

Archaeologies of Rules and Regulation

An Introduction

Barbara Hausmair, Ben Jervis, Ruth Nugent and Eleanor Williams

Rules are central to how we negotiate and experience the world. They structure social practice; if followed, they inhibit social action and if transgressed, then there are consequences for individuals and society as a whole. Archaeologists have long recognized the importance of rules, but, with the exception of studies of 'ritual' behaviour, their influence on past societies, and our understanding of them, has not been theorized. The aim of this volume, is to explore the relationship between written and unwritten rules and the archaeological record.

Our contributors explore the complexity of rules by comparing the physical evidence of everyday practice with documented directives, examining discrepancy and divergence, manipulation, reinforcement and varying interpretations of rules. In so doing, they have tried to avoid a naive dichotomy of domination versus submission or the tracing of acts of rebellion. Instead, the chapters collected here explore the rich interplay between rules structuring and being structured by society. The volume as a whole approaches rules (the terms upon which regulation is practised) as a spectrum of behaviour, expectations and punishments, and discusses how responses to regulation could strengthen or dilute existing rules and practices. Crucially, the archaeological perspective is uniquely capable of addressing intersections between text and practice by harnessing both material evidence and written sources.

The interdisciplinary nature of the volume is matched by its chronological and geographical scope. It surveys past societies from the United Kingdom, Ireland, France, Spain, Austria, Germany, Scandinavia and the United States, from the fifth century AD to the 1970s. The volume is

divided into three parts, each centred on burgeoning themes in archaeology and the humanities and social sciences: 'Networks', 'Space and Power' and 'Corporeality'. This broad span of time and space, orchestrated by three specific themes, is vital for what is a groundbreaking introduction to an overlooked area of archaeological and historical research.

Theorizing Human Behaviour

One only has to look at a map of prehistoric cultures, or the distribution of different styles of material culture, to appreciate that archaeologists are excellent at identifying difference between and amongst past societies (e.g. Myres 1969). The application of social theory has allowed us to examine why these variations occur, but has also led to questions of sameness, coherence and normative behaviour surfacing as areas of archaeological enquiry. It is the mechanisms through which behaviour becomes normative, and social norms are challenged or transgressed, which form the focus of this book. Rules are mechanisms used by societies to regulate behaviour, to reinforce or forcefully change social norms and structures, and that act as mediators of continuity by bringing stability to communities.

There is a growing interest in the archaeology of legal culture; however, studies principally focus on the administration of law, for example, through the study of places of justice (e.g. Buckberry and Hadley 2007; Auler 2008, 2010, 2013) or the ways in which landscapes of administration develop (Baker et al. 2011; Reynolds 2012; Baker and Brookes 2013; Brookes 2013; Oosthuizen 2013; Smith and Reynolds 2013), with a particular emphasis on the early medieval period. Some archaeologists have sought to identify evidence for the adherence to known rules in the archaeological record, for example, in relation to waste management, the subject of several case studies in this volume (e.g. Rathje and Murphy 1992; Brown 1999; Jervis 2013). However, studies often employ textually transmitted regulations solely as sources for explaining patterns in the archaeological record, negating the possibility that the material remains may also embody actions of nonconformance, resistance or simply adaptations of normative behaviour that developed and changed over time. Examinations of the relationships between legal, regulatory or normative texts of various kinds and the archaeological record that pay specific attention to this complex reciprocity of regulation and action have, until now, remained underdeveloped. By making this relationship the central focus of study, the chapters in this volume offer various methods and frameworks for the exploration of how behaviour is managed, how

rules serve to bring stability to communities or create tensions negotiated through the use of material culture and, more generally, in relating written texts to human practice. In this introduction we briefly outline some of the approaches taken in these chapters, their relationship to different theoretical perspectives on human behaviour and practice, and their implications for the integrated study of documents and archaeological material.

Cultural Knowledge and Habitus: What is it to Act Normally?

Across archaeological scholarship, Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) concept of habitus has been particularly influential. This theory – that we subconsciously reproduce normative behaviour as a form of cultural knowledge – has been particularly used to explain how people relate to built spaces and items of portable material culture (e.g. Blinkhorn 1997; Giles 2000). Sameness and continuity are explained as the reproduction of habitus; the way things always were. Within historical archaeology, this has been most evident in the study of buildings, with scholars such as Kate Giles (2000) and Roberta Gilchrist (1994) emphasizing the presence of spatial logics that transcend different types of space, for example. Some archaeologists have critiqued the application of habitus, arguing that rather than identifying habitual behaviour, it is more pertinent to examine how such behaviour emerges and its effects on people, specifically in relation to identity creation (e.g. Chapman and Gaydarska 2011: 37).

