



## Standing buildings and built heritage

Adrian Green & James Dixon

To cite this article: Adrian Green & James Dixon (2016) Standing buildings and built heritage, Post-Medieval Archaeology, 50:1, 121-133, DOI: [10.1080/00794236.2016.1169492](https://doi.org/10.1080/00794236.2016.1169492)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00794236.2016.1169492>



Published online: 21 Jul 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 87



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

# Standing buildings and built heritage

By ADRIAN GREEN and JAMES DIXON

*SUMMARY:* This essay examines the available archive of articles on standing buildings published in Post-Medieval Archaeology. After setting out some general trends evident in a brief analysis of the number of buildings archaeology articles published over the last 50 years, their subjects and authors, this essay places these articles in three key wider contexts: the relationship of buildings archaeology to architectural history; buildings archaeology in Post-Medieval Archaeology in an international context; and the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology's relative lack of engagement with modern buildings and contemporary built heritage.

## BUILDINGS IN POST-MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY

In relating contributions in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* (*PMA*) to the wider field of buildings archaeology, and architectural studies more broadly, there is an obvious difficulty in telling the story of a particular subtheme of post-medieval archaeology through the contributions to a journal which has not been seen as a prime venue for publication on buildings. *Architectural History* (Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain), *Vernacular Architecture* (Vernacular Architecture Group), *The Antiquaries Journal* (Society of Antiquaries of London), the *Archaeological Journal* (Royal Archaeological Institute) and the *Industrial Archaeology Review* (Association for Industrial Archaeology) have all enjoyed particular niches in the vibrant ecology of UK-based building recording and architectural study. As the outlets for specific societies, these learned journals were created by membership-based associations which represent a particularly British way of organizing the scholarly study of the built past. The UK state agencies responsible for buildings (English Heritage, Historic Scotland and Cadw) were late to the party, with English Heritage only launching its own journal for building-related research, *English Heritage Historical Review*, in 2006, while the pioneering works of the Royal Commissions on Historic Monuments were a branch of the state civil

service.<sup>1</sup> Given the complex configuration of British scholarly publication on buildings over the last 50 years, our survey reflecting on contributions to *PMA* inevitably highlights particular articles that appeared in these pages which reflect much wider trends — often, in fact, trends first appearing elsewhere, which only surfaced in *PMA* after a significant time delay.

With a field as broad as this one, it is inevitable that this essay cannot cover it all. We have chosen to focus our discussion here on three relationships: between buildings archaeology and architectural history; between the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology (SPMA), the UK and the wider world; and between the journal and the contemporary built environment. There are, of course, other ways to look at buildings archaeology within the pages of this journal, but we believe these three themes highlight the key issues covered — or neglected — to date. We begin with an overview of the archive and some general trends emerging from it, before returning to discuss some of these trends within their wider contexts.

## OVERVIEW: TRENDS AND NUMBERS

### THE FIRST TEN YEARS

As also noted by other contributors to this 50th-anniversary issue, *PMA* began with a stated coverage of

archaeological and other investigation of ‘the post-medieval period’, loosening the definition from that of SPMA’s predecessor, the Post-Medieval Ceramic Research Group, which restricted itself to the period between the Battle of Bosworth Field in 1485 and the start of industrial porcelain manufacture in the UK in 1750.<sup>2</sup> In every regard, this wide remit and aspiration to multidisciplinary study of the post-medieval period is represented in the first ten years of the *PMA* archive. Despite the predominance of household (form) studies — and a surprising number of articles on fireproofing — the journal published articles from a wide variety of disciplines, the first full article dedicated solely to buildings archaeology being ‘The reduction of fire damage in southern England, 1650–1850’ by E.L. Jones, Lecturer in Economic History at the University of Reading.<sup>3</sup> Thereafter, articles on buildings archaeology were published in what seems now to have been astonishing regularity, with 20 articles appearing in the first ten issues of the journal alone. Articles appeared also from within local history (Leicester and Aston Universities),<sup>4</sup> from lone scholars and, notably, with three examples, from the Ministry of Works.<sup>5</sup> The first article on buildings archaeology in the journal authored by an archaeologist from a university archaeology department was not published until 1973 — Professor Barry Cunliffe’s investigation of ‘Manor Farm, Chalton, Hampshire’.<sup>6</sup>

Looking across these early years of the journal, we see reflected in its buildings-archaeology-focused content a very diverse society in terms of membership — assuming that this is reflected in the authors published — but dedicated to a fairly narrow field of interest: studies of the changes in form of single households over time and into technical aspects of house-building, excepting one area study in 1972,<sup>7</sup> an article on a barracks from 1973<sup>8</sup> and a 1974 article on a farm. None of these minor variations are enough to change the conclusion that SPMA and its journal did, in this first decade, contribute widely to a very small range of topics, all based around the central skill of combining the survey of architectural structure, draughtsmanship and the incorporation of historical research into understanding chronological changes in form. We might very reasonably say here that the journal did very well — averaging between one-third and one-half of each issue — at promoting that type of research which is at the core of buildings archaeology and which is at the core of the study of the post-medieval period.

Standing out in this block of traditional articles is a 1973 article by Gwyn Meirion Jones of the City of London Polytechnic (now London Metropolitan University) assessing the changing form of the long-house in Brittany and comparing its development to English and Welsh examples.<sup>9</sup> From its earliest days, SPMA was welcoming of articles focusing on countries outside the UK, but it took a geographer to take

buildings archaeology in *PMA* beyond the archipelago and into mainland Europe.

#### GLOBAL EXPANSION VERSUS DECLINE IN VOLUME

After its first successful decade of buildings archaeology publication, *PMA* can be seen to have undergone something of a change. Between volumes 12 and 37 (1978–2003), the journal published only eighteen articles directly concerned with standing buildings — fewer than in the first ten years. Without some deep investigation, or perhaps oral history, the reasons for this apparent reduction in buildings-related contributions are not known. It seems doubtful that the journal exhausted its buildings archaeology contributors, but it also seems unlikely that such a long trough in buildings archaeology output could be the result of editorial decisions. Regardless, the change is there to be seen in the archive of published articles, and here we posit two reasons why this might have been the case.

This period of relative paucity begins with a series of four articles on households and house types, but very few thereafter, suggesting that this was an area of study that simply went out of fashion in the late 1970s. In its place, we see a new focus on colonialism, with close to half of the articles between the aforementioned dates covering either colonial settlements or fortification. The first was Pulsipher and Goodwin’s investigation of a sugar plantation on Montserrat in 1982,<sup>10</sup> followed the next year by Robinson’s article on ‘English’ houses in Moneymore, County Londonderry, one of the early archaeological articles on comparative colonialism.<sup>11</sup> Articles followed on Bermuda,<sup>12</sup> St Kitts,<sup>13</sup> Londonderry again,<sup>14</sup> Fort Charlotte<sup>15</sup> and land fortification in general.<sup>16</sup> Towards the end of the period in question, SPMA removed the dates from its stated period of interest and replaced these with the more fitting ‘post-medieval period’, making a clear allowance for the change in focus that can be seen in the journal’s buildings archaeology archive.

