AFTERWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A short genealogy:

At the first conference on 'Devising and Documentation', organised by the Centre for Performance Research in Cardiff in February 1993, a number of performance practitioners and companies were invited to give precise ten-minute reflections on particular aspects of their work. The chosen forms included lecture, demonstration, exposition, short performance. Several used video, slide and overhead projection. They were, by turn, polemical, anecdotal, autobiographical, descriptive, scripted, improvised. In each presentation, the remains of the past were used to create something in the present. And all these ways of remembering represented forms of documentation. This was a revelation for those delegates who had regarded the single viewpoint, real-time video-recording as the authentic record of performance. Julian Thomas also spoke on the nature of the archaeo-logical record, the vagaries of survival and how we make use of the traces of the past in the present. He suggested that we can neither create an authoritative record nor try to predetermine and control its interpretation. Perhaps the best we can ever do is to put exciting material into the world and then let it alight where it will, envisaging creative acts of interpretation at other times and in other places. An initial series of provocations towards a **theatre archaeology** were presented at the conference. Julian Thomas's responses to them completed a seminal piece published in *The Drama Review* (Pearson 1994a; Thomas 1994).

In the dialogue of a set of evolving relationships, articulated in a series of papers, presentations and practical projects manifest almost entirely within the discourse of archaeology, the deeper affinities of the two practices were further revealed. At the Theoretical Archaeology Group con-ference in Durham in December 1993, Julian Thomas organised a session entitled 'Performing Places' with papers addressing notions of space, place and site. Here performance theorists were present within an archaeological setting. Mike Pearson spoke on the genesis and formalisation of performance space. Heike Roms used Foucault's work on the panopticon to consider theatre as a 'spatial machinery of identity'. Clifford McLucas employed a complex interplay of video and slide projection, live action and his own paper pre-recorded on audio tape to examine the com-plexity of large-scale, site-specific performance. Thomas himself spoke on points of convergence between archaeology and performance. Mark Edmonds's paper considered body practices in neolithic flint mines whilst Michael Shanks and David Austin presented, as a heightened dialogue, an experiential view of life in and around a medieval Welsh castle.

Interdisciplinary approaches to performance and the past, and attendant projects such as the archaeology of the contemporary past (Schnapp 1997; Buchli and Lucas 2000) and archaeological

bits of shoe-leather, ground into the earth, rotting. This was where David Davies did his cobbling and mending.

They buried Dai's sheep on the other side of the wall after the performance. And the date stone of 1904 is no longer there. We found it a couple of years ago and David, a friend, has it for safekeeping in his garden down the road.

What time is this place?

With others like Carlo Ginzburg (1989), we identify a forensic aesthetic, a conjectural pursuit of clues to events and worlds left behind. We have tried to explain how we see this as part of the archaeological component of our everyday lives - a melancholic aspect of our social fabric. So in telling an archaeology, in this theatre/archaeology, we make something of our contemporary historicity, our sense of time passing and pasts left in the present, our historical agency in the worlds we inhabit and look upon. Here we claim that this is encapsulated in the question of how to tell of a death.

This anthropological comment upon a style of reasoning in the social fabric of people and things has local historical roots. In the background are some connections, now two centuries old at least, involving experiences of cityscapes of the industrial world, conceptions of underworld and low life, crime and its documentation, the character of information about the comings and goings of people and their history, a romantic sensibility attuned to history, its material ruin and relevance to people's identity. As one of us has argued elsewhere (Shanks 1992a), the progress of science, the invention of photography, notions of the objective gaze, encounters with others and otherness, the bureaucracy of documentation, new public and private spaces in modernity are the true subjects of the history of archaeology, which is also our own.

1798, 1841, 1881, 1902, 1912, 1937, 1942, 1995. We can set dates and describe events, but archaeological time is of another order too. At the beginning of the chapter we shifted from the blank polar wastes of the Antarctic to what may be called a topology of archaeological time (and, of course, history and memory). This is a temporal landscape of that familiar grid or matrix of dates, places and events, but whose geometry is crumpled and folded back upon itself so that what was distanced in time and space is brought close. Michel Serres has played upon the words for time and weather being the same in French *(le temps)* and refers to this turbulent flux as temporal *chiffonage- 'le temps ne coule pas; il percole* (time doesn't flow; it percolates)' (Serres and Latour 1995: 57-62). We have attempted to set off such percolation through the performative practice of the story-teller-guide.

AFTERWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A short genealogy:

At the first conference on 'Devising and Documentation', organised by the Centre for Performance Research in Cardiff in February 1993, a number of performance practitioners and companies were invited to give precise ten-minute reflections on particular aspects of their work. The chosen forms included lecture, demonstration, exposition, short performance. Several used video, slide and overhead projection. They were, by turn, polemical, anecdotal, autobiographical, descriptive, scripted, improvised. In each presentation, the remains of the past were used to create something in the present. And all these ways of remembering represented forms of documentation. This was a revelation for those delegates who had regarded the single viewpoint, real-time video-recording as the authentic record of performance. Julian Thomas also spoke on the nature of the archaeological record, the vagaries of survival and how we make use of the traces of the past in the present. He suggested that we can neither create an authoritative record nor try to predetermine and control its interpretation. Perhaps the best we can ever do is to put exciting material into the world and then let it alight where it will, envisaging creative acts of interpretation at other times and in other places. An initial series of provocations towards a **theatre archaeology** were presented at the conference. Julian Thomas's responses to them completed a seminal piece published in *The Drama Review* (Pearson 1994a; Thomas 1994).

In the dialogue of a set of evolving relationships, articulated in a series of papers, presentations and practical projects manifest almost entirely within the discourse of archaeology, the deeper affinities of the two practices were further revealed. At the Theoretical Archaeology Group conference in Durham in December 1993, Julian Thomas organised a session entitled 'Performing Places' with papers addressing notions of space, place and site. Here performance theorists were present within an archaeological setting. Mike Pearson spoke on the genesis and formalisation of performance space. Heike Roms used Foucault's work on the panopticon to consider theatre as a 'spatial machinery of identity'. Clifford McLucas employed a complex interplay of video and slide projection, live action and his own paper pre-recorded on audio tape to examine the complexity of large-scale, site-specific performance. Thomas himself spoke on points of convergence between archaeology and performance. Mark Edmonds's paper considered body practices in neolithic flint mines whilst Michael Shanks and David Austin presented, as a heightened dialogue, an experiential view of life in and around a medieval Welsh castle.

Interdisciplinary approaches to performance and the past, and attendant projects such as the archaeology of the contemporary past (Schnapp 1997; Buchli and Lucas 2000) and archaeological

Acknowledgements from Mike Pearson.

Acknowledgements from Michael Shanks.

sensibilities (Jonna Hansson and Fiona Campbell at Goteborg), have subsequently been elaborated at the conferences of the European Association of Archaeologists - Ljubljana, Slovenia (1994), Santiago de Compostela, Spain (1995), Riga, Latvia (1996) and Bournemouth, England (1999).

In parallel with his dialogue with Michael Shanks, Mike Pearson began the creation of a series of solo works which comprised a layering of narratives and within which historiography, oral history, memory and the art of the story-teller were welded together in a performed event. These included the trilogy *From Memory* (1991-5): *A Death in the Family,* an intimate reflection on a childhood in rural Lincolnshire and the death of his father; *Autopsy,* an account of the Welsh. settlement of Patagonia and the slaying of Llwyd ap Iwan by Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid in 1910; *The Body of Evidence* (1995), speculations on the murder of Lynette White in Cardiff docklands in 1988. *Dead Men's Shoes* (1997) was about Scott's expedition to the South Pole in 1912. *The First Five Miles* … (1998) was on the enclosures of West Wales in the early nineteenth century. *The man who ate his boots . . .* (1998) comprised four interlocking narratives of moments of emigration in 1820, 1847, 1884 and 1968. And *Bubbling Tom* (2000) comprised a guided tour of the landscape of his childhood in the village of Hibaldstow, Lincolnshire.

Meanwhile Michael Shanks completed his narrative of design and mobility in the ancient Greek city-state (1999), part of a broader look at the disciplinary and cultural experiences of Classical Archaeology (1996). The latter continued that line of investigation represented by the book *Experiencing the Past* in exploring the cultural work, the performative behaviour that is archaeology (1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1995d, 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 1998, 2000a, 2000b, Shanks and Mackenzie 1994).