Such a challenge is taken on here by Marianne Hem Eriksen (Chapter 5), who uses the idea that habitus is reflected in the layout of built spaces as a starting point for a discussion that focuses on what it was that became habitual, and why it came to be reflected in buildings. Behaviour was not just normalized through a passive reproduction of habitus, but rather through the effects of this cultural knowledge, or ontology, being active in determining how people conceived and perceived of spaces. Whilst buildings might act as theatres for the reproduction of cultural memory, they also become media through which knowledge is not just reproduced but also applied to make spaces that may seem alien to us, but entirely logical within their context.

The concept of habitus has a difficult relationship to regulated behaviour. By its very nature, habitus is subconscious behaviour, consisting of deeply ingrained ways of doing. By implication, therefore, habitual practices should not need to be regulated. Yet there are contexts in which such habitual behaviour might be challenged, in which spaces of ambiguity open up, and it is in these spaces that we can see rules playing a role in seeking to maintain the status quo rather than allowing social order to be challenged. In her study, Greta Civis (Chapter 3) works towards a similar

conclusion with regard to waste management, drawing on the writing of Mary Douglas to argue that people may categorize waste in ways they are not necessarily consciously aware of, with normative behaviour emerging within a context as this knowledge is reproduced and applied. She argues that this knowledge surfaces in contentious moments, when it is not possible to reproduce this behaviour, for example, as rural attitudes to waste are unable to be reproduced in the town, leading to the emergence of civic regulations.

A further such context, the Elizabethan theatre, is discussed by Ruth Nugent (Chapter 7). Theatres can be viewed as transgressive spaces, where rich and poor might mingle, where men take on the persona of women and where, generally, things need not be as they seem. Nugent, drawing on an established body of scholarship, demonstrates that it is the contentious and challenging nature of these spaces that caused them to be situated in marginal locations within London and that led to a range of regulations being developed to control theatrical performances. However, rather than focusing on these written rules, Nugent studies the use of space within the theatres, finding parallels between the spatial organization of these public structures with more familiar buildings – churches and elite houses. The reproduction of habitus through spatial grammar is a familiar trope in the study of medieval and early modern buildings, for example, in Giles' (2000) study of the relationship between guildhalls and churches in York. However, Nugent sees this spatial grammar not as a simple reproduction of habitus, but rather as a concept abducted and put to work in the theatrical setting; by being translated into these socially liminal buildings, the use of space could be employed to temper the disruptive and socially jarring nature of the activities that went on within them. This brought a sense of order and regulation that countered the potentially transgressive nature of the theatrical environment.

The colonial context discussed by Magdalena Naum (Chapter 4) is a similarly contested environment. Settlement in new places is a severely disruptive process, which causes habitual behaviour to surface, perhaps as it becomes impossible to re-create it. Whereas in Nugent's study habitual understandings of space were put to work to calm tensions, in Naum's study we see rules being developed to create circumstances in which habitual behaviour can be reproduced, a similar process to that identified by Civis. Rules can therefore be seen, in this context, as a conscious tool used to re-create particular social conditions in which traditional behaviour and attitudes could persist; in Naum's words, they were a means through which familiarity and constancy could be introduced. If, as Naum argues, the North American colonies were shaped by their

European roots, rules were, perhaps, less an instrument of domination and subjugation and more a tool for closing off spaces of contention and ambiguity, designed to mitigate against the effects of re-adjustment.

We see here several different sets of relationships between habitual or normative behaviour and regulatory action emerging. For Eriksen, cultural knowledge, manifesting in habitual behaviour, acts itself as a regulatory mechanism. For Nugent, in the context of the Elizabethan theatre, *habitus* can be seen as being abducted, becoming a regulatory mechanism in a contentious environment, whilst for Civis and Naum, rules become a conscious tool used to create an environment in which normative behaviour and attitudes can persist. A further perspective is advanced by Eleanor Williams' study of medieval Cluniac burial practices (Chapter 14) and Louise Fowler and Natasha Powers' study of the reburial of dissected individuals used in the teaching of anatomy (Chapter 15). In both cases, rules can be seen as emerging from behaviour that was already practised. The 1832 Anatomy Act appears to have legitimized existing practices for the exhumation and reburial of corpses for scientific study, whilst Cluniac customaries record specific elements of a wide spectrum of behaviour practised at the motherhouse, Cluny, and variously across its network of religious houses. Williams' study in particular raises interesting questions about the relationship between normative behaviour and regulated behaviour. Cluniac customaries apply to a range of different behaviours, viewed, at the scale of the individual house, as normative, but, at the scale of the Cluniac Order, potentially as nonstandard. Burial is an area that lends itself to explicit regulation because of the transformative and symbolically loaded nature of death. Here rules seem to emerge as a mechanism for dealing with necessary divergence from accepted practice, creating enough freedom for practices to adapt to specific circumstances, but also defining the limits of what is considered acceptable.