Also potentially important in trying to understand the nature of buildings archaeology publishing in *PMA* at this time is the build-up to and enactment of the UK’s ‘Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning’ (PPG16) in 1990. There is no need to explain that particular piece of guidance here; suffice to say that it had the effect of creating a boom in developer-funded archaeology, which started some years before its publication. Although it had a ‘sister’ document, ‘Planning Policy Guidance 15: Planning and the Historic Environment’ (PPG15), could it be the case that PPG16 had the side effect of skewing publication in *PMA* away from the buildings archaeology work that had enjoyed almost parity with excavation and material culture into the 1980s? Certainly, the guidance contained

within PPG16 was newer than that in PPG15, with the latter being an updating of earlier local planning guidance and the former, effectively, the rewriting of the structure of an entire profession. It is our contention that what we see between the late 1970s and early 2000s in the buildings archaeology archive of *PMA* is PPG16's impact on the study of post-medieval archaeology in Britain and the change in focus weighting it created (in funding and therefore in volume) in favour of excavated archaeological material. Thus, gone are the household and archive studies, along with most of the non-professional authors, to be replaced by a new post-medieval buildings archaeology dedicated to understanding buildings within the context of the colonial world and dominated by authors with academic affiliations.

### A THEORETICAL TURN

Since 2003, buildings archaeology in *PMA* has undergone something of a revival, with a rise in the frequency of published articles and yet another increase in variation of subject matter. Belford and Ross's 2004 article 'Industry and domesticity: exploring historical archaeology in the Ironbridge Gorge' marks a clear change in the nature of articles the journal published and the modes of analysis in post-medieval and historical archaeology represented therein.<sup>17</sup> In particular, it brings together the analysis of architecture, documentary records and landscape within that theme, 'domesticity', in a way not represented in the journal before. Although we may see parallels with earlier treatments of 'colonialism' as an interpretive theme, it was with this article that buildings archaeology in *PMA* can be seen to concern itself explicitly with 'understanding people through buildings', as opposed to understanding buildings within certain social contexts. The difference between those two perspectives may seem small, but it is a crucial one; after 2003, buildings archaeology in *PMA* in general moved beyond the recording of forms and the understanding of historical physical change, to a greater focus on (sometimes individual) people and the differences between groups of people represented in or expressed through built forms.

Thus, we see in this last decade or so articles on the Victorian penal system,<sup>18</sup> Bletchley Park<sup>19</sup> and an American hotel in Jerusalem,<sup>20</sup> all consciously taking on wider social or historical issues with new forms of buildings archaeology. At the same time, the expertise in understanding built forms and how they change has not gone away; rather, in articles like King's on the 'Great Rebuilding' in Norwich,<sup>21</sup> Tatlioglu's on 'Biographies of Place'<sup>22</sup> or Chappell's on 'The Bermuda House',<sup>23</sup> we see a broadening of ambition, both in what can be usefully contained within the scope of a single journal article and in what post-medieval archaeology can and should do.

Of course, these changes could not happen without building on the work of previous generations, and so we do not contend here that buildings archaeology in *PMA* has expressly changed 'for the better' or that current work outshines older pieces. Rather, we see in the archive of buildings archaeology material published by *PMA* the development over half a century of a subdiscipline starting from a necessary beginning as tightly focused yet wider in influence and breadth of contributors than it has ever been since, to a phase in which the yin of a contraction in the amount of buildings archaeology being undertaken 'at home' found its yang in the development of a global outlook and explicit inclusion of the colonial world. Finally, we see the further development of the discipline with a growing awareness of theoretical influences on interpretation and the acknowledgement of contemporary relevance and the ways in which it can change how we understand the past.

### BUILDINGS ARCHAEOLOGY AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

*PMA* has always been open to publishing the widest range of buildings archaeology studies. Early examples include studies of a 17th-century house in Faversham, Kent, in *PMA* 2;<sup>24</sup> a note on 'Haselden Hall, Wakefield' in *PMA* 3;<sup>25</sup> King Charles's Castle, Tresco, in the Isles of Scilly, for *PMA* 4;<sup>26</sup> '17th-century house plans in Hampshire and West Sussex' in *PMA* 6;<sup>27</sup> 'Manor Farm, Chalton, Hampshire' in *PMA* 7;<sup>28</sup> and Quiney on 'Hatchett's Farm, Bedfont, Middlesex' in *PMA* 8.<sup>29</sup> However, it is fair to say that *PMA* has never become a routine receptacle for architectural exegesis or building recording studies — which specialist journals, particularly *Architectural History* and *Vernacular Architecture*, have been much better placed to publish. *The Antiquaries Journal* and the *Archaeological Journal* have also been vehicles for often very full and thorough archaeological building studies. In *PMA*, studies of the grandest buildings, such as the archaeological survey of Richmond Palace in *PMA* 35<sup>30</sup> or 'Buildings analysis of Coombe Abbey, Warwickshire' in *PMA* 40:1,<sup>31</sup> have not been absent. However, comprehensive building analysis of a large house has been rare in *PMA* compared to the many studies of this kind carried by *The Antiquaries Journal*. A more notable theme, appropriate to the chronology of the journal and the conceptualization of historical periodization that underpins SPMA, is the series of articles concentrating on the development of the 'post-medieval house': from Hewett's article on 'The development of the post-medieval house' in *PMA* 7<sup>32</sup> and Kelsall's 'The London house plan in the later 17th century' in *PMA* 8,<sup>33</sup> to McCann and Johnson's note on an Essex lobby-entry

house of 1560 in *PMA* 14.<sup>34</sup> Similar in theme is Brears' article on 'Clarke Hall, Wakefield: architectural innovations in 17th-century West Yorkshire' in *PMA* 12.<sup>35</sup> The concentration of these articles on 17th-century house forms represents a distinct field of study from the architectural history of the 18th-century Georgian house or the vernacular architecture of the rural house and 'great rebuilding'. The landscape historian W.G. Hoskins' 'great rebuilding' thesis has remained central to the study of post-medieval housing: from Crummy's article on 'modernizing Essex houses in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' in *PMA* 10,<sup>36</sup> to King's account of "'Closure'" and the urban great rebuilding in early modern Norwich' in *PMA* 44:1.<sup>37</sup> Yet *PMA* has not sought to address wider debates in architectural history — or historical archaeology — about how the 17th-century 'post-medieval house' developed into the Georgian house of the 18th century.

