulting 1976; papers in Hunter 1996; Fowler 1986; Knudson 1986). Where specific papers are written on aspects of the history of ARM, they either tend to focus on particular moments (e.g., Chippindale 1983; Saunders 1983; Twohig 1987; Chapman 1989; Murray 1990; Evans 1994; Firth 1999) or are designed to support a particular view of archaeology (e.g., Carman 1993; Kristiansen 1996).

This chapter and the two that follow do not claim to offer the definitive global history that the field perhaps requires and deserves, but they do hopefully represent the first outlines of what such a history might look like. The history of ARM is interesting: more interesting, perhaps, than previous attempts at partial history have often made it appear. The aim of this chapter is therefore to provide not only a narrative of key moments within the emergence of the ARM idea but also a rough outline of a Foucauldian 'archaeology' (as in Foucault 1970; 1972; 1977) or a Nietzschean genealogy (as in Nietzsche 1899) of the notions that came together to create the global system of ARM that we see today. This is approached from the perspective that ARM as we know it was not necessarily the intention of those who first

3

created mechanisms to preserve objects from the past; indeed, it proceeds
from the idea that this is exactly what they did not intend at all.

In contrast to much of the rest of the book – which will focus inevitably on
what is common across territorial boundaries in the practice of ARM – this
chapter will celebrate the diverse origins of what is now ARM in different
countries, under different regimes and at different times. Although orga-
nised roughly chronologically – with the earliest instances of ARM-like
practices first – it is, more importantly, organised thematically, to show the
different ideologies and contexts within which the idea grew, and some of
the historical processes that have contributed to its rise. The culminating
section of this chapter is not the emergence of a universal ARM, because the
emergence of a large measure of global agreement on how we should
preserve our material pasts is more properly the topic of the next chapter,
which brings us to our own time, but instead consists of one distinctive
contribution to the rise of the idea that we should do so. This in turn has
become one of the most influential national 'strands' of ARM – one that
has contributed much to the field – but it is doubtful that this was intended
at the time. This inherent 'nationalism' of the field is itself an important
element in ARM as it has developed, and derives directly from its diverse
historical origins, but it is still a potent force in the way ARM is practised,
despite the global acceptance of common practices and principles.

Speaking of common principles, it can be noted here that general
histories of archaeology (e.g., Trigger 1989, 27–31; 2006, 40–48; Barker
1999; Schnapp 1996, 13) often begin by noting that an interest in and
reverence for the past are the hallmark of many cultures. These are often
described in modern terms, so that re-dedication of a much older statue in
fourteenth-century BC Egypt is described as 'one of the oldest references to
archaeological practice' (Schnapp and Kristiansen 1999, 3) collections of
ancient objects in ancient Babylonia are identified as 'the first museum'
(e.g., Woolley 1950, 152–4) or the reconstructions of ancient temples on the
site of the original as an exercise in 'antiquarianism' (e.g., Woolley 1982,
233–59; Schnapp 1996, 13–18, 41–2). Of course, these are nothing of the kind
(see, e.g., Thomason 2005, 219–20), nor do they have any real affinity with
any interest in the past dating from more recent times in the Western world.
The collection of objects – ancient or modern – and the marking of them as
somehow special are activities carried out within the cognitive frame of a
particular time and place. It is always a cultural practice, with all that that
implies in terms of cultural specificity, contingency and contextuality: as
Evelyn Welch (2005, 4–5) has said in relation to buying and selling in
Renaissance Italy, 'far from pinpointing the start of ourselves[, it] challenges

rather than reinforces a sense of the linear transfer from past to present'. Whatever Ka Wab, King Nabonid and Princess Bel-Shalti-Nannar were doing with ancient objects (Schnapp and Kristiansen 1999; Woolley 1950; Trigger 1989, 29; 2006, 44), it was an exercise in neither museology nor ARM as we understand them. In particular, none of these acts represents the idea that preserving things from the past is an expected and normal function of political authority, supported by appropriate laws and the establishment of bureaucratic agencies to oversee it, and responsible to the citizenry as a whole; these are, instead, the hallmarks of modern ARM.