In all of these examples, therefore, we can see the relationship between habitual (or normative) and regulated behaviour being negotiated in different ways. Using the archaeological evidence in isolation limits us only to identifying patterns of similarity and difference (what we might interpret as different regulatory regimes or sets of cultural knowledge). Similarly, in isolation, rules themselves appear prescriptive. The strength of the interdisciplinary approach taken in these studies is to demonstrate that the processes through which rules develop vary contextually and have a complex relationship with how people act, in some cases legitimizing behaviour, in others explaining it and in further contexts becoming a tool in which social tensions can be diffused, thus becoming a medium for persistence.

Processes and Biographies

By seeking to restrict behaviour, regulatory regimes are fundamentally about managing processes. A key metaphor for understanding processes within the archaeological literature is that of biography. As people, places and things pass through time, they can be seen to gain and shed meanings, with their role in past events having implications for their future one. Principally developing from the writing of Igor Kopytoff (1986), ideas of cultural biography have been applied to a range of archaeological materials from Iron Age mirrors to Anglo-Saxon brooches and also to archaeological deposits (Joy 2010; Morris 2011; Martin 2012; see also Gosden and Marshall 1999; Mytum 2010). Allied to the concept of biography is that of the *chaîne opératoire*, a reconstruction of processes (typically in relation to the production of objects) with a focus on the ways in which these processes are socially situated (Lemmonier 1993). Within these related schemes of thinking about the temporality of people, places and things, it is clear that social actors, be they human or nonhuman, exist in a social context, which has implications for them. These implications may be iterative (that is, certain behaviours may be reproduced) or episodic (that is, relating to a particular process of transformation or stage in the 'life course' of a person or thing).

In the most literal terms, these ideas relate to the way in which people operate within a social context. Sarah Inskip's examination of skeletal remains from medieval al-Andalus (Chapter 12) provides an example of the implications for rules within iterative action. Inskip demonstrates that by participating in rituals of prayer and gendered division of labour as prescribed by Islamic law, rules might be seen as becoming embodied, indicated by the presence of particular skeletal modifications related to kneeling (prayer) and manual labour. Here we can see a clear indication that rules are more than texts; they are bundles of ideas that, if enacted in social processes, have wide implications for human experience. These rules do more than lock people into iterative processes of prayer, for example – they also physically affect people, potentially impacting the ways in which they are able to experience the world. Therefore, on the one hand, the enacting of rules limits behaviour in a regulatory way and, on the other hand, these regulated performances can have further, unintended consequences for how the biography of an individual might be able to develop, even within the spectrum of permitted courses of action. An example of the role of rules in processes of transition is provided by Fowler and Powers, who demonstrate that the biography of a person does not end at death, but that burial, excavation and re-interment is a process through which personhood is renegotiated. By being exhumed

and enrolled in a process of scientific study, bodies can be seen as developing new meaning as scientific objects (see Richards 2001; Robb and Harris 2013). It is the transformative and dangerous nature of this activity that stimulated the development of specific regulations that, as described above, served to legitimize these practices. The 1832 Anatomy Act can therefore be seen as opening up possibilities for bodily biographies to be extended into death, with rules becoming a means through which this transformation was intended to be managed safely for the medical sector, while simultaneously, the very same rules conflicted with the understanding of the “Christian body”, further reinforcing social class divides. Furthermore, the regulation imbued certain people with the ability to exhume these bodies, creating new forms of specialist employment, which would have broader implications for how they sat, as potentially marginal figures, within the communities in which they lived and worked. Within these two studies, therefore, we see rules as having different implications for people; on the one hand, they regulate behaviour explicitly, but also impact the body and the range of human experience, while on the other hand, rules provide a framework in which processes of transition can occur.

It is not only for people that rules could have implications; they can also mediate the ways in which places and things could become meaningful. In her study of the medieval castle at Frodsham, Rachel Swallow (Chapter 6) demonstrates that the development of the site is closely bound up with its legal status. Legal status gave the castle, as a place, particular official power over a region, allowing it to develop along a specific trajectory not open to other places. Crucially for Swallow, this legal status does not need to equate to any specific architectural form, but rather to a set of associations that imbue significance. It might be considered that for this reason, sites of significance in the early medieval period retain their significance in the later medieval period, with these processes of persistence being less about the taking over of existing places of power by incoming elites and more about places continuing along a trajectory through which they had acquired and continued to maintain specific associations, mediated through their legal status, from which their significance was derived.