Research articles on industrial buildings have reflected a divide in emphasis between the study of production processes (such as mills) and attention to domesticity. More innovative and integrative is Belford and Ross's exploration of 'Industry and domesticity: exploring historical archaeology in the Ironbridge Gorge',<sup>38</sup> or Belford's paper in SPMA conference proceedings, *Cities in the World*.<sup>39</sup> Newman and Newman's study in *PMA* 42:1 on 'Housing the workforce in 19th-century east Lancashire' is also notable for its attention to 'contemporary meanings' as part of an interest in elucidating experience.<sup>40</sup> The most important development in more 'theoretical' archaeology has been this focus on what might be described as the archaeology of experience — a move beyond merely recording materiality.<sup>41</sup> Yet the empirical tradition of archaeological recording remains fundamental to the discipline and publication in *PMA*. Rightly so, since empirical archaeological recording provides the only secure basis for reasoned interpretations of cultural behaviour, and only through scholarly contextualization can we identify 'meanings' in material culture. Witness the excellent example of a building analysis in, Rodwell's 'study in structural archaeology' at the Dower House, Stoke Park, Bristol, in *PMA* 42:1,<sup>42</sup> or the insights to be gained from focusing on a building structure in Hanke's analysis of 'a proto-modern roof' at Newark Castle, Port Glasgow, in *PMA* 46:1.<sup>43</sup> Also exemplary in presenting an enduring contribution to knowledge is the meticulous study of the baths at Bath by Boucher *et al.* in *PMA* 47:1,<sup>44</sup> providing an archaeological contribution to the study of this particular Georgian city.<sup>45</sup> Studies in *PMA* of post-1800 buildings have, to date, mainly focused on industrial contexts, with the notable exception of Monckton on Bletchley Park and the architecture of the government's code-breaking station in the Second World War in *PMA* 40:2<sup>46</sup> — a rare instance, thus far, of 20th-century buildings archaeology.

Rather than focusing on debates about interpretation in the study of architecture, buildings archaeology has instead developed over the past 50 years into a holistic methodological approach. In particular, this all-embracing methodology has overcome the earlier divide between vernacular architecture studies and 'polite' architectural history. The very term 'buildings archaeology' eschews an emphasis on architecture — though contained within this is a danger that archaeologists may fail to grasp the significance of architectural form and functions. When SPMA was formed in 1965, the study of buildings had been fragmented in Britain during the preceding decade by the differing scholarly traditions, priorities and, above all, class politics of architectural history versus vernacular architecture studies. In the decade before SPMA was established, the Vernacular Architecture Group, with its journal *Vernacular Architecture*, and the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, with its journal *Architectural History*, were founded in 1952 and 1956 respectively. Throughout the post-war period in Britain, especially in England, there was a divide between those who studied high architecture and the finery of the elite, and those who studied the vernacular tradition and celebrated all that was small, local and popular. Forty years on, Anthony Emery wrote in the opening pages of his *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales*, published in 1996, that post-war interest in vernacular buildings and the excavation of deserted villages had led to a profusion of — in his view — unnecessary publication:

The transactions and journals of architectural societies across the country were increasingly filled with articles on these new subjects to the extent that the pendulum has sometimes swung too far in the opposite direction. Many papers have been published on minor or even insignificant buildings, overburdened by excavation reports and finds which do not necessarily warrant the undue expense of publication that has been devoted to them.<sup>47</sup>

Thankfully, in the 21st century we have moved on from this antagonistic division between the study of high architecture and vernacular traditions. There remains a danger, however, that this new holistic approach has a flattening effect on the study of buildings. High-status buildings created by the powerful should not necessarily be treated in the same way as a place of worship, squatter's cottage or industrial housing. The very different social context, cultural practice and power relationships at stake in the construction and use of these buildings arguably requires distinct approaches to their interpretation.

SPMA has always been aware that buildings form only one part of the archaeological data set and, unlike

specialists in architectural history or vernacular architecture studies, *PMA* has provided a venue for the publication of studies on standing buildings, excavation and documentation that embrace artefacts, osteology and landscape. This gives *PMA* a rationale for promoting the study of buildings as part of archaeology, rather than a specialism which risks reifying and abstracting architecture from the wider social world in which it was created and experienced. Only by studying the archaeology of buildings in their historical context can we pin down the social and economic specifics that explain when, how and why architecture was created. Archaeology is particularly well placed to deal with buildings in relation to the historical building stock, rather than merely in relation to what still stands today. Even surviving buildings are rarely an adequate guide to their original appearance without archaeological and documentary research.

Archaeological interpretation of the standing building, and associated excavation of the site, can provide the basis for a much fuller record of how buildings appeared in the past. Witness, for example, Ryder's reconstruction of a Yorkshire hunting lodge at Oxspring in *PMA* 19,<sup>48</sup> or the terracotta architectural decoration recovered at Suffolk Place, Southwark, in *PMA* 48:1.<sup>49</sup> Wider buildings archaeology, with its twin emphasis on standing buildings and excavation, is also freed from the overwhelming concerns of many specialist architectural history organizations (such as the Georgian Group, the Victorian Society, the Twentieth Century Society or the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings) with the preservation of their particular slice of the historic built environment. Articles setting buildings in the context of place have formed a stronger contribution in *PMA*, with studies of 'The development of buildings in Witham from 1500 to circa 1800' in *PMA* 6,<sup>50</sup> and the 'Town houses in Taunton, 1500–1700' in *PMA* 8.<sup>51</sup> As valuable and important as preservation and advocacy is, *PMA* has always been an outlet for empirical research on the historical character of buildings. Archaeology is distinct from architectural history in focusing not on the comparative analysis of surviving architecture, but on investigating and reconstructing how buildings were built, developed and experienced over time.

Post-medieval archaeology also differs from traditional architectural history by situating buildings in relation to the urban landscape, planned landscapes, and estate and rural landscapes. The articles published in *PMA* over the last half-century indicate the transformation of the subject from a specific focus on buildings to a now routine attention to landscape setting. Note also the SPMA conference proceedings on *Estate Landscapes*.<sup>52</sup> Two particularly innovative articles have pointed to the potential of landscape and garden archaeology: Briggs on 'Aberglasney: the theory, history and archaeology of a post-medieval landscape'

in *PMA* 33,<sup>53</sup> and Hickman on 'The garden as a laboratory: the role of domestic gardens as places of scientific exploration in the long 18th century' in *PMA* 48:1.<sup>54</sup> As both studies demonstrate, close attention to the historical development of landscape and gardens is crucial to the successful and satisfying explanation of a site. Broader-brush landscape approaches that interpret buildings in relation to an imagined 'visitor' approaching the house, forever unfamiliar with the site and its inhabitants, are more problematic. Reconstructing the way in which 'the visitor' approached a grand building can risk generating a rather predictable interpretation of power relations that is more determined by the conceptual theory than by close empirical study of the actual building, landscape and historical context for those who lived and worked on the site.<sup>55</sup> Interpreting power and the role of structures and spaces in social relations is an important aspect of archaeology, but the best archaeology is contextual, and buildings should always be studied as they were built and experienced.

