Archaeology is often seen as a scientific discipline that explores the material of the past. Likewise, heritage is conventionally understood as material from the past to which people develop a sense of attachment and pride. Although heritage studies, as an academic endeavour, is relatively new compared with the science of archaeology, we argue that ancient cultures conserved material of the past because they considered it their heritage. For example, the prominent Roman architect in the first century CE, Vitruvius, regarded the architectural heritage of Rome as a reflection of his people’s achievements at all levels: a heritage that expressed Roman culture and shaped its present and future. In Vitruvius’ (1995, I, p. 5) words to Caesar: ‘with respect to the future, you have such regard to public and private buildings, that they will correspond to the grandeur of our history, and will be a memorial to future ages’. The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitution documented the law of Rome in the time between 313 CE and 438 CE. The Code, edited and translated by Clyde Pharr in 1952, demonstrated different measures to protect the Classical material of the past. For example, penalties against those who stole or vandalized monuments or tombs were declared (Pharr, 1952, p. 239). Furthermore, officers were designated to inspect monuments regularly and to report the necessary levels of interventions needed to preserve the Classical material of the past (Pharr, 1952, p. 242).

Interest in the Classical past and its material reminders flourished during the Renaissance period (1450–1600), as strong feelings of attachment and belonging to it appeared among European scholars. According to Cleere (1989, p. 7), the Renaissance approach to the Classical past is the ‘basic philosophical tenet [that] is now widely accepted in many countries of the world, and it underlies much modern heritage management’. It can be concluded that the Renaissance scholars were the first to start systematic conservation operations of material from the past (Jokilehto, 1999, p. 27). This approach can be labelled the art history approach. It is based on emphasizing intrinsic values of material culture,
in particular aesthetic value, monumentality and authenticity, which were considered the basic sources of significance for the material remains of the past (Mason, 2002, p. 19). Therefore, practices concerned with material remains during the Renaissance period were inspired by, and based on, a sense of cultural and emotional attachment.

**Inventing archaeology**

Governments in Europe have for quite some time acknowledged archaeological monuments as national heritage. Organizations concerned with national heritage protection were established, for example in England, at the beginning of the eighteenth century (Dobby, 1978, p. 61; Feilden, 1982, p. 5; Cleere, 1984b, p. 54). It is worth mentioning that as early as 1572 there were attempts among English scholars to establish a society to protect ancient monuments (Daniel, 1981, p. 46), with the first archaeological society in the world, the Society of Antiquaries of London, constituted in 1718 (Willems, 2002). Such societies reflect the obsession of the elite at the time with acquiring antiquities and visiting ancient sites, including not only the Classical world, but also the Holy Land, Egypt and Mesopotamia.

The modern perception of material remains from the past in terms of their value and significance was influenced by canonical ideas emerging from art history, particularly those concerned with aesthetic value, monumentality and authenticity. The application of the notion of authenticity to the perception of archaeological sites, developed by the German archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckleman in his book *History of Ancient Art* (1764), was fundamentally inspired by ideas of originality and age. Similarly, in England during the nineteenth century, John Ruskin, an architect and art critic, developed his approach to historic buildings and monuments in a context dominated by a high appreciation of the picturesque nature of ruins (Jokilehto, 1999, p. 156). Ruskin, in his books *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* (1849) and *The Bible of Amiens* (1908), followed a Romantic approach to the past that valued a minimum level of intervention in conservation. His work argued that any intervention towards historical buildings and archaeological monuments should be minimized in order to avoid jeopardizing ‘the soul of the building’ (Ruskin, 1996, pp. 322–23). Ruskin’s approach contradicted the Restoration approach that was established by the French architect Viollett le Duc, who instead called for an intervention in historic buildings that aimed ‘neither to maintain it, nor to repair it, nor to rebuild it; it means to re-establish it in a finished state, which may in fact never have actually existed at any time’ (le Duc, 1996, p. 314, emphasis added).

However, most practices concerned with historical sites were designed to conserve the original state of the ‘non-renewable’ material of the past. Such