



**new  
futures  
for  
replicas**

**principles  
and guidance  
for museums  
and heritage**

lead authors  
**Sally Foster and Siân Jones**

# contents

<b>introduction</b>	1
<b>context</b>	2
<b>principles</b>	5
<b>guidance</b>	6
<b>1 researching and understanding replicas</b>	6
<b>2 understanding the significance of replicas</b>	7
<b>3 caring and protecting</b>	8
<b>4 engaging and enjoying</b>	9
<b>5 creating new replicas</b>	10
<b>appendix questions to ask of replicas</b>	11
<b>glossary</b>	12
<b>starter reading</b>	14
<b>credits</b>	16





# introduction

**In unique ways replicas extend our understanding of the relationships between people, places and things. If we lose them or fail to change our practices in relation to the creation of new replicas, we will fail to release the potential they embody, to challenge our notions of authenticity and value, to interrogate our heritage and museum practices, and to acknowledge underappreciated human skills, crafts, passions and ways of seeing the world.**

Caring for and working with replicas, past, present or future, will benefit from joined-up thinking in relation to the authenticity, value and significance of analogue and digital copies, and in relation to ethical considerations that also embrace the originals. The intellectual and practical treatment of replicas is disjointed and fragmented in terms of heritage and museum practices; replicas and their originals often sit between places, collections and sectors, and are subject to inconsistent, different and divergent practices, which may well include inertia and invisibility. Ultimately, this treatment is a product of the questionable or secondary authenticity and value associated with replicas.

We seek to change this, because a substantial body of research now demonstrates that replicas do indeed acquire diverse forms of authenticity, significance and value. It is clear that authenticity, significance and value are not exclusive or intrinsic to an object, whether it is a historic original or a replica. The experience of authenticity and aura is linked to material qualities, but also informed by a sense of 'pastness', and the networks of social relations in which an object is embedded over time. This can be illuminated by considering the interlinked lives of a historic original and its copies – thinking in terms of 'composite biographies' of related or 'extended objects'.

These principles and guidance have been co-produced with a wide-ranging group of academics and museum and heritage professionals (see Credits). They are intended for high-level international application in conjunction with national and local, culturally specific adaptation, by people creating, using and caring for replicas. We also seek to transcend sectoral boundaries and generate dialogue, particularly between treatment of replicas in museum and landscape contexts.

## **Dr Sally Foster**

Senior Lecturer in Heritage and Conservation  
*s.m.foster@stir.ac.uk* **Twitter** @ableminds\_

## **Professor Siân Jones**

Professor of Heritage  
*sian.jones@stir.ac.uk* **Twitter** @blinkymanx

## **Gillian Findlay**

Interim Head of Museums & Collections,  
Culture Perth & Kinross

## **Dr Sam Alberti**

Keeper of Science & Technology,  
National Museums Scotland and Honorary Professor,  
University of Stirling

## **Historic Environment Scotland**

**“new futures for replicas** necessitates an urgent re-calibration of how replicas are considered by museums and presents exciting directions for research, engagement and interpretation of these objects. The guidance is also an invaluable toolkit for enabling museums to apply a much-needed consistency of care to objects which often span diverse collections and disciplines.”

“These principles and guidance synthesise and advance our understanding of cultures of copying in heritage practice. They articulate and champion the significance of an element of material (and other) culture. Collections are riddled with replicas – some good, some bad, some ugly – but this collaborative, multidisciplinary research constitutes an important contribution to the theory and use of replicas in museums.”

“Recent work has highlighted that replicas have an important role to play in the understanding of our historic environment. This guidance shows how we can view their cultural significance and is a helpful addition to aid our decision-making about designating and managing change affecting replicas.”

## 2 context

### focus on analogue

We interpret 'replica' broadly since our objective is to explore shared issues not create boundaries. Our focus is primarily objects designed to be exact copies of an original, and where the act of reproduction involves 'direct' contact in some way with the original. In heritage and museum contexts, these objects are considered 'proxies', not fakes. They may differ from the original in terms of when and why they were created, who they were created by, how they were intended to function, how they have been or are used, and/or their materiality, location and context.

Our primary focus is analogue (physical) replicas made of diverse materials – plaster, concrete, stone, fibreglass, synthetic resin, metal casts and electrotypes, *etc.* They range from the monumental to small-scale and portable. Our focus includes the intermediary stages of their production, such as moulds and three-dimensional data. Much that we offer will, though, be applicable to digital and other forms of replication, such as models or experimental reconstructions (see **Glossary**).

### need for principles and guidance

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, replicas were extremely important components of museum collections around the world. Antiquarians and curators created and shared replicas of new and existing finds for research purposes. They also wanted visitors to learn about and compare the materiality of a representative range of objects and monuments, often from other countries and continents. The use of replicas on heritage sites is more recent. In the 'Western' conservation tradition, authenticity was primarily associated with the original historic object, deemed an intrinsic quality linked to material fabric and remains. With the passage of time, replicas at museums were often regarded as 'secondary' to originals and many were destroyed. Then as now, the realities included pressures on display and storage space. The risk, in a digital age, is that 'preservation' by 3D digital record is seen as the 'answer' to dealing with the number and volume of surviving replicas, even though 'digital records are not a substitute for preservation' of 'the Work itself'.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 2017 ReACH Declaration Article 3.