Post-medieval archaeology is but one section of a wider discipline of historical archaeology, and is by its very nature a documented archaeology. It is striking that many of the early articles in *PMA* on the study of buildings were, in fact, pieces of documentary scholarship, albeit focused on what documents reveal about past materialities. Post-medieval archaeologists should be 'loud and proud' in their use of documents for the study of buildings: documentation is too important to the study of the material past for it to be left to historians.<sup>56</sup> Among the first articles relating to buildings published in *PMA*, in the second issue, concerned 'The reduction of fire damage in southern England, 1650–1850' — a documentary study by an economic historian that usefully demonstrated the importance of fire to building survival.<sup>57</sup> *PMA* also promoted the use of probate inventories for the study of buildings, and published two important articles demonstrating the potential of inventories for the study of room use in urban housing in 1981 and 1982. Priestley and Corfield's analysis of 'Rooms and room use in Norwich housing, 1580–1730' in *PMA* 16 was especially important for signalling a new direction in building studies, attending to the use of space as well as construction.<sup>58</sup> Other articles have highlighted particular documentary sources, such as Alcock's publication of a draft and a contract for a Warwickshire timber-framed house in *PMA* 9,<sup>59</sup> Warmington's use of building accounts for "'Le Belle" Inn, Andover, 1534' in *PMA* 10,<sup>60</sup> and Tyson's 'Construction schedules for some 17th-century farm buildings in Cumbria' in *PMA* 15.<sup>61</sup> Documents deserve to be treated with the same attention to the complexity of their creation, use and deposition as settlements, buildings, artefacts and burials. *PMA* has a scholarly tradition of making the best use of documentary sources, and historical archaeologists must continue to contextualize and understand the material past

by taking note of the excellent scholarship available on sources for the study of buildings, such as probate records or the hearth tax.<sup>62</sup>

### INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

For better or worse, *PMA* is an English-language journal and has mainly served the English-speaking world. The SPMA's and the Society for Historical Archaeology's emphasis has been on an archaeology that is defined by colonialism, with the European intervention in the Americas posited as the decisive rupture that separates post-medieval archaeology from all that went before. There has been disappointingly little interaction with continental European studies of buildings and architecture, with even Meirion-Jones's typological study of 'The long-house in Brittany' in *PMA* 7 an extension of a UK approach to French material, rather than a true engagement with architectural and archaeological scholarship in Europe. For architecture, this lack of engagement with archaeological recording and interpretation is especially depressing, given the sophistication of techniques in many European countries — notably Italy, where archaeologists have for decades developed innovative methods for recording and understanding their classical and Renaissance architectural heritage.<sup>63</sup>

More firmly rooted in the Anglosphere, *PMA* has been more closely engaged with North American archaeology. Surprisingly few studies of mainland America have appeared in the journal apart from the Jamestown volume (40:1), the paper on the Williamsburg carpenters' yard in *PMA* 47:1 and a clutch of articles on the Caribbean,<sup>64</sup> all of which represent the extension of post-medieval archaeology approaches overseas, rather than a truly internationalist archaeology. Aside from an isolated article on a fulling mill in Turkey in *PMA* 11,<sup>65</sup> the only research on architecture in the Middle East is focused on the American colony in Jerusalem in *PMA* 45:2.<sup>66</sup> Arguably, this is further evidence of *PMA* as the outlet for research within an essentially UK/US frame. The editorial policy of *PMA*, as a journal that aspires to be international, reflects a particularly English tendency to suppress nationalism by replacing it with post-imperial claims to international relevance. The tensions within the coverage of Britain and Ireland should also be confronted; most published research in *PMA* concerns England, occasionally Wales and rarely Scotland, looking to Ireland as a stepping stone to engagement with the archaeology of colonization and cultural entanglements in North America. There is a larger global context for historical archaeology, albeit one predominantly rooted in North America, South Africa and Australia. Archaeologists in these places have, however, seldom published in *PMA*,

which remains an essentially British — perhaps even English — journal.

There is a further problem in that historical archaeology in the USA has defined itself as the study of European expansion — arguably the same perspective from the other side of the Atlantic. In studying architecture, the loss of indigenous building traditions has reinforced a focus on European colonization, except through excavation and replica structures. However, the architecture of indigenous cultures or the enslaved has yet to feature in *PMA*. If we are to have an ethical historical archaeology of all groups, then we need to treat the subject, not the material, as our focus. In the field of architecture, SPMA is best placed to promote the integrated study of excavated evidence, standing buildings and documentary sources. Witness, for instance, Blades' analysis of maps and surveys of 'English villages in the Londonderry plantation' in *PMA* 20, which has more recently been utilized by Audrey Horning in her archaeological study of *Ireland in the Virginia Sea*.<sup>67</sup> Horning's study has, however, been criticized by the historian Nicholas Canny for distorting Ireland's past by framing its interpretation in relation to present-day politics, raising an important issue about the role of contemporary relevance in archaeological interpretation.<sup>68</sup>

In the USA, archaeology is often taught at university from within anthropology departments, and there is a strong case to be made for archaeology as a branch of anthropology. The articles in *PMA* by Dalglish on the Scottish Highland estate,<sup>69</sup> and King on 'closure' in Norwich's urban 'Great Rebuilding',<sup>70</sup> have both been influenced by Matthew Johnson, who has done most to promote a US-style anthropologically informed historical archaeology in the study of post-medieval archaeology in the UK,<sup>71</sup> though Johnson himself has not published directly in *PMA*. The broader study of architecture and vernacular architecture in the USA followed a similar pattern as in post-war Britain. There has been a parallel move to arrive at a more integrative approach, with buildings one strand within a vibrant historical archaeology of the early USA — plantations, slavery and indigenous as well as colonial settlements and buildings — paralleled by work in South Africa, Australia and Canada.<sup>72</sup> Innovative work exploring bourgeois perspectives on 'slum' living was led from Australia and the USA, and only latterly applied to British cities.<sup>73</sup> The English-speaking archaeology world is a defined community, and SPMA integrates well with the Society for Historical Archaeology in North America. There remains work to be done in bridging to archaeological work in South America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia. UNESCO World Heritage sites offer one framework for doing so. However, we should be wary of the UNESCO badging exercise distorting the study of buildings and places in historical context. One World Heritage site is not the

same as the next, though there can be surprising synergies — such as comparing Durham as a 1000-year-old centre of learning and religion with Timbuktu. Durham is nonetheless still best studied as an example of an English cathedral city and bishopric capital within a recognizable European tradition.

Colonialism has provided a useful way to link English-language archaeology around the globe, but European colonization was not the only historical process reflected in architecture. What about continental Europe? Historical archaeology's interest in colonialism, and focus on the Anglosphere, takes us away from links with Europe. This is regrettable, given the historical relationship of architecture in the British Isles and architecture in Western Europe. The scope for comparative study of classicism — in Russia and Scandinavia as well as in Western Europe — does not have to be on a diffusionist 'Renaissance Italy and Northern European Renaissance' model and we may, for instance, consider the possibility of comparative studies with France, Russia or Sweden; each had its own 'Georgian order' and relationship to the 'vernacular tradition'. Norden's article on 17th-century Swedish mercantile culture in *PMA* 46:1 indicates the potential for more transnational studies of colonialism and cultural diffusion.<sup>74</sup> Among the few instances of a transnational study focused on buildings is Allan's account of 'Breton woodworkers in the immigrant communities of south-west England, 1500–1550' in *PMA* 48:2,<sup>75</sup> which points the way towards the study of transnational processes. This is vital for the full comprehension of architecture, since building practice and craftsmanship invariably transcended national boundaries. As Hentie Louw long ago demonstrated in the pages of *Architectural History*, only by studying 'architectural interchange' between regions in transnational contexts can we fully appreciate and recover the pattern and scale of architecture and its cultural habits.<sup>76</sup>

The study of buildings needs to be undertaken as part of international scholarship focused on related historical processes. For architecture, this means relating to parallel and antecedent developments in buildings in continental Europe, as well as in colonies of trade and settlement throughout the world. If SPMA truly aspires to be an international society, then buildings archaeology needs to be studied worldwide, without any Eurocentric or Western bias. Paul Oliver's work on vernacular architecture worldwide stands outside the archaeological approach, and arguably misses the insights to be gained from a deeply contextualized and holistic study of specific historical and cultural situations, though the importance of studying cross-cultural commonalities should be noted. As well as being worldly wise, buildings archaeology should also be open to incorporating the insights of other disciplines, working with colleagues in architectural history, anthropology and folk studies.