Preserving the objects and structures that come to us from the past and making decisions about how we should treat them as things that matter to us collectively is essentially a very modern idea. It is arguably one of the key characteristics of the culture in which we live: rather than being distinguished from previous and subsequent manifestations of culture by the objects we use and discard (e.g., the idea current a few decades ago that future archaeologists would designate us as 'the Coca-Cola culture' because of the ubiquity of that product and its containers), perhaps we shall instead be remembered as the culture that preserved old things (and see Fairclough 2009; Holtorf 2012). It is therefore one of the aims of this chapter to emphasise the peculiar and distinctive nature of that particular obsession of our time and its diverse origins, providing a valuable jolt to commonly held assumptions, one that will prove a useful starting point for further consideration of the ARM field as it presents itself today in the rest of the book.

The areas chosen for consideration here have been selected with some care to illustrate the origins of the elements of ARM that are covered by this book, although other combinations and sequences both are possible and would no doubt be equally enlightening. The elements of ARM of particular concern here are, especially: the grounding of preservation practice in law; systems of recording and inventory; the various types of and approaches to preservation; and issues of access. The earliest examples – late medieval Italy and early modern Scandinavia – show the emergence of the idea of preservation out of a different framework of thought, of understanding and of legitimate authority from our own. Greece and Italy in the nineteenth century represent early – and, in the case of Greece, the first in Europe – examples of the creation of a state-controlled national heritage. Britain was relatively late in the game, in many ways atypical in the field, and other European states might be more indicative of certain processes; but Britain was an Imperial state at the time of discovery of its national heritage, and the idea was not home-grown: instead it derived from the

experience of British colonial administrators elsewhere and was transported into Britain from the territories of subject peoples. Finally, the United States and Australia represent encounters with an Indigenous population whose culture was capable in the thought of the time of being treated as part of 'nature', resulting in a number of interesting, if tragic, consequences. The selection of historical examples is therefore highly Euro- and indeed rather Anglocentric, and leaves out of account large parts of the globe. Together, however, they illustrate what are arguably the main processes involved in the development and spread of the idea of preservation of the past. These did not emerge anywhere in the world as a complete package to be handed down to us; rather, they emerged haphazardly in different contexts. It behoves students of ARM to be aware of this in order that we should not fall prey to the belief that our approach to the past is the only one possible and justifiable.

Predecessors: Papal Italy, Scandinavia

In medieval Europe, the ruined past was generally something to treat with suspicion. It represented a degenerate and pagan world, at odds with established biblical authority. Earthen mounds were thought to contain treasure or demons; ruined buildings were unholy and their material ripe for secular reuse. The medieval world view (neatly summed up by Trigger 1989, 31–5, and expanded upon by Schnapp 1996, 80–118) had no need of a distant past: the people of that time imagined themselves to be locked in a present doomed to imminent replacement by divine intervention (but for a slightly more nuanced view see Trigger 2006, 48–51). There were nevertheless occasional attempts to protect ancient structures: as at Rome from 1162, reaffirmed in 1363 (Schnapp 1996, 94), or in England at Glastonbury Abbey in 1194, when the supposed burial place of King Arthur was found by monks rebuilding the great church after a fire.

Despite a general attitude that was disparaging of material from the past, the 'glorious pasts' of ancient Greece and Rome left abundant traces across the landscapes of Europe. The rediscovery of Classical literature – and increasing literacy among the wealthy laity of Italy – provided ample evidence of the superiority of ancient Republican states such as Athens and pre-Imperial Rome, an idea ripe for application in justifying new city polities and secular, non-royal government. The replacement of Gothic art and architecture, with its feudalist overtones and associations, meant the search for inspiration elsewhere, and this was found in the

forms of Classical ruins. Greek and, especially, Roman forms were there-fore copied and emulated in the new building of the merchant-prince rulers of Italian city-states. The political authority of the popes – founded, as it was, in the Christianity of the late Roman Empire – also found its expression in Classical forms and their reuse of ancient statuary and architectural features.