The early importance of analogue replicas is evidenced by the 1867 *Convention for Promoting Universally Reproductions of Works of Art for the Benefit of Museums of All Countries*. Digital reproduction was addressed by the 2017 V&A / Peri *Reproduction of Art and Cultural Heritage Declaration* (see also Denard 2009, *The London Charter*). No contemporary guidance exists in relation to analogue replicas, and the problem is that the authenticity, value and significance of replicas more generally is still under-appreciated. Although ethical considerations underpin much of the *ReACH Declaration* for digital reproduction, they were not a consideration in the 1867 *Convention*. The result is that approaches to the curation and creation of replicas continues to raise many ethical issues.

With failure to assess, analyze and recognise their significance, the interest and benefits of replicas is not realised. This applies to historic replicas as well as to replicas created today. Physical replication arguably plays an increasingly important role at heritage sites and in museums, among re-enactors and living history societies, as well as in the home. Modern replication may or may not involve digital technologies, but these have certainly popularised and democratised the production of analogue replicas, generating further profusion, among the public as well as academics, heritage and museum professionals.

The survival of historic replicas is therefore threatened. Deaccessioning and disposing are necessary facets of collections management but decisions are, and have been, made about the future of replicas in the absence of significance assessment. Such decisions may be made by people who do not consider, research, understand and assess their significance, or necessarily think to ask someone with the awareness, skills and expertise to do this.





**St Andrews**

750–800  
manufacture and use  
at royal monastery  
800–1000  
burial/loss



Pictish king,  
probably **Oengus**  
son of **Fergus**  
died 761

1833

most of **Sarcophagus** discovered  
during grave digging between  
**St Rule's Tower** and **Cathedral**

1836

**stone 3a** discovered.  
Transported to York

1922

**stone 3a** restored to Sarcophagus  
in **Cathedral Museum** per **Hay Fleming**.  
**cast 3a** given to York and Edinburgh

1988

→ **casts set** received



grave-diggers

**Newcastle Upon Tyne**

1848

**unknown cast** ←  
donated to **Black-Gate**  
**Museum** by **Walter**  
**Calverley Trevelyan**



1931 last recorded  
1956 now lost

**York**

1836

**stone 3a**  
given by **Rev**  
**Dr Dibden**  
to **James**  
**Atkinson**  
1881  
in **Yorkshire**  
**Philosophical**  
**Society**  
collections  
1922  
→ **stone 3a**  
transferred  
→ **cast 3a**  
received



**London**

1997

**Sarcophagus** displayed  
at **British Museum** in  
Heirs of Rome exhibition

**Cupar**

1839

**Sarcophagus**  
stones transported  
from **St Andrews**.  
**Plaster casts**  
commissioned by



**George Buist**  
for display in  
**Fife Literary,**  
**Scientific and**  
**Philosophical**  
**Society Museum**



1837  
editor of  
**Fifeshire Journal**  
1840  
editor of  
**Bombay Times**

**unknown cast**

1848

→ **casts set**

1849

→ **casts set**

1852

→ **casts set**

**Bombay** INDIA



**Edinburgh**

1849

→ **casts set**

purchased by subscription  
for **National Museum of**  
**Antiquities** received by  
curator **Sir Daniel Wilson**

1922

→ **cast 3a** received

1937

→ **cast 3** received

1997

**Sarcophagus** displayed.  
**Society of Antiquaries**  
of **Scotland** conference

**Dublin**

1852

→ **casts set**

acquired by **Mr Deane**

1853

Shown at  
**Industrial Exhibition**  
per **Lord Malahide** and **Albert Way**,  
President and Secretary of  
**Royal Archaeological Institute**.  
Moved to **Museum of Irish Antiquities**



1890

one cast now lost

1894

Moved to **Royal Irish Academy**,  
since lost

1998

Publication of **The St Andrews Sarcophagus:**  
**A Pictish Masterpiece and its International Connections**

## **A New understandings of authenticity recognise replicas as *original* objects in their own right with stories worth telling**

- 1 Replicas, like all objects, have their own biographies and life stories, and those life stories will necessarily diverge from their historic originals.
- 2 New approaches to authenticity recognise that authenticity is not an intrinsic, material quality of a thing, but a socially mediated experience.
- 3 The materiality, location, use, accessibility, social context, biography, technology / craft of production and authorship will inform how authenticity is experienced and negotiated.
- 4 The production of replicas, including the practitioners involved and the technical and craft practices deployed, is important and often under-researched.
- 5 Co-producing replicas, not least with local communities, can stimulate interest, debate and wider democratisation of heritage and museum practices through the co-production of meaning and establishment of authenticity, values and significance. The benefits of such activities may lie in the process rather than the end-product.

## **B Replicas are distinctive as ‘extended objects’ with ‘composite biographies’ that link the lives of the copies and original**

- 1 ‘Relatedness’ is a fundamental characteristic of replicas, because their meaning and value is in large measure a product of their relationships with people, places and other things, which may include further replicas. Appreciating the significance of individual replicas requires recognizing and appreciating these specific linkages.
- 2 The values that are given to replicas are complicated and risk being constrained by existing mechanisms. Replicas therefore invite alternative ways of thinking within institutional or disciplinary silos, as well as *new* ways of working within and across communities of interest.
- 3 Institutions can help by making their replicas more accessible and visible, integrating them into their catalogues, database structures and their online searchability. The intellectual and practical benefits of cross-institutional, cross-sector thinking / action would extend well beyond replicas and any one country.