Henry Glassie has been enormously influential in historical archaeology, particularly the study of vernacular architecture. Glassie's approach was rooted in measured survey, but advocates a synthetic approach to reaching a more fundamental understanding of how buildings are expressive of culture. As Glassie wrote, '[w]e must have some higher calling than destroying experience to consolidate our disciplines and advance our careers', noting that communication — as, for example, through architecture — 'is the central fact of what we call culture, and culture is the central fact of what we call history, and that people, as history's force, create the phenomena we study whatever name we give to our discipline'.<sup>77</sup>

## BUILT HERITAGE

Taken together, buildings archaeology in *PMA* seems healthy. There are, however, a number of areas into which *PMA* has not yet expanded, but which are certainly concerns of SPMA and should be part of its published output in future. To end this article, we step sideways from buildings archaeology to built heritage — something that we feel is not well represented in *PMA* — and discuss, briefly, what might be the distinct archaeological contribution that could be made by SPMA to wider debates in these areas, and how this might shape SPMA as it moves into its next half-century of publication and debate.

## WHAT DO WE MEAN BY BUILT HERITAGE?

It is useful to draw a (relatively soft) distinction between archaeology and heritage. Archaeology is a particular form of practical investigation with an associated distinct mode of interpretive thought. Heritage is, broadly, the ascription to and communication of the value and significance of that archaeology (and other non-archaeological pasts). We find very little in archaeology that is not heritage-related, and large amounts of popular heritage are in some way archaeological. However, we draw a distinction between the two things to make the point that while SPMA has a strong remit for involvement in both areas, *PMA* has thus far focused almost entirely on one at the expense of the other. The common term 'built heritage' bridges the gap between pure archaeological investigation and the public reception of archaeological results, being a multidisciplinary field that takes in many different perspectives on the built environment not as different disciplinary 'takes' on the same thing, but as necessary contributions to the understanding of the built environment and built heritage 'in process'. Thus, for instance, archaeological investigation is part of the planning process surrounding standing buildings, but

so are architectural and social history, engineering, human geography and politics.

When it comes to built heritage, especially in active contexts like policy development and planning, archaeologists have a choice to make. They can either continue to produce stand-alone pieces of archaeological investigation, which will be found useful by many others at different stages in the process and will continue to make valuable expert contributions to built heritage, or they can try to engage more beyond archaeology's traditional boundaries, taking in new subjects and new forms of investigation, and work towards new forms of buildings archaeology that are more purposefully integrated into the contexts in which archaeology is used by others in the contemporary world. As with many other distinctions we have drawn in this article, these two positions are not mutually exclusive, but the incorporation of the latter into the output of *PMA* and SPMA would require a greatly expanded notion of what the practical aims of the Society are (though the self-imposed remit of the Society is arguably already in this direction) with an associated widening of what is being published on this subject in the journal.

A particular sign that *PMA* is not yet tackling contemporary built heritage as a subject is the relative lack of post-1900 coverage within the journal, despite the statement in the front matter of the printed journal that the remit of the Society covers the post-medieval period 'up to the present day'.<sup>78</sup> Is this just a lack of certain kinds of building? Partly. But the lack of post-1900 buildings in *PMA* may also be part of the reason why it has not yet developed beyond the more purely archaeological approach to buildings into more heritage/theoretical directions. By ignoring the 20th century (never mind the 21st century), buildings archaeology in *PMA* excludes structures from the First and Second World Wars and Cold War installations, as well as many aspects of post-war reconstruction. Yet these and other aspects of the built environment, such as modernism and brutalism, are among the types of structure and site that form the contemporary urban built environment. On a wider scale, the journal has not considered the archaeological signatures of the town planning movement (a 20th-century phenomenon) and its manifestations, including the history of the development of urban social housing and the still important impact of the various attempts to construct intra- and inter-regional transport systems across the country, many of which entailed large-scale re-imaginings of the form and purpose of town centres and have clear impacts on other kinds of urban archaeology on a daily basis.

It is not for everyone, but perhaps those readers of *PMA* and SPMA members who played a heroic part in having post-medieval archaeology itself recognized as a serious subject (at least in Great Britain and Ireland) might appreciate the frustrations of those historical

archaeologists who now desire a closer engagement with contemporary archaeology and interdisciplinary approaches.<sup>79</sup> Although there have been a few more contemporary pieces appearing over the last few years, and a full-length article on Second World War communications facilities is forthcoming,<sup>80</sup> the built heritage of the 20th century is a clear gap — at least, it is a gap insofar as *PMA* has not yet truly delved into understanding *any* buildings as modern spaces. Every site that has been published in *PMA* has had a 20th- or 21st-century phase. It would not necessarily be useful to add the contemporary implications of each site into *PMA* articles, but there are certainly a few where the connections between past and present could have been usefully explored. There are a number of examples of this being done in a thoughtful and productive way outside the pages of *PMA*. For instance, Emma Dwyer's work for Museum of London Archaeology (MOLA) on the works for the London Overground East London Line incorporated contemporary residents and contemporary archaeological theory into the archaeological and historical analysis of sites.<sup>81</sup> Laura McAtackney's work at Kilmainham Gaol in Dublin also provides a very good example of the explicit treatment of a historical building as a 20th-century space, with the recording of graffiti in cells used as the basis for understanding women's experience of incarceration during the Irish Civil War.<sup>82</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS

Broadly speaking, the 60 or so articles (with additional notes) on the subject published in *PMA* since 1966 (we chose to work primarily with those articles concerning standing buildings; there are clearly more articles relevant to wider buildings archaeology through their use of excavated material) tell a particular story that is, perhaps, to be expected — that of a discipline strongly led by professional practice going into decline after an initial flurry, only to be revived within the last ten years or so due to a revised theoretical orientation in wider buildings archaeology. This is, in general, the case here, but it is also possible to see a number of interesting nuances within that broad narrative which highlight the connections between the history of buildings archaeology publication in *PMA* and the wider field. In conclusion, we would like to advocate that SPMA and *PMA* can make an especially important contribution to promoting publication of research on standing buildings, together with excavation and landscape survey. No other organization is so well placed to link standing buildings to excavated ones, or to explore the relationship to medieval archaeology. In Britain especially, and Europe more generally, there is a clear need to research the relationship between medieval and post-medieval life — in other words, how the post-medieval world

built upon and transformed the economy and society of the Middle Ages. Most post-medieval buildings, after all, are on sites and settlements established in the medieval period. The Society for Medieval Archaeology and SPMA could lead research on the relationship between medieval and post-medieval buildings and landscape, which can only deepen our appreciation of developments in architecture and landscape in the processes of colonization and acculturation outside Europe.