However, as Katherine Fennelly (Chapter 9) demonstrates in her study of nineteenth-century asylum chapels, this can also be true in relation to the marginalization of places and the people who occupy them. Through the study of the development of asylum buildings, Fennelly demonstrates that the biographies of these buildings are closely related to how outsiders perceive of the care offered inside. This perception is bidirectional, with a desire to be perceived of as offering appropriate care influencing the form of buildings, and structural forms impacting upon these perceptions. It

was, Fennelly argues, this preoccupation with perception that resulted in these communities becoming increasingly marginalized and the development of distinctive forms of asylum architecture within the legal structures associated with care. A similar link between architecture and behaviour can be seen in Laura McAtackney's study of twentieth-century internment in Northern Ireland (Chapter 10), with changes in the form of buildings taking place in response to unrest and riots. McAtackney's chapter also makes a profound point about the temporality of biographies. Portable material culture can be seen as having a biography that runs more quickly than those of the buildings. For example, the appropriation of objects for disruptive purposes (for example, as weapons) played a role in determining the development of the prison architecture. Furthermore, this portable material culture was situated within the wider power structures of the prison, with the maintenance and availability of objects being controlled by prison authorities. We can therefore see how the decision to transgress regulatory structures within the prison, and the performance of the structures themselves, had material implications, entangling the biographies of the prison buildings, staff, prisoners and portable objects. Therefore, by tracing the biographies of buildings and objects, as well as of the people occupying these institutions, we can understand how regulatory structures had implications for how institutions, as bundles of all of these human and nonhuman actors, developed – for example, asylums came to be marginalized from society and prisons were continuously contested spaces.

We have thus seen how people, institutions and buildings were all shaped by rules, which limited how their biographies could develop, with both intended and unintended consequences. In her study of medieval waste deposition, Civis develops a specific framework for articulating this social embeddedness of behaviour, coining the term *chaîne éliminatoire* to describe the biography of waste and rubbish deposits. This framework offers a way of both reconstructing streams of waste within settlements, but also of understanding these in relation to cultural knowledge about how substances might contaminate spaces. As discussed above, it is when this cultural knowledge surfaces due to the inability to reproduce these practices that rules develop. Ute Scholz (Chapter 2), in her study of waste deposition in the medieval town of Tulln, also demonstrates this embeddedness, seeing deposition, and its regulation, as a medium through which consumption, religion and power are all performed, exemplifying that cultural knowledge and rules relate to different stages in the process of food consumption and preparation.

Amongst these diverse case studies, therefore, general points emerge about the relationship between rules and biographies. The first of these

is that rules, if enacted, have a cumulative impact, as iterative behaviour causes particular effects. This is most vividly apparent in Inskip's study, but is also evidenced in the discussions of waste management and deposition by Scholz and Civis, in which an emphasis on the social embeddedness of processes sees the reproduction of cultural knowledge. Similarly, Swallow shows how the biographies of places emerge out of, and reproduce and strengthen, regulatory systems. As Civis demonstrates, a further intersection occurs at points of transition, when existing practices cannot be performed. This is also evident in Fowler and Powers' study of the transition of corpses into scientific bodies, and Fennelly's considerations on the development of asylum buildings. Indeed, both Fennelly and McAtackney's studies show that the iterative and episodic relationships between actors and rules are not distinct from one another, but that changing attitudes or transgressions of rules can culminate in processes of transition, which may have the effect of changing power dynamics, or the relationship of a community or institution to the outside world. A useful means of conceptualizing this relationship can be seen in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's (1987: 47) concept of the 'coding' of social action, with iterative behaviour serving to restrict social action within a particular spectrum of behaviour. Particular actions serve to reinforce the code or channel biographies along particular trajectories or 'lines of becoming'. The episodic events can be seen as processes of 'over-coding', in which existing codes become submerged beneath new structures, which emerge from their weakening through social interaction, leading in turn to new coding structures (Deleuze and Guattari 1984: 288–89). With this in mind, it becomes clear that rules and regulatory frameworks are a vital, but understudied, element of biographical perspectives on archaeological material.