## **C Replicas merit the same care as other objects and places**

- 1 While allowing that some replicas continue to be used and made for educational and experimental purposes,<sup>2</sup> replicas are ideally subject to the same evidence-based, research-led heritage / curatorial processes as other objects and places.
- 2 Caring for replicas should therefore consider collecting, accessioning, recording, researching, designation, conserving, interpreting, presenting, deaccessioning and disposal, as appropriate.
- 3 Significance assessment offers a framework for action based on transparent and holistic assessment of authenticity, value and significance of individual replicas and replica collections.

## **D Replicas invoke specific local and global ethical issues**

- 1 Replicas are and will continue to be an essential component of the world’s cultural heritage and strategies for its curation.
- 2 Past practices or contexts of replica production may not have been, or may no longer be, deemed ethical. The consequences of such issues need to be identified and handled with due sensitivity and appropriate consultation.<sup>3</sup>
- 3 In creating replicas, contemporary ethical considerations include intellectual property, copyright and attribution, self-documentation of identity and integrity,<sup>4</sup> the risk of physical impact on historic originals, and the positive and negative impact on communities of interest associated with the subject’s biography. The latter may be unexpected, hence the importance of an ethical review process that brings in multiple viewpoints.
- 4 Contexts in which replicas are now being considered may already be highly contested, such as questions of restitution and repatriation, or relocation of historic originals because they are under threat in their current location.

*These cross-cutting Principles underpin the Guidance that follows.*

<sup>2</sup> cf. ICOM 2017 *Code of Ethics*, §2.8.

<sup>3</sup> cf. V&A 2017 *ReACH Declaration* Article 5.

<sup>4</sup> cf. ICOM 2017 *Code of Ethics*, §4.7.

## 6 guidance

Sections 1–4 reflect a cycle in which an understanding of value, iteratively fed and shaped by knowledge and understanding, can be used to inform decisions about what to secure for the future, and how such resources can be engaged for wider public benefit, generating a desire to know more about the resource in question.



### I researching and understanding replicas

- I.1 Replicas have lives like other objects but, as 'extended objects', researching an individual replica, or replica collection, requires identifying and researching all parts of the 'composite biography' and bringing them together in some way.** As networked objects with linked but semi-independent lives, their meaning and significance resides in the relationship of people, places and things, including originals and other copies, analogue and digital.
- I.2 Important stories are likely to emerge from focusing on the relational / network aspects rather than the objects themselves.** Replicas 'do' distinctive work, and there will be benefits from establishing what this might be, historically and in the now.
- I.3 All parts of the lives of the replica need to be considered, including their materials and technology of production.** The materiality, technology and craft of replicas, including in relation to the original, tends to be under-researched.
- I.4 Motivations and intent at the point of creation are integral to understanding the historic value of replicas and their contemporary resonances,** particularly for those that commissioned, manufactured, circulated or received them. Such stories can embrace local to international relationships. The production of replicas has been embedded in discourses of nationalism, colonialism and naturalism (and in some instances still are). Yet they have also been produced by diverse communities and informed by complex localised interests.
- I.5 Replicas contribute to the ongoing life of the original, and vice versa.** Tracing this emerging relationship through time enables the nature, meaning and outcomes of this relationship to be determined. Replication is also a part of the creative story and process of the creation of many 'original' artworks.
- I.6 Replicas have complex biographies, so the stories they tell, and people they involve, will evolve.** For example, they might transition from being a handled object to a curated object.
- I.7 Researching composite biographies is likely to call for interdisciplinary approaches and practices.** Social and spiritual values, past and present, need to be understood and this calls for qualitative social research methods.
- I.8 The understanding of individual replicas and collections of replicas will be enhanced by comparative research that provides a broader context for understanding them.** Simply mapping who holds what is an important starting point.
- I.9 Representing composite biographies calls for new practices in capturing and linking information from multiple objects or places that are unlikely to be within the remit of a single institution or even sector.**
- I.10 Relevant records may reside in the archives of individuals and manufacturers rather than heritage and museum bodies.** They might also be more extensive in the archives of the recipient rather than the creator or donor.
- I.11 The agency of local makers and modern-day conservators is generally under-explored and needs to be considered.**
- I.12 Replicas may help to map decay of originals since the mid-nineteenth century, if not before, or represent lost originals.** They can also help understand past surface treatment or stages in the restoration of the original.
- I.13 This list is hardly exhaustive, but the ideas expressed here lay the groundwork for future approaches.**







## 2 understanding the authenticity and significance of replicas

**2.1 Replicas and associated evidence for their creation, such as moulds, can and should be subject to the same processes for assessment of authenticity and significance as other objects and places.** It is to be noted that some were or are created for handling / experimental purposes or are intended to be sacrificial because they in some way offer protection to an original.

**2.2 New approaches to authenticity recognise that authenticity is not an intrinsic, material quality of a thing, but a socially mediated experience in which the material qualities of the subject, its location and social context, play an important role.** Materials and technologies of production will also affect and contribute to understandings of authenticity and significance, as will co-participatory activities.