Research articles in *PMA* maintain an empiricist tradition, as a journal of record, while being open to new developments in interpretation and approach. *PMA* offers a holistic approach to the reconstruction of past experience in relation to the built environment, architecture, space and landscape, which is focused on their historical development as revealed by archaeology — an archaeology, that is, which utilizes the widest range of research tools, from scientific dating methods to documentary scholarship. Archaeology, by focusing on the past, can provide insights into the development of buildings over time in far deeper ways than the study of visual clues on that fraction of standing buildings which happen to survive in the present can ever provide. This is not to say that SPMA and *PMA* ought to take up a position in opposition to those archaeologies that seek to study more contemporary buildings and, through them, present-day concerns, heritage and policy. As SPMA states an interest in archaeology right ‘up to the present day’, it is only right that the journal seeks to continue to expand its range of subjects over that stumbling block of 1900 which is so clear in the archive of published articles.

Moving into a second half-century of publication, buildings archaeology in *PMA* can continue to become ever more relevant and take a lead in the subject both within the wider academic discipline and beyond. It can do this by continuing to include new ways of understanding the archaeology of buildings and architecture that address both more traditional and modern concerns, looking right to the beginning of the post-medieval period and questioning that time period’s relevance to the present day, and by seeking to be inclusive of global concerns while questioning both why and how it expanded its outlook in the way it has.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Note relationship to RCHME, RCHM in Wales and Scotland.

<sup>2</sup> Barton 1967, 102; for further discussion, see also Dixon 2011.

<sup>3</sup> Jones 1968.

<sup>4</sup> Laithwaite 1968; Tann & Smith 1972.

<sup>5</sup> Coad 1969; Miles & Saunders 1970; Coad 1973.

<sup>6</sup> Cunliffe 1973.

<sup>7</sup> Cake *et al.* 1972.

<sup>8</sup> Stell 1973.

<sup>9</sup> Meirion-Jones 1973.

<sup>10</sup> Pulsipher & Goodwin 1982.

<sup>11</sup> Robinson 1983.

<sup>12</sup> Harris 1986; 1987.

<sup>13</sup> Smith 1994; 1995.

<sup>14</sup> Blades 1986.

<sup>15</sup> Pringle *et al.* 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Smith 1985.

<sup>17</sup> Belford & Ross 2004.

<sup>18</sup> Oleksy 2008.

<sup>19</sup> Monckton 2006.

<sup>20</sup> Amiri & Wharton 2011.

<sup>21</sup> King 2010.

<sup>22</sup> Tatlioglu 2010.

<sup>23</sup> Chappell 2011.

<sup>24</sup> Laithwaite 1968.

<sup>25</sup> Field 1969.

<sup>26</sup> Miles & Saunders 1970.

<sup>27</sup> Cake *et al.* 1972.

<sup>28</sup> Cunliffe 1973.

<sup>29</sup> Quiney 1974.

<sup>30</sup> Cowie & Cloake 2001.

<sup>31</sup> Soden *et al.* 2006.

<sup>32</sup> Hewett 1973.

<sup>33</sup> Kelsall 1974.

<sup>34</sup> McCann & Johnson 1980.

<sup>35</sup> Brears 1978.

<sup>36</sup> Crummy 1976.

<sup>37</sup> King 2010.

<sup>38</sup> Belford & Ross 2004.

<sup>39</sup> Belford 2006.

<sup>40</sup> Newman & Newman 2008.

<sup>41</sup> Oleksy 2008; Newman 2013; Tatlioglu 2010.

<sup>42</sup> Rodwell 2008.

<sup>43</sup> Hanke 2012.

<sup>44</sup> Boucher *et al.* 2013.

<sup>45</sup> Borsay 2000.

<sup>46</sup> Monckton 2006.

<sup>47</sup> Emery 1996.

<sup>48</sup> Ryder 1985.

<sup>49</sup> Smith *et al.* 2014.

<sup>50</sup> Wadhams 1972.

<sup>51</sup> Taylor 1974.

<sup>52</sup> Finch & Giles 2007.

<sup>53</sup> Briggs 1999.

<sup>54</sup> Hickman 2014.

<sup>55</sup> Johnson 2002; 2007.

<sup>56</sup> Beaudry 1988.

<sup>57</sup> Jones 1968; see also Currie 1988.

<sup>58</sup> Priestley & Corfield 1982; see also Dyer 1981.

<sup>59</sup> Alcock 1975.

<sup>60</sup> Warmington 1976.

<sup>61</sup> Tyson 1981.

<sup>62</sup> Arkell *et al.* 2000; Barnwell & Airs 2006; Schürer & Arkell 1992.

<sup>63</sup> Verdiani *et al.* 2015.

<sup>64</sup> Edwards *et al.* 2013; see also Jamestown special issue, *PMA* 40:1; Pulsipher & Goodwin 1982; Harris 1987; Smith 1994; 1995; Chappell 2011.

<sup>65</sup> Günhan Danisman 1977.

<sup>66</sup> Amiri & Wharton 2011.

<sup>67</sup> Blades 1986; Horning 2013.

<sup>68</sup> Canny 2014.

<sup>69</sup> Dalglish 2005.

<sup>70</sup> King 2010.

<sup>71</sup> Johnson 1996; 2010.

<sup>72</sup> Hall 2000; Lawrence 2003.

<sup>73</sup> Mayne & Murray 2001.

<sup>74</sup> Nordin 2012.

<sup>75</sup> Allan 2014.

<sup>76</sup> Louw 1981.

<sup>77</sup> Glassie 1982, xiv; see also Glassie 1975; Glassie 2000.

<sup>78</sup> Dixon 2011, p. 313.

<sup>79</sup> See, for instance, Penrose 2007; Harrison & Schofield 2010.

<sup>80</sup> Gregory forthcoming.

<sup>81</sup> Dwyer 2011.

<sup>82</sup> McAtackney 2015.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alcock, N.W. 1975, 'Warwickshire timber-framed houses: a draft and a contract', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **9**, 212–18.

Allan, J. 2014, 'Breton woodworkers in the immigrant communities of south-west England, 1500–1550', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **48**:2, 320–56.

Amiri, A. & Wharton, A. 2011, 'Home in Jerusalem: the American Colony and Palestinian suburban architecture', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **45**:2, 237–65.

Arkell, T., Evans, N. & Goose, N. (eds) 2000, *When Death Do Us Part: Understanding and Interpreting the Probate Records of Early Modern England*, Oxford: Leopard's Head Press.

Barnwell, P. & Airs, M. (eds) 2006, *Houses and the Hearth Tax: the Later Stuart House and Society*, Counc. Brit. Archaeol. Res. Rep. **150**.

Barton, K. 1967, 'The origins of the Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **1**, 102–3.