The Ontological and Material Turns

A key transition has occurred in archaeological theory in recent years. Two separate but connected intellectual 'turns' are evident. The material turn (Hicks and Beaudry 2010) sees archaeologists paying more attention to the active role of objects and materials in the lives of past societies, developing out of perspectives on the nature of material agency (Gell 1998; Latour 2005; Robb 2010). The second is the ontological turn, which has emphasized the importance of appreciating that societies develop ontologies that differ from the modern Western worldview. This has, for example, led to discussions of animism and active materials, which provide further frameworks for understanding the power of the material. Indeed, Hodder (2012: 86) has even suggested that regulations emerge to

allow us to harness the power of the material and to stop us getting into trouble with things. The implications of this are twofold. First, archaeologists might be encouraged to identify and discuss the ontologies of past communities (e.g. Jones 2005) and, second, alternative ontologies might be used as a tool to view archaeological problems from alternative perspectives (Harris 2014). In doing so, the ontological turn has forced archaeologists to question the nature of knowledge and cast a newly critical eye on our understanding of the past.

The influence of the material turn is evident in Ben Jervis' contribution (Chapter 1), which considers the agency of medieval guild rules. Jervis, following Bruno Latour's (2010) ethnography of the French legal system, argues that rules should be considered participants in social action. As discussed above, rules limit social behaviour as long as they are enrolled within performances of social action. However, Jervis argues that rules do not possess agency, but rather contribute to the emergence of particular forms of agency that prompt certain actions and limit others within the context of the town. The agency of material culture is also demonstrated well by McAttackney's discussion of the appropriation of material culture in a prison environment. In a discussion, which is analogous with Bruno Latour's (1993) classic discussion of how neither guns nor people kill people, but rather that a shooting is the result of an assemblage of the two, so too might we see unrest as emerging from the joining of people and objects within an oppressive regulatory environment.

Several studies reflect more explicitly on the relationship between rules and past ontologies, or ways of knowing the world. Civis, for example, highlights elemental theory as a dominant medieval ontology that contributed to cultural understandings of how types of waste should be treated. The other dominant ontology in medieval Europe was Christianity. However, Barbara Hausmair's study of the treatment of unbaptized children in medieval Austria (Chapter 13) highlights the dangers of imposing an idealized version of such ontologies on the past. It is clear from Hausmair's chapter that documents reveal an idealized, or perhaps scholarly, ontology, but also that people may mistrust this top-down orthodoxy as a result of their living in the world. She suggests that the illicit burial of unbaptized children on consecrated ground is indicative of this process, with knowledge emerging through social experience and practice and what is written down being only one part of knowledge. A further perspective is provided by Justin Eichelberger's study of a US military camp (Chapter 8). Eichelberger highlights how the use of space within the camp is codified in military rules and regulation. However, the process of dwelling in, and inhabiting, this space caused it to be experienced and thought about in different ways. Focusing on the evidence

for illicit drinking, Eichelberger shows how surveillance and regulations caused new spatial understandings to emerge as hidden spaces became locations for the performance of transgression and resistance. Therefore, as in Hausmair's study, the archaeological record betrays the messiness of social realities and the ways in which top-down frameworks may be treated with ambivalence in order to open up spaces for the performance of necessary but culturally undesirable acts to occur. These studies offer an interesting contrast to Fowler and Powers' study of the treatment of corpses in medical study, in which rules were developed in order to legitimize what was initially illicit and questionable behaviour. Therefore, we can think about how rules may be based upon such idealized norms, but that behaviour takes place in a more complex world in which the ambivalence towards rules may not be conscious dissent, but rather a means of adapting to the harsh realities of life.

For the early medieval period, attitudes are less clear, due to the patchy nature of the historical record. Kristopher Poole (Chapter 11) focuses on attitudes towards animals, specifically dogs, in Anglo-Saxon England. His discussion questions whether the clear modern ontological divide between humans and animals existed in the Anglo-Saxon mind. This discussion demonstrates how dogs can be active agents and highlights how a tension may have arisen between rules intended for a category of people that may have been broader than that which exists in the modern world. Furthermore, through analysis of the archaeological record, it is suggested that attitudes towards dogs differed between contexts (for example, between town and country). Thus, it is clear from this study that an anthropocentric view of agency and regulatory frameworks may not be appropriate in all instances, and that when we examine the evidence of past behaviour, we should contextualize this behaviour in a manner that is not beholden to a modern perspective on relations between people and the natural world. Eriksen's study also highlights the importance of contextual ontologies, arguing that boundaries in Viking houses and settlements were determined by understandings of the world that differ from our own. This is more than habitus, being instead a conscious and rational scheme based on a particular understanding of the world.