**2.3 The significance of replicas is based on a range of values, including evidential / scientific, historic, aesthetic or social / spiritual perspective, unlikely to be reflected in their economic value.**

**2.4 The authenticity and significance of replicas should be researched not assumed, for example through techniques of rapid ethnographic assessment.** If applicable, it is important to distinguish past and contemporary attitudes to the replica / replica collection in question.

**2.5 The place(s) that replicas have circulated between and/or their contemporary location and setting play an important part in understanding their authenticity and significance.** They are likely to be severed from the original in spatial terms, finding themselves in a new context, but still attached in other ways.

**2.6 When describing and assessing the authenticity and significance of an individual replica, such as for designation, the replica should be foregrounded, albeit considered in terms of the composite biography of the original and its replicas since these are hard to disentangle.**

**2.7 Some values will be more important than others, and judgements will need to be made.** There will be known unknowns and unknown unknowns, but the absence of a type of evidence should not automatically render a replica of less worth.

**2.8 Replicas may be associated with originals adversely affected by extreme events (fire, earthquakes, floods, warfare etc).** This is likely to change or enhance their contemporary authenticity and significance.

**2.9 The 'chain of proximity' of the replica to the original is under-researched.** How direct is the copying relationship? What is the quality of the copy? What levels of meaning does this add from past and contemporary human perspectives?

**2.10 The appendix summarises questions that might be asked of replicas to research respective values and start to understand their significance, individually and in groups.**



### 3 caring and protecting

**3.1 Decision-making about replicas, as for historic originals, should be informed by a sympathetic understanding of authenticity and significance, on a case-by-case basis.** The outcome may be diverse approaches to conservation and management, whether collecting, accessioning, recording, designating, curating, conserving, surface treatment, deaccessioning, disposing of or destroying them.

**3.2 Conservation and management planning needs to recognise that the authenticity and significance of replicas will be dynamic** – they have an ongoing life, particularly if they are in the researcher and public domain.

**3.3 Replicas should not be disenfranchised if there is the apparent lack of potential to recover their full biographies.**

**3.4 An added dimension of replicas is that, unlike historic originals, it is always essential to think about the relationship of the replica to the original / other collections, and the relationship of the location of each.** This should make a difference to decisions about the care and management of replicas.

**3.5 It is necessary to know whether replicas have been accessioned or not, and review whether it is best practice to do so.**

**3.6 New systems for documenting the nature, value and significance of replicas need to be designed and implemented to capture information and enable queries about their relational nature.** This need invites collaboration between institutions on a national and international scale.



**3.7 Decisions about whether to designate replicas may invite controversy, but designation will be important for some cases and not appropriate in others.**

**3.8 Like historic originals, the broad context of replicas, including their reception history, needs to be considered in securing them for the future.** This includes their setting, moulds, old labels, historic display cases, bases and documentation.

**3.9 In terms of need and technical conservation practice, there is no difference in caring for originals or replicas, while recognizing that some are created to be sacrificial because of likely wear or other anticipated impacts.** The act of conservation has the potential to generate new knowledge about the replica.

**3.10 A desirable new practice is that documentation of conservation work records not just what was done to replicas, but why and who was involved.** Ideally, semi-reflective observations might also be kept noting how the people involved felt about this and the experience of working with the replica.

**3.11 Curatorial input is desirable in the disposal of replicas to ensure that this is informed by significance assessment alongside a disposal policy, whether they are accessioned or not.<sup>5</sup>** Loss may become acceptable, but some replicas will also be, or become, worth preserving. Today's new replicas are tomorrow's historic replicas.

<sup>5</sup> cf. ICON 2017 Code of Ethics §2.13.





‘Museums should be engaging and impactful spaces and replicas have the capacity to generate curiosity and creativity, to challenge established knowledge, and help us reconsider our relationship with objects and the ways we think about the past. This publication sets out the principles that will allow museum professionals to think anew about these objects and how best to protect and display them.’

Dr Yannis Galanakis  
 Director of Archives and of the  
 Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
 Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge

## 4 engaging and enjoying

- 4.1 Replicas are located in diverse contexts** where they are deployed for the engagement and enjoyment of the wider public, whether replacing or protecting original objects, features or monuments, or for interpretation, exhibition, living history and education, including handling.
- 4.2 Replicas will have a story of their own to tell,** and this can therefore be considered as part of the development of interpretation and presentation strategies.
- 4.3 The stories that can be told will emerge from researching them and an assessment of their value and significance.** They are not just a proxy for a historic original. Attention should be paid to the intent of the replica, the relationship with the original, and how they ‘grow’ together (the ‘composite biography’).
- 4.4 An understanding of how senses connect through affect and performance can aid replica presentation and interpretation strategies,** helping to understand and manage visitor expectations and perceptions.
- 4.5 The use of replicas that can be handled is particularly effective for visitor understanding,** but also informs affective experience including authenticity.
- 4.6 The creation and circulation of replicas beyond museums and heritage sites can enable wider access and engagement with artefacts through replicas.**
- 4.7 If information about the existence, character and relational nature of replicas is publicly available,** people can make meaningful connections for themselves.
- 4.8 Replicas should be readily identified as such, but in a way that contextualises them** in terms of relationships, processes and materials.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> e.g. MA nd *Code of Ethics: additional guidance 2(b)*.