Part of this process was the promulgation of law to preserve ancient remains: in particular, a law of 1363 protecting ruins in Rome was reaf-firmed by Pope Pius II in 1462 and subsequently reaffirmed and recast by successors. Such regulations concentrated on banning the reuse of monu-ments for building purposes, and the administrator of antiquities was dubbed from 1573 the 'Commissioner of Treasures and other Antiquities, and of Mines' (Schnapp 1996, 123). For Schnapp (1996, 125) there was clear purpose in this: 'in putting treasures, antiquities and quarrying on the same level [of control], the papal administration revealed . . . that the control of antiquities was an instrument of power . . . because antiquities were one of Rome's resources.' As such, they were a realisable source of wealth as pre-formed building material (Welch 2005, 279) but could also be consid-ered as in some sense 'natural' since they lay within the soil. Accordingly, control over their exploitation served to emphasise the authority of the pope as a secular ruler: the fact that the rulers of Tuscany in 1571 chose to follow their lead (Pellati 1932, 31, cited in O'Keefe and Prott 1984, 35) should not come as a surprise. These laws of the popes can claim to be the first efforts to legislate the protection of ancient remains anywhere in the world, but they were not really about preserving antiquities. Instead they control access to pre-cut stone and material to make lime (Welch 2005, 279).

The same is true of Renaissance Italian collections of antiquities from exploratory excavations. Digging was frequently carried out for the purpose of creating wealth from their sale, and a market in Roman antiquities was well established by the early years of the sixteenth century (Welch 2005, 281–3). On the death of the owner, such collections would normally be broken up and distributed among heirs or sold to settle debts: accordingly, they were initially seen as just another household object (Welch 2005, 291–2). However, as the value of these collections grew, the idea of keeping them intact into the future also grew. As Welch (2005, 292) explains it, in wills 'the language of family honour would become increasingly popular as testators urged their heirs to respect the integrity of their collections . . . To the notion that . . . antiquities were "virtuous riches" that demonstrated the owner's taste and intellectual standing was attached a strong sense of family obligation.' Where such calls on family duty failed, or were likely to fail, an

alternative was the donation of the collection to the state. These were not, Welch (2005, 294) notes, donations to the city-state or its citizens but efforts to preserve the memory of the donor in the corridors of power: in at least one case, destined for a room in the Ducal Palace that the Doge of Venice would pass on his way to and from his private apartments, this term can be taken quite literally. These 'proto-museums' (as they have been called: Welch 2005, 295) were not about the material of the past as a public good but about the satisfaction of private concerns as to future memory. Where they presage our future – if indeed they do – is in the establishment of a realm of ownership where the concerns of the market do not penetrate (Carman 2005b). But they were neither public collections nor museums as we know them.

It was, however, also during this period that the first systematic surveys of archaeological remains were being carried out. Trigger's 'first archaeologist' Cyriacus of Ancona was a merchant travelling extensively in the late fifteenth century to make drawings and other records of monuments and inscriptions and, crucially for Schnapp in the development of archaeology, taking a critical attitude to interpretation (Trigger 1989, 36; Schnapp 1996, 110). However, the sixteenth century was the time of the first recognisable attempt to identify and record the monuments of Rome. In 1519 the artist Raphael urged on Pope Leo X the project of making full architectural drawings of monuments, comprising external and internal elevations as well as detailed plans (Schnapp 1996, 126), and such plans were subsequently published by a series of individuals: Ligorio in 1533, Marliano in 1534 and Bufalini in 1551 (Schnapp 1996, 341–3), among others. Such was the influence of these works that the idea of seeking out and recording monuments spread to other lands further north: in France, across Germany and to England, where, in newly founded states or where precarious dynasties had become newly established, the primary concern became one of identifying ancient origins (Trigger 1989, 45–52; Schnapp 1996, 133–53). Beyond the narrow confines of Rome the idea of recording ancient features became combined with that of travelling to seek them out: this is a true beginning of the process of inventory.