The issue of alternative perspectives and categories is also highlighted by Swallow in her study of the medieval castle. Swallow uses the term 'black boxes' to describe the term 'castle', arguing that it potentially had different meanings in the medieval period, depending upon the nature of discourse. This discussion finds parallels in Fowler's (2013) discussion of circulating references in prehistoric burial archaeology and Jervis' (2016) discussion of medieval towns. Swallow's study is important in this regard because it demonstrates how we must take care in adopting legal terms

and applying them directly to categories of archaeological material. A similar point can perhaps be transferred to Poole's study of dogs, in which the dog circulates as a loaded term in archaeological literature, with sets of associations which they may not have held in the past.

Contemporary theoretical perspectives, focusing on the diversity of ways of knowing the world and the active role of the material, have thus offered fertile ground for exploring the archaeology of rules and regulation. On the one hand, we can see written rules as a powerful form of material culture in themselves, enrolled in performances of life with other objects and materials. On the other hand, we can use the archaeological record to reconstruct past ontologies, to question processes of categorization based upon legal terminology and to understand how, as Poole and Eriksen seek to do, cultural knowledge was articulated through practice. However, as Hausmair and Eichelberger demonstrate, the archaeological record may provide evidence of transgressions, which do more than show disobedience or deviation from normative behaviour. Rather, these can be used to illustrate a complex relationship between people and regulatory frameworks, in which ambivalence may be a necessary tool for dealing with the realities of a messy social existence.

Text and Practice

The problem of how to integrate archaeological evidence and historical documents is a persistent one in archaeological practice. Nancy Wicker (1999) outlined a tripartite scheme for characterizing this relationship: seeing approaches as either crossdisciplinary (combining historical and archaeological sources to a common end), multidisciplinary (using these approaches separately to address the same question) or interdisciplinary (exploring the links between text and the material record). Scholars such as Anders Andréén (1998) and John Moreland (2006) have all emphasized the need to move towards approaches equivalent to Wicker's interdisciplinary approach by considering the active nature of documents as forming a part of, and finding meaning through, social processes. The chapters presented in this volume form a contribution to achieving this goal, through addressing the relationship between text and practice in a variety of ways.

The most explicit attempt to achieve this aim is Jervis' study, which uses the writing of Bruno Latour to provide a framework for understanding how rules both emerge from, and contribute to, social practice. Other contributions also demonstrate this point by working through specific examples. For Williams, Cluniac customaries find meaning through enrolment in practice, with a dialogue existing between the circumstances

and materiality of burial, and the ideals recorded in these documents. In Eichelberger's study, it is in the performance of ambivalence that we can see tensions emerging between authority and rank-and-file soldiers; here we see the potency of rules in bringing about alternative ways of thinking about, and experiencing, space. Scholz demonstrates how the writing down of rules is an important component of the mediation of power, whilst Naum clearly illuminates the active role of texts in practice, both by limiting behaviour and also by opening up areas of ambiguity in which new transgressions might occur (for example, the selling of weapons to Native Americans). That rules also open up spaces of ambiguity is exemplified by Fowler and Powers, who highlight variability in the treatment of interred human remains as the Anatomy Act does not specify what decent re-interment is.

Studies by Eichelberger, Williams, Inskip and Hausmair all consider the malleability of rules. If documents are seen as repositories of knowledge of how to behave, it is clear from the variations presented in each of these studies that people know the world through other mediums too. Knowledge and ideas are all negotiated through behaviour. As Inskip shows, the same meaning was not understood by everyone reading a document and, as Hausmair argues, knowledge also emerges from living in the world. It is then in the dialogue between archaeology and texts that we can reveal how texts, such as rules and directives, mediated understandings of the world.

By emphasizing processes of writing down rules and by seeing them as a form of material culture, it is also possible to gain deeper insights into the social dynamics and areas of tension within communities. This can work in a variety of ways. In Nugent's study, texts did more than document the socially dangerous nature of theatres; they also served to reify their potency as the recorded attitudes were played out. Similarly, in Fennelly's study, buildings come to materialize social attitudes from which the regulatory framework in which these buildings existed emerged with the institutions themselves. In Civis' study, we see a different type of tension, with rules emerging as a process of managing new kinds of space, with texts emerging from practices, as an urban translation of rural ways of living with each other and the environment.

However, it is not only regulatory documents that detail rules and regulation. Working in the early medieval period, both Poole and Eriksen demonstrate how a range of documents and literary traditions reveal attitudes. Folklore emerges out of real situations and is grounded in contemporary knowledge. As such, it not only provides insights into what was regulated, but it also highlights where areas of tension may emerge and therefore where regulation might have been required, for example, in

the maintenance of real and cosmological barriers in the case of Eriksen's study.