## 5 creating new replicas

- 5.1 The demand to produce replicas is likely to increase globally, in response to extreme events and demands for the repatriation of originals because of the decolonialisation of museum collections.**
- 5.2 Identifying and addressing ethical issues is a critical aspect of planning the production of a replica, not least anticipating and resolving copyright issues.**
- 5.3 At heritage sites, replicas are sometimes created with the intention that they will cover and preserve an *in-situ* original that is threatened, intentionally or otherwise, by human action, or replace a monument or feature of a monument that is endangered in some way (or has even been destroyed).<sup>7</sup> Issues and possible mitigation include how and if wider communities of interest participate in the decisions as well as the creation of the replicas.**

<sup>7</sup> e.g. Petzet 2004, 15–16.



**5.4 The story of the creation of replicas can be captured and shared for the benefit of present and future generations.** This might encompass all the people involved, the intent, the decisions made along the way, and personal reflections as people engage with the historic original and replica. Visual media are particularly effective but should be accompanied by documentary sources. This can be built into commissions for new replicas.

**5.5 Questions that should be addressed in capturing the stories of new replicas include:**

- Why is it being made?
- Who is it for?
- How will it be used?
- Where will it go?
- How is it to be looked after?
- How was it made, who was involved in this process and how?
- How accurate a copy is it? (factors influencing etc).
- Is it a repeatable form of replication?
- Is it permanent or disposable? If the latter, how will you dispose of it?
- Is there a *surviving* original?
- How does it relate to the original, e.g. direct copy, digital scan, free version, reconstruction etc.
- What is its materiality and how does this compare to the original?
- How has engagement with the replica, and with the historic original, changed the process of creation and the personal journeys of those involved?

**5.6 The practice and process of replica production can be as important as the endpoint.** For example, creativity and craft play an important role in generating authenticity and significance for those involved in the production. Others may also engage with this as part of the 'felt relationship' with the replica, *if* the people, places and things involved in the process are accessible.

**5.7 Involving curators, conservators and/or heritage managers offers potential insights as replicas are created, and in monitoring interest in these replicas through time.**

**5.8 Community collaboration, in particular participatory approaches such as co-design and co-creation, can add to the authenticity and value of replicas.** Individuals and communities with specific attachments, interests and forms of expertise can also contribute to the conservation of replicas over time.

**5.9 Once created, the principles outlined in Guidance sections 1–4 apply.**



# appendix questions to ask of replicas 11

## individually or in groups

What is the composite biography of the replica / replica collection?

What is the relationship of people, places and things through time?

What are the key moments in the composite lives in terms of changing meanings and values?

What is the contribution of the replica to the biography of a place or institution?

What is it that the replica does that the historic original does not?

What comparative questions should be asked?

### evidential values

- What and where is the historic original?
- What physical evidence survives of the replica, its production (ancillary objects), use and reception (associated sources)?
- What other copies were made at any point, and which of these survive?
- How unique is the replica, or do multiple copies exist (value resides in either)? What is the relationship between multiple replicas, including medium, and how are they individually distinctive? How does being a multiple, then or now, add value?
- Does the replica belong to a replica collection and, if so, what is the nature and interest of this as an assemblage?
- What is the physical relationship to the historic original, what difference does this make, how does it matter (type of copy, accuracy, materials, investment of resources etc)?
- How was the replica made, of what, and what does this tell us about technology, engineering and artisan skills?
- Was investigation or experimentation involved, who did this, why and how?
- Does the replica have any conservation value in terms of mapping erosion of historic originals since the nineteenth century, or any other scientific evidential values?

### historic values

- What agencies and people were involved in the creation of the replica and what does this tell us about motivations, intentionality, purpose, and how these change over time?
- What was the social/historical/political context of the replica production (local-regional-national-international)? What are the important stories that emerge?
- How, where and why did the replica originally circulate?
- What does the history of its location/setting/context tell us?

- What is the post-creation biography of the replica?
- How has the replica moved around since it was created and why?
- Has the replica been relocated since it was created?
- If so, how often and why?
- Are there significant changes in context, meaning and use resulting from relocation?
- What are the human stories behind the networks that the replica is part of (not limited to nationally important people or events)?
- How has the creation and subsequent life of the replica contributed to the life of the historic original, and vice versa?

### aesthetic values

- What is the impact of location/setting/display/context, including accessibility to visitors, e.g. touchability, on how the replica was or is experienced? Does this tell us anything about the historic original?
- What is the nature of the replica's materiality, including its fragility?
- How has the material of the replica been transformed through weathering, decay, patination etc and how do people respond to the experience of this?
- What is the age value of the replica? Replicas do acquire life and age is relative.
- What is the aesthetic quality/artistry of the replica?

### social/spiritual values

- What is known of the replica's range of contemporary social values? It may be necessary to undertake or commission qualitative social research.
- How does the replica inform contemporary meanings, identities and sense of place?
- Does the replica have spiritual associations?
- What community investment does its production and use involve?
- Are their claims relating to ownership and belonging? If so, are these contested?
- How significant is the craft, creativity and passion of the people involved in the replica's life?
- How do the above inform the authenticity of the replica?