Beaudry, M. (ed.) 1988, *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*, Cambridge: University Press.

Belford, P. 2006, 'The world of the workshop: archaeologies of urban industrialisation', in Green & Leech 2006, 133–50.

Belford, P. & Ross, R.A. 2004, 'Industry and domesticity: exploring historical archaeology in the Ironbridge Gorge', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **38**:2, 215–25.

Blades, B. 1986, 'English villages in the Londonderry plantation', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **20**, 257–69.

Borsary, P. 2000, *The Image of Georgian Bath, 1700–2000: Towns, Heritage and History*, Oxford: University Press.

Boucher, A.R., Morriss, R.K. & Mayes, S.R. 2013, 'An architectural analysis of the Hot Bath and Cross Bath, Bath, 1997–2003', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **47**:1, 164–94.

Brears, P. 1978, 'Clarke Hall, Wakefield: architectural innovations in 17th-century West Yorkshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **12**, 86–100.

Briggs, C.S. 1999, 'Aberglasney: the theory, history and archaeology of a post-medieval landscape', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **33**, 242–84.

Cake, R.H., Lewis, E. & Noon, J. 1972, 'Paulsgrove House and 17th-century house plans in Hampshire and West Sussex', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **6**, 160–74.

Canny, N. 2014, 'Reconciled to colonialism? Ireland in the Virginian Sea — colonialism in the British Atlantic', *Irish Times*, <<http://www.irishtimes.com/culture/books/reconciled-to-colonialism-ireland-in-the-virginian-sea-colonialism-in-the-british-atlantic-1.1803796>> [accessed 28 February 2016].

Chappell, E.A. 2011, 'The Bermuda house', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **45**:1, 93–143.

Coad, J.G. 1969, 'Chatham Ropeyard', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **3**, 143–65.

Cowie, R. & Cloake, J. 2001, 'An archaeological survey of Richmond Palace, Surrey', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **35**, 3–52.

Crummy, P. 1976, 'Portreeve's House, Colchester and a method of modernizing Essex houses in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **10**, 89–103.

Cunliffe, B. 1973, 'Manor Farm, Chalton, Hampshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **7**, 31–59.

Currie, C. 1988, 'Time and chance: modelling the attrition of old houses', *Vernac. Architect.* **19**:1, 1–9.

Dalglish, C. 2005, 'An age of transition? Castles and the Scottish Highland estate in the 16th and 17th centuries', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **39**:2, 243–66.

Dixon, J. 2011, 'Is the present day post-medieval?', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **45**:2, 313–21.

Dwyer, E. 2011, *The Impact of the Railways in the East End, 1835–2010: Historical Archaeology from the London Overground East London Line*, MOLA Monogr. **52**.

Dyer, A. 1981, 'Urban housing: a documentary study of four Midland towns 1530–1700', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **15**, 207–18.

Edwards, A. *et al.* 2013, 'James Wray's Carpentry Yard: archaeology of an early Williamsburg industrial craft site', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **47**:1, 35–65.

Emery, A. 1996, *Greater Medieval Houses of England and Wales, Volume 1: Northern England*, Cambridge: University Press.

- Field, J.J. 1969, 'Haselden Hall, Wakefield', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **3**, 188–90.
- Finch, J. & Giles, K. (eds) 2007, *Estate Landscapes: Design, Improvement and Power in the Post-Medieval Landscape*, Soc. Post-Medieval Archaeol. Monogr. **4**.
- Glassie, H. 1975, *Folk Housing in Middle Virginia: a Structural Analysis of Historic Artifacts*, Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Glassie, H. 1982, *Passing the Time in Ballymenone: Culture and History of an Ulster Community*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Glassie, H. 2000, *Vernacular Architecture*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Green, A. & Leech, R. (eds) 2006, *Cities in the World, 1500–2000*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Gregory, D. forthcoming, 'Communicating with the European Resistance: an assessment of the Special Operations Executive's wireless facilities in the UK during the Second World War', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **50**:2.
- Günhan Danisman, H.H. 1977, 'An operational fulling-mill at Kirha-Divan in the Central Anatolian Plateau, Turkey', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **11**, 80–6.
- Hall, M. 2000, *Archaeology and the Modern World: Colonial Transcripts in South Africa and the Chesapeake*, London: Routledge.
- Hanke, T. 2012, 'Newark Castle, Port Glasgow: a proto-modern roof of the late 16th century', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **46**:1, 1–35.
- Harris, E. 1986, 'American spies at Bermuda's forts, 1842–52', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **20**, 311–31.
- Harris, E. 1987, 'The defences of the Bermuda dockyard', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **21**, 227–55.
- Harrison, R. & Schofield, J. 2010, *After Modernity: Archaeological Approaches to the Contemporary Past*, Oxford: University Press.
- Hewett, C.A. 1973, 'The development of the post-medieval house', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **7**, 60–78.
- Hickman, C. 2014, 'The garden as a laboratory: the role of domestic gardens as places of scientific exploration in the long 18th century', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **48**:1, 229–47.
- Horning, A. 2013, *Ireland in the Virginia Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Johnson, M. 1996, *An Archaeology of Capitalism*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, M. 2002, *Behind the Castle Gate: from Medieval to Renaissance*, London: Routledge.
- Johnson, M. 2007, *Ideas of Landscape*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, M. 2010, *English Houses, 1300–1800: Vernacular Architecture, Social Life*, London: Routledge.
- Jones, E.L. 1968, 'The reduction of fire damage in southern England, 1650–1850', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **2**, 140–9.
- Kelsall, A.F. 1974, 'The London house plan in the later 17th century', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **8**, 80–91.
- King, C. 2010, '"Closure" and the urban great rebuilding in early modern Norwich', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **44**:1, 54–80.
- Laithwaite, M. 1968, 'A ship-master's house at Faversham, Kent', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **2**, 150–64.
- Lawrence, S. 2003, *Archaeologies of the British: Explorations of Identity in Great Britain and Its Colonies, 1600–1945*, London: Routledge.
- Louw, H. 1981, 'Anglo-Netherlandish architectural interchange, c.1600–1660', *Architect. Hist.* **24**, 1–23.
- Mayne, A. & Murray, T. (eds.) 2001, *The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes: Explorations in Slumland*, Cambridge: University Press.
- McAtackney, L. 2015, *Kilmainhamgaolgraffiti: Exploring Female Experiences of Imprisonment during the Irish Civil War (1922–1923)*, <<http://kilmainhamgaolgraffiti.com>> [accessed 13 March 2016].
- McCann, J. & Johnson, I. 1980, 'Whiteheads, Hatfield Broad Oak: an Essex lobby-entrance house reconsidered', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **14**, 189–97.
- Meirion-Jones, G.I. 1973, 'The long-house in Brittany: a provisional assessment', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **7**, 1–19.
- Miles, T.J. & Saunders, A.D. 1970, 'King Charles's Castle, Treviso, Scilly', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **4**, 1–30.
- Monckton, L. 2006, 'Bletchley Park, Buckinghamshire: the architecture of the Government Code and Cypher School', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **40**:2, 291–300.
- Newman, C. 2013, 'An archaeology of poverty: architectural innovation and pauper experience at Madeley Union Workhouse, Shropshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **47**:2, 359–77.
- Newman, C. & Newman, R. 2008, 'Housing the workforce in 19th-century east Lancashire: past processes, enduring perceptions and contemporary meanings', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **42**:1, 181–200.
- Nordin, J.M. 2012, 'Embodied colonialism: the cultural meaning of silver in a Swedish colonial context in the 17th century', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **46**:1, 143–65.
- Oleksy, V. 2008, 'Conformity and resistance in the Victorian penal system: archaeological investigations at Parliament House, Edinburgh', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **42**:2, 276–303.
- Penrose, S. 2007, *Images of Change: an Archaeology of England's Contemporary Landscape*, Swindon: English Heritage.
- Priestley, U. & Corfield, P. 1982, 'Rooms and room use in Norwich housing, 1580–1730', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **16**, 93–123.
- Pringle, D., Ewart, G. & Ruckley, N. 2000, '"... an old pentagonal fort built of stone": excavation of the battery wall at Fort Charlotte, Lerwick, Shetland', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **34**, 105–43.