A key point arising from Swallow's study is that within crossdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approaches, treatment of the historical record as fact can have implications for archaeological interpretations. Swallow makes one of the strongest cases for interdisciplinary study by highlighting how legal terms and archaeological sites find meaning in relation to one another, meaning that we cannot fully understand one without the other, not because of the incompleteness of either record, but because of their inherent relatedness. This is a point made in a different way in McAtackney's chapter, which highlights how the biographies of prisoners, prison artefacts and prison buildings are indivisible from regulatory developments, highlighting the potency of documents as part of the material world.

Although highly varied, the studies presented here all make contributions to the development of an interdisciplinary approach in which the relationships between documentary and archaeological evidence take centre stage. These chapters demonstrate that rules have implications that extend beyond simple regulation. Rather, they are central components of social interactions that must be taken seriously, whether we are considering the biographies of objects, narratives of continuity and change, or seeking to discover how people understood the world around them.

Barbara Hausmair is a post-doctoral researcher at the Freie Universität Berlin, Germany and previously held a Marie-Sklodowska-Curie-Fellowship at the Zukunftskolleg, University of Konstanz, Germany. She gained her Ph.D. from the University of Vienna, Austria where she was also a research associate and site supervisor in international excavation projects in France, Austria and Italy. She is the author of *Am Rande des Grabs: Todeskonzepte und Bestattungsritual in der frühmittelalterlichen Alamannia* (Sidestone Press, 2015), co-editor of *Spruch von den sibnen* (Thorbecke, 2016) and has published several articles on medieval mortuary practices and social dynamics as well as the archaeology of twentieth-century internment.

Ben Jervis is Lecturer in Medieval Archaeology at Cardiff University, United Kingdom, having gained his Ph.D. from the University of Southampton in 2011. He is the author of *Pottery and Social Life in Medieval England: Towards a Relational Approach* (Oxbow, 2014) and has published widely on topics including medieval urbanism and the application of

archaeological theory to the study of medieval objects in journals such as the *Journal of Social Archaeology* and *Early Medieval Europe and Medieval Archaeology*. He is also the co-editor of *Objects, Environment and Everyday Life in Medieval Europe* (Brepols, 2016) and *Insight from Innovation: New Light on Archaeological Ceramics* (Highfield Press, 2016).

Ruth Nugent completed her doctoral thesis on mortuary culture in English cathedrals in the Department of History and Archaeology at the University of Chester, United Kingdom, where she is also a visiting lecturer. She has previously published on early Anglo-Saxon mortuary practices and perceptions of bodies, material culture and their spatial arrangement, e.g. in 'Medieval Archaeology'. Her research interests include interactions between bodies (living or dead) and physical/conceptual spaces, and the role of touch in navigating this intersection.

Eleanor Williams is Lecturer in Archaeology at Canterbury Christ Church University, United Kingdom, specializing in human osteology, zooarchaeology, and medieval archaeology. She gained her Ph.D. from the University of Southampton, United Kingdom, on burial practices in Cluniac monasteries in England and France, with a particular focus on the relationship between practice and the Cluniac customaries. She has presented and published on different aspects of her research, including with the Centre d'Archéologie et d'Histoire Médiévales des Etablissements Religieux. She is currently collaborating at CCCU on the HLF sponsored community project 'Finding Eanswythe: the Life and Afterlife of an Anglo-Saxon Saint'.

References

- Andrén, A. 1998. *Between Artifacts and Texts: Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*. Philadelphia, PA: Plenum Press.
- Auler, J. (ed.). 2008. *Richtstättenarchäologie, Vol. 1*. Dormagen: Archaeotopos-Verlag.
- . 2010. *Richtstättenarchäologie, Vol. 2*. Dormagen: Archaeotopos-Verlag.
- . (ed.). 2013. *Richtstättenarchäologie, Vol. 3*. Dormagen: Archaeotopos-Verlag.
- Baker, J., and S. Brookes. 2013. 'Governance at the Anglo-Scandinavian Interface: Hundredal Organization in the Southern Danelaw', *Journal of the North Atlantic* 5: 76–95.
- Baker, J., S. Brookes and A. Reynolds. 2011. 'Landscapes of Governance: Assembly Sites in England from the Fifth to the Eleventh Centuries', *Post-Classical Archaeologies* 1: 499–502.