# glossary

Notwithstanding definitions enshrined in international charters and guidance, there is a lot of inconsistency in the application of terms, in different contexts and over time. It is not our intention to be prescriptive. The important thing is to understand the relationship between the historic original and copy, taking into account, for example: whether there is a *surviving* original, intent, context of creation, physical relationship of replica to historic original (accuracy of appearance), how copied, materials used, function, use, and scale in relation to original. Conscious and unconscious prejudices may attach to the specific terminology applied to an object, an issue that requires careful consideration in specific contexts.

accurate copy	A term applied to a copy where the intention was to be accurate in terms of material, form, colour and/or texture, within the limitations of the available materials, technology and craftspeople.
authenticity	How people experience the 'truthfulness' and auratic qualities of a thing or place, based on materiality, setting (including display context), a sense of 'pastness' (Holtorf 2013) and the networks of social relations it is embedded in over time (see Jones 2010). It can vary according to cultural context (ICOMOS 1994; Japan ICOMOS 2014).
composite biography	The interlinked lives of a historic original and its copies, however defined; an approach that can be fruitfully applied to collections as well as 'individual' replicas (see Foster and Curtis 2016)
copy	Something that is created with the intention that it looks like something else; its scale and accuracy may not be material considerations. This may include manufactured souvenirs, for example.
extended object	An object, such as a replica, for which its meaning and significance is bound up with the relationships and networks of people, places and things that it is linked to, as expressed by its composite biography.
fabrication	Something that is intended to look like something else at a particular moment of time but involves a very high degree of speculation.
fake	A copy created with the intention to deceive people by giving them the impression that it is a 'historic' original.
facsimile	Historically could be applied to replicas and other copies, often of jewelry /metalwork, but the degree of accuracy of the copy will be context-specific, often less so in commercial contexts, and scale varies.
pastiche	Not designed for a museum or heritage context, an anachronistic modern design that references in some way the character and function of an original subject or category of things, often mixing elements from different periods.
model	A planned reconstruction of what something looked like, usually at a particular time in its life, often created at a different scale to the original.
modern versions / experimental archaeology	Scientifically informed reconstructions of what an original thing may have looked like, normally at its point of creation, with the intention that the process of manufacture tells us something about the original and/or it can be used to undertake its assumed original function.





<b>original</b>	A thing that possesses originality. Historic originals and reproduced originals (replicas) both do this but need to be distinguished.
<b>reconstruction</b>	The attempted return of something to a former appearance, often at point of creation, introducing modern fabric.
<b>recreation</b>	A totally modern reconstruction of something where the artistic qualities and skills of the modern craftsman are likely to have been given full rein and credit.
<b>re-enactment</b>	Relates to experimental archaeology, but where the participants are more normally skilled members of the public who enjoy recreating how they believe objects were made and used, often in the context of re-enactment of events or how past peoples appeared and lived.
<b>replica</b>	An accurate copy made for heritage and museum contexts to act in some way as a proxy for the historic original. The copying process is likely to involve 'direct' contact with and/or measurement of the historic original (includes scanning).
<b>reproduction</b>	A copy, often one of many. Historically, this term was applied to many replicas produced for display in art galleries, art schools and museums.
<b>restoration</b>	The attempted return of something to a former condition or appearance using the original historic material (also referred to as anastylosis).
<b>significance</b>	The 'sum' of values, to be distinguished from 'importance', which in heritage and museum contexts may be a formal system for rating things.
<b>simulacra</b>	An interpretive representation or imitation of a thing that no longer exists or never existed.
<b>values</b>	The qualities that people attribute to something and the regard resulting from this, often classified for heritage contexts under the headings of evidential/scientific, historic, aesthetic and social/spiritual.



# 14 starter reading



See also wider reading lists at [www.replicas.stir.ac.uk](http://www.replicas.stir.ac.uk).

Australia ICOMOS, 1979 revised 2013. *The Burra Charter: The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance*. Available: <http://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>. Burwood: Australia ICOMOS.

Codell, J. and Hughes, L. K., 2018. Introduction. In: J.F. Codell and L. Hughes, eds, *Replication in the Long Nineteenth Century: Re-makings and Reproductions*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 1–20.

Collections Trust, various. Spectrum-related resources. Available: <https://collectionstrust.org.uk/spectrum-resources/>.

Denard, H., ed, 2007. *The London Charter for the Computer-based Visualisation of Cultural Heritage*. Available: <http://www.londoncharter.org/downloads.html>.

Foster, S. M. and Curtis, N. G. W., 2016. The thing about replicas: why historic replicas matter. *European Journal of Archaeology*, 19(1), 122–48. <https://doi.org/10.1179/1461957115Y.0000000011>.

Foster, S.M. and Jones, S., 2019a. Concrete and non-concrete: exploring the contemporary value and authenticity of historic replicas through an ethnographic study of the St John's Cross replica, Iona. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 25(11), 1169–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1583272>.

Foster, S. M. and Jones, S., 2019b. The untold heritage value and significance of replicas. *Conservation and Management of Heritage Sites*, 21(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13505033.2019.1588008>.

Foster, S.M. with Jones, S., 2020. *My Life as a Replica: St John's Cross, Iona*. Oxford: Windgather.

Holtorf, C., 2013. On pastness: a reconsideration of materiality in archaeological object authenticity. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 86(2), pp. 427–443. <https://doi.org/10.1353/anq.2013.0026>.