Shanks and Pearson have subsequently presented 'performed lectures' at the Centre for Performance Research conference 'Performance, Identity, Tourism', Aberystwyth, Wales (1996); at the Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group conference in Goteborg, Sweden (1997) and at the 'Thinking through the Body' conference in Lampeter, Wales (1998). Their work on the ruined farm. of Esgair Fraith was published in *Performance Research* (Pearson and Shanks 1997) under the title 'Performing a Visit: Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past'. In September 1998 Shanks and Pearson curated the Centre for Performance Research peripatetic conference entitled 'Performance, Places and Pasts', which guided academics, theorists and practitioners on a series of walks and visits to presentations and performances in the landscape of West Wales (see Savill 1998: 68-71). Amongst the presentations were Roger Owen's taped evocations of the landscape of his childhood set in three sheds on his family farm; Lisa Lewis's commemoration of her grandfather, given from the pulpit of the rural chapel where he once was a minister; and Eddie Ladd's tracing of the paths in the landscape, no longer visible, once used by dairy cattle, the whole conference invited to wear cow masks!

Shanks and Pearson's work together has been informed and energised by experiences of visiting (sites, colleagues, issues), and particularly of estrangement from the normative textures of intellectual discourse - exploring margins, negotiating relations between disciplinary cores and peripheries. In this, they owe a debt of gratitude to supporters and sceptics, friends and foes.

THEATRE/ARCHAEOLOGY

- how lucky I have been since that day Mike Pearson came into my office at Lampeter, how much Cliff McLucas has offered in his extraordinary pieces.

Together we wish to mention the following.

Outside our institutions we both thank the many archaeologists who have taken our work seriously. Douglass Bailey at Cardiff, and John Barrett at Sheffield, always intelligently aware. At Goteborg Jonna Hansson and Fiona Campbell deserve special mention, further stretching the envelope in their own work, developing their own **archaeological sensibilities,** a new publishing initiative, and never allowing us to take ourselves too seriously. In Paris Laurent Olivier and Alain Schnapp have given great intellectual support and inspiration, particularly in relation to the project of archaeologies of the contemporary past (Schnapp 1997; Olivier 1999a, 1999b). Julian Thomas figures most significantly here too, with his own archaeological project now at Manchester, whose initial interest and responses stimulated this volume and who continues to inform our approaches (Thomas 1994).

Many of the basic tenets of theatre archaeology and its subsequent elaboration were developed in the context of conferences organised by the Centre for Performance Research at Aberystwyth, including those on 'Devising and Documentation', Cardiff, February 1993 and University of Lancaster, July 1994, on 'Performance, Identity, Tourism', Aberystwyth, September 1996 and on 'Performance, Places and Pasts', Aberystwyth, September 1998.

The book owes a debt to current Brith Gof artistic director Clifford McLucas for his championing of the work of Bernard Tschumi (1990, 1994a, 1994b, 1994c) and for developing approaches to site which inform this book (McLucas 2000, forthcoming). Joint thoughts with Mike Pearson can be found in McLucas and Pearson 1996 and 1999.

Walter Benjamin's essay 'The Storyteller' (1992: 83-107) informs and inspires much of the creative writing in this volume. His work generally has been an inspiration to us both (see particularly Shanks 1999).

Our remaining acknowledgements are arranged according to the sections of the book.

Theatre archaeology

The 'him' in the early part of this chapter is disabled performer Dave Levett. Since the early 1990s, Mike Pearson and Dave Levett have collaborated on a series of performances which have examined the expressive potential of different physicalities within the genre of physical theatre. Significantly, all four works have involved vigorous encounters between men. In *In Black and White* (1992), Dave worked both in his wheelchair and out, in a series of duets inspired by the photographs of Edweard Muybridge. In a subsequent series of performances - *D.O.A.* (1993), *Camlann* (1993) and *Arturius Rex* (1994), which paralleled material from various versions of the myth of King Arthur with contemporary events in Bosnia - Dave worked without his chair, developing a repertoire of lifts, carries, supports, encounters and close physical interactions with a wider group of colleagues from Brith Gof, notably Richard Morgan and John Rowley. Levett,

Morgan and Rowley were instrumental in devising the training technique named 'In All Languages', which was demonstrated at the CPR 'Past Masters: Antonin Artaud' conference, Aberystwyth 1996. For material on this work see Pearson (1998a) and Pearson and Levett (forthcoming). Also note Townsend (1998) on the representation of disability. Dave now lives his life as Lyn for most of the time.

On political ecology the work of Bruno Latour must be brought forward (1987, as well as citations made in the text). The argument here, and more generally in notions of heterogeneous networking, began development at a colloquium organised by Latour and held at the Schlumberger retreat at Les Treilles, Provence in June 1991, though the subject then was somewhat different - the social origins of technology/the technical origins of society (see Lemonnier 1993). Later developed in a course run by Shanks at the Archaeology Centre, University of Leiden in 1992, some of it has been published in the Finnish journal *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* (Shanks 1998).

