Cover Page

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/138482 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Veldi, M.
Title: A landscape biography of the 'Land of Drumlins': Vooremaa, East Estonia
Issue date: 2020-12-03

4 Theoretical Framework and Basic Concepts: Landscape as Transforming Heritage

For the current study of the Vooremaa landscape, theories and methods of landscape archaeology, cultural geography, and historical GIS are combined within the larger framework of landscape biography.

Within this framework, the term *landscape* is defined according to the European Landscape Convention:

> *Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors* (ELC 2000).

This definition, in its conciseness, comprises of all the above-mentioned elements: physical place (land), perception (sense of place), and the interaction of people with their natural setting and living environment (dwelling perspective). It focuses on both the physical and mental aspects of landscape, and therefore is quite holistic and universal. The discussion about joining and ratifying the European Landscape Convention went on in Estonia for more than 15 years. Finally, in 2018 Estonia became a member country of the European Landscape Convention, which is the first international agreement to improve the cooperation between member countries in landscape protection, management and planning.

In order to understand the basics of landscape biography, we first have to analyse the origins of the concepts of *land, landscape, biography,* and also *heritage* in the context of landscape archaeology and cultural geography (Veldi 2015)[10].

4.1 Concepts of "land" and "landscape"

Throughout history, one of the most fundamental human conflicts have been over land. The reason for this is actually simple: there is as much land as there is; the Earth is not expanding. Thus, land is amongst the most valuable possessions there can be. Discussions about land and landownership in materialist terms can be considered neo-marxist, which observes relationships between material values (capital=land) and human resources as main driving forces of development and power (Trigger 2003, 340–347).

---

[10] Some of the following ideas were presented at the Baltic Archaeology Seminar (BASE) in 2009 by the author, published in: Veldi, M. 2015. Identity-creating landscapes. Who owns archaeological sites? – *Interarchaeologica 4, pp 151 – 164.*

"Land" and "landscape" are complicated concepts. Although both terms, at first sight, seem quite similar, there is a significant difference between them. In this section, I discuss several definitions of land and landscape, followed by a short overview of the landscape paradigm as understood in archaeology and cultural geography.

The linguistic etymology tells us that the word *land* is related to the Old Irish word *land* meaning "open space", the Middle French *lande* meaning heath, and the Middle English *launde*, an open, usually grassy area among trees, which is the root of lawn (*land, launde, lawn*; Merriam-Webster 1995; Olwig 2006, 27).

Etymologic evidence on Gothic language indicate that in its original sense the word *land* was used to refer to *a definite portion of the earth's surface owned by an individual or home of a nation*. The latter is now mostly understood as *country* (Online Etymology Dictionary – http://www.etymonline.com). In this light both "openness", and "ownership" are the most important features of land. *No man's land* is generally known as something strange and dangerous or is *under dispute between parties that will not occupy it because of fear or uncertainty* (www.wikipedia.org). The term can be traced back to 1320s when it was originally introduced to *describe a disputed territory or one over which there was legal disagreement* (OED 1999).

The history of the word "landscape" according to the Online Etymology dictionary is as follows:

> c.1600, "painting representing natural scenery," from Du. *landschap*, from M.Du. *landscap* "region," from *land* "land" (see *land*) + *-scap* "-ship, condition" (see *-ship*). Originally introduced as a painters' term. O.E. had cognate *landscipe*, and cf. O.H.G. *lantscaf*, Ger. *Landschaft*, O.N. *landskapr*. Meaning "tract of land with its distinguishing characteristics" is from 1886.

Still, the definition of the term "landscape" is much more complicated than this brief etymological overview suggests.

In cultural geography "land" and "landscape" are often considered as counterparts of "place" and "space". Both, "land" and "place" are considered to be concrete, physical, and touchable to the hand; while "landscape" and "space" refer to more abstract perceptions. Kenneth Olwig describes the creation of landscapes through actions in places as follows:

> *Through movement in and out of places develops a "sense of place" capable of being reflected in the texts and representations of artists. It is thus not just movement in, out,*

and between places that landscape is generated as a field of practice. This movement creates the basis for the process of reflection that allows landscape, as an assemblage of places, to be represented in speech, text and image (Olwig 2006, 26).

In Estonian, the word *maastik* for "landscape" was applied for the first time in 1910 by the poet Gustav Suits in a catalogue for an art exhibition. In geographical studies the term was not introduced until a decade later by professor Granö. He also stated the four key characteristics, which were the most important elements to form a regional unit of landscape: 1) surface features 2) waters 3) vegetation, and 4) human settlement. Based on this very simple classification Granö distinguished seven landscape regions in Estonia (Granö 1922; Granö 1997), which to a large extent has remained valid till today. For Granö the surrounding land consisted of two zones: 1) close surroundings or milieu, which is comprehensible to all human senses and 2) wider surroundings or landscape, which can only be seen and understood as territorial unit, both natural and humanin origin. The wider surroundings is defined as extending 100 – 200 m from the observer to the horizon (Granö 1924). Granö's ideas about landscape and landscape morphology were very similar to the one of Carl Sauer (see below).

4.2   Natural or cultural landscapes?

In landscape studies, there has always been an enigmatic need for dividing landscape into natural and cultural landscapes (Jones 2003b). The same dichotomy can be observed between physical and cultural geography. Usually, the distinction is based on the intensity of human impact on a certain region. Still, natural and cultural landscapes do not have to be opposed to each other, but can be understood as different layers or developments of the same landscape (Palang 1998b: 13). Carl Sauer addressed human culture as an acquired habit, and the environment surrounding culture as an habitat, which at any given moment is an "accumulation of practical experience" (Sauer 1941, 8). For Sauer, landscape itself was an outcome and expression of human activities. From this perspective all landscapes should be considered cultural landscapes.