ICOM 2017. ICOM Code of Ethics for Museums. Paris: International Council of Museums. Available: <https://icom.museum/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/ICOM-code-En-web.pdf>.

ICOMOS, 1994. *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Available: <http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/nara-e.pdf>.

Japan ICOMOS, 2014. *NARA+20, Japan ICOMOS, 22–24 October, 2014*. Available: [http://www.japan-icomos.org/pdf/nara20\\_final\\_eng.pdf](http://www.japan-icomos.org/pdf/nara20_final_eng.pdf).

Jeffrey, S., 2015. Challenging heritage visualisation: beauty, aura and democratisation. *Open Archaeology*, 1(1), 144–52. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opar-2015-0008>.





Jones, Shar, 2007. *Sharing our Stories. Guidelines for Heritage Interpretation (2007)*. Available: <http://www.nationaltrust.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/20110208SharingourStories.pdf>. The National Trust of Australia and Museums Australia.

Jones, Siân, 2010. Negotiating authentic objects and authentic selves. Beyond the deconstruction of authenticity. *Journal of Material Culture*, 15(2), 181–203. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1359183510364074>.

Jones, Siân, Jeffrey, S., Maxwell, M., Hale, A. and Jones, C., 2017. 3D heritage visualisation and the negotiation of authenticity: the ACCORD project. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 24(4), pp. 333–353. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2017.1378905>.

MA (Museums Association), nd. Code of Ethics: Additional guidance. Museums Association. Available: <https://www.museumsassociation.org/ethics/ethics-of-disposal>.

Petzet, M., 2004. Principles of preservation. An introduction to international charters for conservation and restoration 40 years after the Venice Charter. Available: [http://openarchive.icomos.org/43111/Monuments\\_and\\_Sites\\_I\\_Charters.pdf](http://openarchive.icomos.org/43111/Monuments_and_Sites_I_Charters.pdf). In: ICOMOS, ed, *International Charters for Conservation and Restoration. Monuments and Sites I*. 2nd edn. Munich: ICOMOS, pp. 7–29.

Reed, C., 2018. *Reviewing Significance 3.0: A Framework for Assessing Museum, Archive and Library Collections' Significance, Management and Use*. Available: <https://collectionstrust.org.uk/resource/reviewing-significance-3-0/>. Caroline Reed Consulting.

Russell, R., and Winkworth, K., 2009. *Significance 2.0: A Guide to Assessing the Significance of Collections*. 2nd edn. Rundle Mall: Collections Council of Australia Ltd. Available: <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/112443/20101122-1236/significance.collectionscouncil.com.au/pdf/bw/bSignificance20.pdf>.

Sweetman, R., and Hadfield, A., 2018. Artefact or art? Perceiving objects via object-viewing, Object-handling, and virtual reality. *University Museums and Collections Journal*, 10, pp. 46–66. Available: <http://umac.icom.museum/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/3-Sweetman-Hadfield.pdf>.

Sweetman, R., O'Connor, A., and Hadfield, A., 2020. Material culture, museums and memory: experiments in visitor recall and memory. *Journal of Visitor Studies*. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2020.1731671>.

V&A and PERI, ReACH (Reproduction of Art and Cultural Heritage). Available: <https://www.vam.ac.uk/research/projects/reach-reproduction-of-art-and-cultural-heritage>.



As researchers, museum curators and heritage practitioners, we came together at the invitation of the University of Stirling to co-produce this independent statement because we wanted to consider the implications of new research on the authenticity and value of replicas for heritage and museum practice. We are interested in replicas and the wider implications of critical thinking about them.

The text is the outcome of three workshops held in Edinburgh and Stirling, Scotland, with 32 attendees:

*Replicas in museums and heritage contexts: putting theory into practice* (28 November 2019)

*Replicas in museums and heritage contexts: co-production of guidance* (29 November 2019)

*Historic replicas in north-west Europe: current research, future prospects* (8 January 2020).

The November workshops were organised by the University of Stirling in partnership with ICOMOS UK and National Museums Scotland and the Scottish Graduate School of the Arts and Humanities' Heritage Hub.

**Contributors** are workshop attendees who commented on drafts, while the **reference group** includes other attendees as well as people who we contacted for advice.



## contributors

### England

**Dr Sue Brunning** *Curator: European Early Medieval Collections, British Museum*

**Valentina Risdonne** *PhD candidate, Northumbria University/Victoria and Albert Museum*

**Dr Susanne Turner** *Curator, Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

### Finland

**Hanna Forsell** *Head of Public Programmes, National Museum of Finland*

### Germany

**Dr Jörg Drauschke** *Chief Curator, Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum – Leibniz-Forschungsinstitut für Archäologie, Mainz*