Ideas of landscape in this chapter and that on theatre/archaeology began as archaeologist Andrew Fleming joined Lampeter from Sheffield in 1995 to help organise, with David Austin, a Masters and Ph.D. programme in landscape archaeology. It is worth mentioning how different to the United States are approaches to landscape in a distinctive British tradition (on this also below), and how influential have been the close links between Lampeter archaeologists and colleagues in the University Geography Department, creating an intellectual forum, at one time or another, of palaeo-environmentalists Martin Bell, Mike Walker, Astrid Casteldine and John Crowther, human geographers Chris Philo (now Glasgow), Paul Cloke, Catherine Nash (now Royal Holloway, London), Phil Crang (now Durham), Ulf Strohmeyer and Tim Cresswell, cartographer Trevor Harris, and archaeologists Julian Thomas (now Manchester), Chris Tilley (now University College, London). Drawing on this terrific expertise and collegiality, Michael Shanks ran a seminar in 1997 on landscape archaeology at Goteborg, where he holds a *Docentur.*

Our ideas on scenes of crime were fundamentally influenced by an exhibition of photography held at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art in 1998 under the title *Police Pictures* (Phillips, Haworth-Booth and Squiers 1998). The exhibition carried as supplementary publication a haunting book by Luc Sante (1992), without which our ideas would simply not have matured.

In its examination of narrative, the chapter is inevitably informed by the work of John Berger (1975, 1984, 1985, 1989, 1990, 1992, 1995).

Theatre and archaeology

The conjunction of Kubrick, Tsukamoto, Theweleit and a Korinthian pot painter was first presented at a conference on ancient Korinth, held in Newcastle upon Tyne UK in 1992, and where it horrified many of the classicists in the audience.

The constituting features of the Greek city-state were questioned by Michael Shanks in an examination of some performative behaviours and their field of cultural referents recoverable from ancient artefacts and literatures (1992b, 1995a, 1995b). The insinuation is that the changes in the Greek Mediterranean of the first millennium BC, those usually connected in a narrative of the emergence of the *polis* (city-state) in the eighth century BC, were a lot to do with models of conduct and

forms of gendered identity central to these performative behaviours (from ceramic design to soldiery to travel to political rhetoric). This argument was developed with further reflection upon the category of the cyborg and the necessary elision of people and things - society is simultaneously material artefact and socio-cultural relations. In understanding society, the separation of people and things is a false and disabling one (Shanks 1998). There were cyborgs in ancient Greece.

This chapter includes significant material on theatre space from Heike Roms's presentation at the Theoretical Archaeology Group conference, Durham December 1993, itself a reflection on Foucault (Roms 1993).

The particular commentary on visiting the past was first partly explored in a paper on critical romanticism presented at a Nordic TAG (Theoretical Archaeology Group) conference held in Helsinki in 1991, and later published with the helpful criticism of Kristian Kristiansen and colleagues associated with the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme in Paris (Shanks 1995d).

In a symmetrical look at the convergence of people and things in museums and theme parks, the phenomenon called 'heritage' has been subject to positive critique. With a focus upon the embodied experience of the past, the **consumption** of remains, material (ruin) and virtual (memory), mobilised in acts of cultural construction, was celebrated (Shanks 1992a, 1995d and the Pearson solo works). This contrasts with the conventional critiques of heritage as simply a reactionary, nostalgic and erosive **consumerism** (for example, Walsh 1992).

The section on choreographing the prehistoric body takes us both back to our first experiences in archaeology in the late 1960s and 1970s (Shanks and Tilley 1982). It is endebted to the innovative work of British prehistorians John Barrett (1988, 1991, 1994; Barrett *et al.* 1991); Richard Bradley (1993, 1998); Colin Richards (1988, 1992, 1996); Julian Thomas (1991a, 1991b, 1996, 1999); Christopher Tilley (1994); Mike Parker Pearson (1993) and Alistair Whittle (1988). They have set the agenda for a sophisticated social archaeology. Versions of the material included on neolithic architectures were presented at 'The Connected Body?' conference, Amsterdam School of the. Arts, Amsterdam August 1995 (Pearson 1996d) and at the CPR 'Giving Voice: Archaeology of the Voice' conference, Aberystwyth April 1997.

Extended definitions of what constitutes performative behaviour and an application of aspects of performance theory, such as a comparison between the functioning of the theatrical object or 'prop' in performance and artefacts within burial contexts, helped illuminate performative aspects of the prehistoric funeral, in a chapter for a volume entitled *The Archaeology of Prestige and Wealth* edited by another archaeological collaborator Douglass Bailey (Pearson 1998b).