- Blinkhorn, P. 1997. 'Habitus, Social Identity and Anglo-Saxon Pottery', in P. Blinkhorn and C. Cumberpatch (eds), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life*. Oxford: Oxbow, pp. 113–24.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brookes, S. 2013. 'Outside the Gate: Sub-urban Legal Practices in Early Medieval England', *World Archaeology* 45(5): 747–61.
- Brown, D. 1999. 'Class and Rubbish', in P. Funari, M. Hall and S. Jones (eds), *Historical Archaeology Back from the Edge*. London: Routledge, pp. 150–63.
- Buckberry, J., and D. Hadley. 2007. 'An Anglo-Saxon Execution Cemetery at Walkington Wold, Yorkshire', *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26(3): 209–39.
- Chapman, J., and B. Gaydarska. 2011. 'Can We Reconcile Individualisation with Relational Personhood? A Case Study from the Early Neolithic', *Documenta Praehistorica* 38: 21–44.
- Deleuze, G., and F. Guattari. 1984. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. R. Hurley, M. Seem and H.R. Lane. London: Bloomsbury.
- . 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. B. Massumi. London: Bloomsbury.
- Fowler, C. 2013. *The Emergent Past: A Relational Realist Archaeology of Early Bronze Age Mortuary Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gell, A. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gilchrist, R. 1994. *Gender and Material Culture: The Archaeology of Religious Women*. London: Routledge.
- Giles, K. 2000. *An Archaeology of Social Identity: Guildhalls in York, c.1350–1630*, BAR British Series 315. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Gosden, C., and Marshall, Y. 1999. 'The Cultural Biography of Objects', *World Archaeology* 31(2): 169–78.
- Harris, O. 2014. '(Re)assembling Communities', *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 21: 76–97.
- Hicks, D., and M. Beaudry. 2010. 'The Material-Culture Turn: Event and Effect', in D. Hicks and M. Beaudry (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25–98.
- Hodder, I. 2012. *Entangled: An Archaeology of the Relationships between Humans and Things*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jervis, B. 2013. 'Rubbish and the Creation of Urban Landscape: A Case Study from Medieval Southampton, UK', in J. Bintliff and M. Carosco (eds), *Pottery and Social Dynamics in the Mediterranean and beyond in Medieval and Post-Medieval Times*, BAR International Series 2557. Oxford: Archaeopress, pp. 57–73.
- . 2016. 'Assemblage Theory and Town Foundation in Medieval England', *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 26(3): 381–395.
- Jones, A. 2005. 'Lives in Fragments? Personhood and the European Neolithic', *Journal of Social Archaeology* 5(2): 193–224.
- Joy, J. 2010. *Iron Age Mirrors*, BAR Series 518. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Kopytoff, I. 1986. 'The Cultural Biography of Things: Commodization as Process', in A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 64–91.

- Latour, B. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. C. Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2010. *The Making of Law: An Ethnography of the Conseil d'Etat*, trans. M. Brillman. London: Polity Press.
- Lemmonier, P. 1993. 'Introduction', in P. Lemmonier (ed.), *Technological Choices*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–35.
- Martin, T. 2012. 'Riveting Biographies: The Theoretical Implications of Early Anglo-Saxon Brooch Repair, Customisation and Use-Adaptation', in B. Jervis and A. Kyle (eds), *Make-do and Mend*, BAR International Series 2408. Oxford: Archaeopress, pp. 53–66.
- Moreland, J. 2006. 'Archaeology and Texts: Subsistence or Enlightenment', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35: 135–51.
- Morris, J. 2011. *Investigating Animal Burials: Ritual, Mundane and Beyond*, BAR British Series 535. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Myres, J.N.L. 1969. *Anglo-Saxon Pottery and the Settlement of England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mytum, H. 2010. 'Ways of Writing in Post-Medieval and Historical Archaeology: Introducing Biography', *Post Medieval Archaeology* 44(2): 237–54.
- Oosthuizen, S. 2013. *Tradition and Transformation in Anglo-Saxon England: Archaeology, Common Rights and Landscape*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rathje, W., and C. Murphy. 1992. *Rubbish! The Archaeology of Garbage*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Reynolds, A. 2012. 'Crime and Punishment', in S. Crawford, H. Hamerow and D. Hinton (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Anglo-Saxon Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 910–31.
- Richards, R. 2001. *Death, Dissection and the Destitute*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robb, J. 2010. 'Beyond Agency', *World Archaeology* 42: 493–520.
- Robb, J., and O. Harris. 2013. *The Body in History: Europe from Palaeolithic to the Future*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, K., and Reynolds, A. 2013. 'Introduction: The Archaeology of Legal Culture', *World Archaeology* 45(5): 687–98.
- Wicker, N. 1999. 'Archaeology and Art History: Common Ground for the New Millennium', *Medieval Archaeology* 43: 161–71.