- Pulsipher, L.M. & Goodwin, C.M. 1982, 'A sugar-boiling house at Galways: an Irish sugar plantation in Montserrat, West Indies', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **16**, 21–7.
- Quiney, A. 1974, 'Hatchett's Farm, Bedfont, Middlesex', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **8**, 108–12.
- Robinson, P. 1983, 'English houses built at Moneymore, County Londonderry', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **17**, 47–63.
- Rodwell, K. 2008, 'The Dower House, Stoke Park, Bristol: a study in structural archaeology', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **42**:1, 1–47.
- Ryder, P.F. 1985, 'Oxspring Lodge: reconstructing a Yorkshire hunting lodge', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **19**, 49–62.
- Schürer, K. & Arkell, T. (eds.) 1992, *Surveying the People: the Interpretation and Use of Document Sources for the Study of Population in the Later Seventeenth Century*, Oxford: Leopard's Head Press.
- Smith, T.P. *et al.* 2014, 'Suffolk Place, Southwark, London: a Tudor palace and its architectural decoration', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **48**:1, 90–132.
- Smith, V.T.C. 1985, 'Chatham and London: the changing face of English land fortification, 1870–1918', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **19**, 105–49.
- Smith, V.T.C. 1994, 'Brimstone Hill Fortress, St Kitts, West Indies. Part one: history', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **28**, 73–109.
- Smith, V.T.C. 1995, 'Brimstone Hill Fortress, St Kitts, West Indies. Part two: description', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **29**, 77–106.
- Soden, I. *et al.* 2006, 'Buildings analysis at Coombe Abbey, Warwickshire, 1993–94', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **40**:1, 129–59.
- Stell, G. 1973, 'Highland garrisons 1717–23: Bernera Barracks', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **7**, 20–30.
- Tann, J. & Smith, L.D.W. 1972, 'Early fireproof housing in a Staffordshire factory village', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **6**, 191–7.
- Tatlioglu, T. 2010, 'Biographies of place: the joiners' workshop at Harewood, West Yorkshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **44**:2, 273–93.
- Taylor, R. 1974, 'Town houses in Taunton, 1500–1700', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **8**, 63–79.
- Tyson, B. 1981, 'Construction schedules for some 17th-century farm buildings in Cumbria', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **15**, 219–24.
- Verdiani, G., Cornell, P. & Rodriguez-Navarro, P. (eds.) 2015, *Architecture, Archaeology and Contemporary City Planning: State of Knowledge in the Digital Age*, Raleigh: Lulu Press.
- Wadhams, M.C. 1972, 'The development of buildings in Witham from 1500 to circa 1800', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **6**, 1–41.
- Warmington, R. 1976, 'Rebuilding of "Le Belle" Inn, Andover, 1534', *Post-Medieval Archaeol.* **10**, 131–41.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- MOLA Museum of London Archaeology  
 PMA *Post-Medieval Archaeology*  
 PPG Planning Policy Guidance  
 SPMA Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology

#### SUMMARIES IN FRENCH, GERMAN, ITALIAN AND SPANISH

##### RÉSUMÉ

##### Des bâtiments en place et le patrimoine bâti

Cet article examine les archives disponibles que constituent les publications sur les bâtiments en place publiées dans ce journal. Il expose d'abord quelques tendances générales évidentes à travers une brève analyse des nombreuses publications en archéologie du bâti parues au cours de ces cinquante dernières années, de leurs sujets et auteurs. Ces publications sont ensuite classées en trois contextes-clés plus larges: la relation entre archéologie du bâti et histoire de l'architecture, l'archéologie du bâti dans *Post-Medieval Archaeology* dans un contexte international et le relatif manque d'engagement de la Société dans le patrimoine bâti moderne et contemporain.

##### ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

##### Stehende Gebäude und gebautes Erbe

Diese Studie untersucht das verfügbare Archiv stehender Gebäude, die in diesem Journal veröffentlicht sind. Nachdem die generellen Trends durch eine kurze Analyse der publizierten Zusammenfassungen der Artikel der letzten 50 Jahre verstanden waren, inklusive deren Themen und Autoren, wurden die Artikel in drei Gruppen des weiteren Umfeldes geteilt: das Verhältnis der Archäologie der Gebäude zur archäologischen Geschichte, Gebäude-Archäologie in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* in einem internationalen Kontext und der gesellschaftliche Mangel an Bindung zu modernen Gebäuden und zeitgeschichtlich gebautem Erbe.

*RIASSUNTO***Edifici in piedi e patrimonio edificato**

Questo articolo prende in esame l'archivio disponibile dei contributi sugli edifici in elevato pubblicati nella rivista. Dopo aver delineato alcune tendenze generali, che emergono da una breve analisi sul numero di lavori dedicati agli edifici archeologici e pubblicati negli ultimi 50 anni, sui temi trattati, e sugli autori, questo contributo colloca gli articoli ricordati in tre contesti-chiave più ampi: la relazione fra edifici archeologici e storia dell'architettura, l'archeologia degli elevati in *Post-Medieval Archaeology* nell'ottica del contesto internazionale, e l'impegno relativamente scarso della Society for Post-Medieval Archaeology verso gli edifici moderni e gli edifici del patrimonio contemporaneo.

*RESUMEN***Edificios y patrimonio construido**

Este artículo examina los artículos que se han publicado en *Post-Medieval Archaeology* sobre edificios. Después de exponer algunas tendencias generales evidentes en un breve análisis de los artículos publicados durante los últimos 50 años, sus temas y autores, expondremos tres contextos más amplios donde se pueden enlazar: la relación de la arqueología muraria con la historia de la arquitectura, la arqueología muraria en *Post-Medieval Archaeology* en un contexto internacional, y la relativa falta de interés por los edificios modernos y contemporáneos.

*Adrian Green, Department of History, Durham University*

*James Dixon, MOLA, Mortimer Wheeler House, 46 Eagle Wharf Road, London, N1 7ED, UK*

*[jdixon@mola.org.uk]*