Theatre/archaeology

As the relationship developed, experimental performance practices began to indicate provocative models for the presentation of archaeological material. In acknowledging the performative nature of the lecture, it was possible to reassess and to recast it as a multimedia exposition carrying different orders of information or narrative within its various media; or as a performance-like activity including the manual examination of artefacts, improvised discussion and the speculative re-enactment of past behaviours and events; or as a mode of story-telling which includes the

subjective experience of the archaeologist as well as the exposition of data. Here both Pearson and Shanks have also been involved in curricular and pedagogic experiment, designing course materials, teaching and learning environments for performance studies and archaeology (www. Stanford.edu/~mshanks; www.aber.ac.uk/~psswww).

In several works Shanks has presented new formulations of an archaeological poetics, creative acts of interpretive construction using rhetorical and narrative devices of parataxis and hypotaxis (1992b, 1995c, 1995d, 1999). The book *Art and the Greek City State* (1999) presented an assemblage of fragments, a new historiographical arrangement of evidences surrounding, and subverting, a political narrative of the city-state.

Commencing at the European Association of Archaeologists conference in Santiago, Spain in 1994 Pearson and Shanks have devised forms of performance/lecture, both at site and in the lecture theatre, which include personal reflection and video and computer-generated projection to examine the phenomenology of place and the complexity of memory.

In retrospect, this chapter reflects many of the notions of Homi K. Bhahba (1994): ambivalence, liminality, hybridity, mimicry and performativity. It also draws upon the work of Paul Carter, a speaker at the 'Performance, Places and Pasts' conference held in Aberystwyth in September 1998 and curated by us both. He describes the imperial project as imagining an empty stage upon which theatre of history is enacted, with 'naming' of place as a form of appropriation (1987, 1996).

The chapter includes performance scripts drawn from Brith Gof's *Patagonia* (Pearson 1996a), and Pearson/Brookes *Dead Men's Shoes* and *The Man Who Ate His Boots* ... As will be noted from uncredited quotations littered through the textual fragments, their composition was much influenced by the work of Gaston Bachelard (1964), Pierre Bourdieu (1977) and Walter Benjamin (1992). The text for *Dead Men's Shoes* inevitably draws upon Scott's account of the *Discovery* expedition (1953); Apsley Cherry-Garrard's classic *The Worst Journey in the World (1994)* and the work of Roland Huntford (1985) and Francis Spufford (1996).

For the social history of Esgair Fraith, we are delighted to acknowledge the research of Professor David Austin at Lampeter on our behalf and the material supplied to the Department of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Wales Aberystwyth 'Exploring Ceredigion' course, 1995. The various writings on folk customs are informed by Owen (1978) and Rudkin (1987).

Versions of *Deep Maps,* the Pearson/Shanks joint work on Esgair Fraith and basis for the sedimentary map with which the chapter ends, were presented at the CPR 'Performance, Identity, Tourism' conference, Aberystwyth, September 1996; at the Nordic Theoretical Archaeology Group conference, University of Goteborg, Sweden, April 1997 and at the Department of Archaeology, University of Sheffield, May 1998 (see also Pearson and Shanks 1997).

In **theatre/archaeology** knowledge is conceived as an historical process and achievement, though there is, concomitantly, no possible final account of things. There are always other ways of telling and reality itself is plural. Pluralism and multivocality, and related issues of relativism, were explored and defined in an experiment in multi-authored, co-operative theory (Lampeter Archaeology Workshop 1997). Pluralism and the active construction of knowledge were key themes in Shanks's study of the discipline and discourse of classical archaeology (1996) - interests constituting the classical archaeological imagination were unpacked. These included tourism and

visiting (after the aristocratic grand tour of the eighteenth century), the character of the collecting connoisseur, and myths of European identity. These have begun to be explored in fieldwork in Sicily, in the documentation of an archaeological expedition to investigate an ancient city, another effort to retrieve and work upon archaeological remains. This and the performed lectures, with their rhetoric of assemblage, have involved Shanks in experiments in multimedia composition and authorship (www.stanford.edu/~mshanks).

The project *Footloose* is inspired by the work of Laurent Olivier. A version of *The Body of Evidence,* which included thoughts on the forensic gaze, was presented by both Pearson and Shanks at The Body in Archaeology' conference, University of Wales, Lampeter, June 1998.

THEATRE/ARCHAEOLOGY