Scandinavia – divided between two rival kingdoms, Denmark and Sweden, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – was the laboratory where these trends came together to form the earliest instances of ARM as we might recognise it. Johan Bure and his assistants travelled through Sweden in the early seventeenth century collecting runic inscriptions: as tutor to the heir to the throne, Bure had access to all the conveniences and resources of official royal patronage. The same can be said of Bure's Danish

contemporary Ole Worm, who was given similar support. The underlying purpose of these surveys was to provide evidence of the antiquity of the Danes or the Swedes, especially their priority over the people of the other state. Without written evidence from the Classics, they had to rely on runic inscriptions and the investigation of landscape monuments. Although it may be too much to claim for Bure's status, as Schnapp (1996, 159) does, that 'Sweden was thus the first state to endow an archaeological service', since Bure's team was not officially an organ of the state, it is nevertheless true that much subsequent ARM practice has been based on that model. The care that was put into the work and the equal concern for publication of results represent aspects of any modern system of inventory. Out of official recognition came also the precursor to a 'national' identity, although at this stage the nationalist ideology of the nineteenth century lay in the future (Hobsbawm 1990), and the service was owed to the monarch rather than to the citizenry.

By contrast with Italy, in Sweden legislation came after the first steps towards inventory rather than preceding it. An edict concerning the protection of antiquities was issued by the Danish king, and, not to be outdone, in 1630 the Swedish monarch published a statute covering Swedish antiquities (Schnapp 1996, 176). The destruction of ancient monuments and relics was expressly forbidden by a Swedish proclamation of 1666, and in 1684 a further decree declared all ancient objects found in the ground to be the property of the Swedish crown (O'Keefe and Prott 1984, 35; Cleere 1989b, 1; Kristiansen 1989, 25). Although not the first preservation legislation, and although the fact of their regular renewal implies a level of ineffectiveness, these are the first laws that seek to place ancient remains under the control of the government and to deny them to private owners. Combined with the simultaneous creation of an Antiquaries College at Uppsala to continue the work begun by Bure and his associates, these laws also represent the earliest creation of an antiquities service as we would recognise it.

Schnapp (1996, 167–77) charts the development of the ordered collection of objects out of the Renaissance 'cabinet of curiosities', culminating in the publication in 1654 of Ole Worm's *Museum Wormianum*, collections from which would go on to form the basis for the Danish Royal Collection (Trigger 1989, 49). Typical of such assemblages, it was an eclectic mixture of the natural and the fashioned. Less typically, at least as published in book form, it was organised in a hierarchy of progression from the less 'designed' to the more: from mineral samples through vegetable material to animal forms. The major contribution comes in the section devoted to made objects, which for Schnapp (1996, 174) represents 'the first general treatise

on archaeological and ethnographic material': it is divided essentially by the kind of material the object is made from, thus separating objects out not by assumed function but by form. In developing his *Museum*, Worm largely prefigured the synthetic work of the modern archaeological scholar, who sees a programme of research from its inception through the gathering of data to its analysis and finally to publication.

By the early eighteenth century in Europe three of the key components of a modern ARM system had, in various places, been invented: legislation to preserve and protect ancient remains; a service to carry out inventory and recording; and the publication and public display of results. At this stage archaeology was not yet professionalised, had to develop many of its now 'standard' techniques and tools and was the province of a few private individuals rather than of institutions and nations. Archaeological resource management as it is understood today was thus still a long way off. These were, in particular, matters for the latter decades of the next century. But the question remains: if not ARM, what do these efforts at preserving, recording and legislating the past represent?

In the case of the northern Lutheran countries, it is an exercise deriving from international rivalry. The context is the declining influence of Denmark in northern Europe and the rise of Sweden as a major military power; a wider context is the ongoing conflict between European Protestant states and Catholic ones, in which both Sweden and Denmark were involved against Catholic German states and Spain. At the same time, 'in both [countries], the centralizing authority of the Crown was checked by an ambitious nobility . . . [and both were led by] kings who intended by the encouragement of the merchant and professional classes to subdue the aristocracy' (Wedgwood 1957, 30). Royal claims on the past can be read in this context to be an effort to assert the legitimacy of the crown over nobility, by making a connection with a deeper past: the similarity in approach in both states may be an example of 'peer polity interaction' (Renfrew 1986), driven by identical religious and political ideology and similarity of circumstance. The end result is an effort to 'outdo' each other in similar fields of endeavour, and the investigation and control of the past constitute only one of these.

Understanding late medieval and Renaissance Italy is more problematic from a modern perspective. The nascent nationalism represented by Scandinavian activity is recognisable from the perspective of the twenty-first century as something akin to our own efforts. By contrast, the apparent confusion by popes of archaeological remains with mineral resources is less easy for us to identify with. It is clearly an exercise in power and control over