### Ireland

**Dr Rachel Moss** *Associate Professor, History of Art and Architecture, Trinity College Dublin*

### Netherlands

**Dr Luc Amkreutz** *Curator Prehistoric Collections, National Museum of Antiquities (RMO) Leiden*

### Scotland

**Dr Sam Alberti** *Keeper of Science and Technology, National Museums Scotland*

**Neil Curtis** *Head of Museums and Special Collections, University of Aberdeen*

**Alison Hadfield** *Ancient History and KE Specialist, School of Classics, University of St Andrews*

**Dr Stuart Jeffrey** *Reader, School of Simulation and Visualisation, Glasgow School of Art*

**Sean Kinnear** *PhD candidate, Glasgow School of Art*

**Colin Muir** *Stone Conservator, Historic Environment Scotland*

**J P Reid** *Exhibitions and Interpretation Officer, Culture Perth and Kinross*

**Mark Watson** *Deputy Head of Industrial Heritage, Historic Environment Scotland*

### Wales

**Dr Mark Redknap** *Deputy Head of Archaeology Collections and Research, Amgueddfa Cymru – National Museum Wales*

## reference group

### England

**Susan Denyer** *Secretary, ICOMOS-UK*  
**Professor Bonnie Effros** *Chaddock Chair of Economic and Social History, University of Liverpool*  
**Kate Johnson** *University of Bradford*  
**Dr Angus Patterson** *Senior Curator, Department of Sculpture, V&A Museum*

### Denmark

**Dr Anne Pedersen** *Curator and Senior Researcher, National Museum of Denmark*

### Ireland

**Dr Michael Ann Bevivino** *Discovery Programme*  
**Dr Maeve Sikora**, *Keeper of Irish Antiquities, National Museum of Ireland*

### Isle of Man

**Andy Johnson** *Archaeologist, Manx National Heritage*

### Northern Ireland

**Dr Greer Ramsay** *Curator of Archaeology, National Museums Northern Ireland*

### Norway

**Dr Cynthia Osiecki** *Curator of Old Masters, National Museum for Art, Architecture and Design, Oslo*

### Scotland

**Dr Hugo Anderson-Whymark** *Curator of Early Prehistory, National Museums Scotland*  
**Claire Banks** *PhD candidate, University of Edinburgh*  
**Dr Alice Blackwell** *Senior Curator of Medieval Archaeology and History, National Museums Scotland*  
**Dr Louisa Campbell** *LKAS Fellow in Archaeology, University of Glasgow*  
**J Anna Estaroth** *PhD candidate, University of the Highlands and Islands*  
**Dr Martin Goldberg** *Principal Curator of Medieval Archaeology and History, National Museums Scotland*  
**Sarah Harper** *PhD candidate, University of Stirling / National Museums Scotland*  
**Dr Matt Knight** *Curator of Prehistory, National Museums Scotland*  
**Dr John Raven** *Deputy Head of Casework (Ancient Monuments): West, Historic Environment Scotland*  
**Beth Spence** *Regional Collections Manager, Historic Environment Scotland*  
**Tricia Weeks** *Deputy Head of World Heritage: Antonine Wall Coordinator, Historic Environment Scotland*

### Sweden

**Dr Nanouschka Myrberg Burström** *Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University*

All images © Sally Foster unless otherwise credited:

© Doug Simpson, by kind permission National Museums Scotland (*front cover, pp. 6, 15 centre and bottom*); photographer Arthur Macgregor, © courtesy of Historic Environment Scotland (J. R. Scott Collection) (*p. 10 top*); © S Jones (*Contents left and p.12*); Libraries, Leisure and Culture Dundee (*p. 2*); © Museum of Classical Archaeology, University of Cambridge (*p. 9*); © National Museum of Antiquities, Leiden (*pp. 8, 13 top, 16*); © National Museum of Ireland (*p. 3*); by kind permission National Museums Scotland (*p. 6*); © Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, Mainz / V. Iserhardt (*p. 13 bottom*); © University of St Andrews (*p. 10 bottom*). Graphic by Christina Unwin (*p. 4*) incorporates images that are © B Keeling, S Foster, © courtesy of Historic Environment Scotland (artist Alexander Archer), © Trustees of the National Museums of Scotland and © The University of Edinburgh (original: out of copyright).





## new futures for replicas

### principles and guidance for museums and heritage

aspires to active, evidence-based, research-led heritage futures  
for replicas in museums and at heritage sites,  
generating dialogue between collections

Co-produced by researchers, heritage and museum professionals,  
and welcoming all interested disciplines, institutions and sectors,  
its target audience is:

- museum and heritage practitioners  
curators, heritage managers, collections managers, conservators,  
interpretation providers, education providers
- researchers
- individuals/communities who commission replicas
- people, companies and other organisations who create replicas
- educators and others who actively engage with replicas

Please send us your feedback on the guidance  
and how you apply and adapt it for your own purposes

blog [www.replicas.stir.ac.uk](http://www.replicas.stir.ac.uk) Twitter @StirHeritage #replicafutures

Lucas Petit  
Head of Collections  
and Research,  
National Museum  
of Antiquities,  
Leiden

“The principles and guidelines offered in **new futures for replicas** form a useful basis/tool for directing new research and conservation questions and contribute to an overall re-evaluation of this category of objects. For museums in particular this could help making replicas more visible and an integrated, valued and functional part of their collections and (online) catalogues.”

Dr Mark Redknap  
Deputy Head of  
Archaeology,  
Collections and Research,  
Amgueddfa Cymru –  
National Museum Wales

“These clear principles and guidelines endorse the promotion of replicas from ‘secondary’ artefacts to objects which sit at the right hand of the originals, and at times replace them.”

UNIVERSITY of  
STIRLING 

 National  
Museums  
Scotland



Stirling, July 2020

design Christina Unwin