What makes the study of cultural landscapes meaningful is change, especially change evoked by human actions. According to Sauer it is possible to study the initial creation of the cultural landscape, how through human action the natural environment is turned into something artificial and more suitable for our needs (Sauer 1941). Landscapes can change in several

different directions, depending on our choices. These choices are largely based upon our understanding of the values of landscape.

Estonian geographer Hannes Palang has pointed out that people in Estonia nowadays tend to romanticize the old landscape of the past, which often does not coincide with the needs of the modern world (Palang 1998a, 16). Also elsewhere, like in England, reminiscences of landscapes long lost are especially characteristic themes in local histories, e. g. in the work of William Hoskins (Hoskins 1955) and Francis Pryor (Pryor 2010).

How to overcome this dualistic problem? Solutions could be offered by new designs of sustainable development, which enable landscapes to progress, but at the same time to preserve cultural and environmental values, such as biodiversity or the potential of places to act as *lieux de memoire*. In order to integrate these cultural and natural values we need to analyse different aspects of the landscape in relation to each other within a larger framework, that also includes the temporalities of place.

In the next sections I will briefly discuss three different approaches that aim at such an integration, but from very different points of view: 1) the culture-historical approach of landscape 2) the processual approach of landscape in archaeology 3) the perspective on landscape in the "New Cultural Geography" and post-processual (interpretative) archaeology. It is improtnat to state in advance that, according to me, these approaches do not necessarily exclude each other but may (partially) overlap, as landscape in its essence is always charged with conflict and contradiction.

4.3   The culture-historical approach

The term "landscape" occurred in historical documents already as early as $11^{th} - 13^{th}$ century, referring to the trinity of land (geographical connotation), people (social) and territory (political; for more detailed discussion: Kolen, Renes, and Hermans 2015).

The content and meaning of the term "landscape" changed significantly at the start of the 16th century, when the landscape paintings of Dutch artists rapidly became popular on the English art market. From then, in England, the word "landscape" was gradually used for the two-dimensional representation of landscape in works of art that decorated the house interiors of the elite. As a result, the word "landscape" came to refer prominently on the visual and visible aspects of the outside world – the surrounding scenery as the context of dwelling and

inhabitation (David et al. 2008, 27). This paradigm, including the conceptualization of "landscape" as a way of seeing and a politics of vision (Cosgrove 1984; Cosgrove & Daniels 1988) has dominated our thinking about and experience of landscape up to the present, even within the disciplines that are involved in the scientific research and academic study of landscape.

Marina Gkiasta (Gkiasta 2008, 16) has pointed out that culture-historical approach of landscape in 20th-century landscape research developed as a combination of cultural-historical attitudes in archaeology and art history. The influence of the "old" cultural geography and (applied) historical geography, especially in Anglo-American part of the world, also played a significant role.

In geography, the culture-historical understanding of landscape has its origins in regional geography, such as in the work of Paul Vidal de la Blache (1903; 1918) and Carl Ortwin Sauer (1925). Culture-historical tendencies in geography, like Carl Otwin Sauer's school of cultural geography (1925), was also strongly influenced by Vidal and the Annales School historians, established in France. The Annalistes, notably Fernand Braudel, introduced to geography and history the concept of *longue duree*, which became part of the historical geography linking together people and places through the ways of their everyday life and their natural and cultural environment (Gregory et al. 2009, 130).

Today Carl Sauer is considered to be the founder of "traditional" cultural geography, especially with his geographical essay *The Morphology of Landscape* (Sauer 1925), where he defined cultural landscape as follows:

> *The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group. Culture is the agent, the natural area the medium, the cultural landscape is the result. Under the influence of a given culture, itself changing through time, the landscape undergoes development, passing through phases, and probably reaching ultimately the end of its cycle of development* (Sauer 1925, 26).

For Sauer, geography is distinctly anthropocentric, and there would be no landscape or starting for geographical study without human beings or cultural traditions. As a matter of fact, Sauer's distinction between "geology" and "geography" is the presence of the human factor in the latter. Besides other important aspects, Sauer points out that different landscapes exist only in interrelation, and while possessing an individual identites are constituted in a larger general system (Sauer 1925). The legacy of Carl Sauer and the Berkeley School was so

influential, that well into the 1950s all human geography in the United States was thought of essentially as cultural geography (Gregory et al. 2009, 130).

Culture-historical regional studies also gained a lot of popularity in Britain and Scandinavia, where the methods of ethnography and language studies were applied to define cultural regions. In Britain, landscape studies also included local history and archaeology (e. g. Hoskins 1955; Hawkes 1951), so that landscape studies particularly contributed to the definition of the identity of landscapes – often called the "personality" of regions, following Vidal's earlier publications on this topic. British landscape research has a long tradition in local landscape studies. One of the first archaeologists to integrate settlement studies with the idea of regional personalities, was Cyril Fox, who in 1932 published his book *The Personality of Britain* (Fox 1932).

The classical writings by Jacquetta Hawkes (*A Land*, Hawkes 1951) and Willam George Hoskins (*The Making of the English Landscape,* Hoskins 1955) stressed the visual aesthetic value of landscapes and preached against all modernity and change. They had both arrived at an understanding that industrialisation of the landscape was the main cause of the ongoing dehumanisation and deformation of landscapes, and notably of people's harmonious bond with places (Muir 1998, 77). Though Hoskins' approach was primarily based on local history, applying rather traditional methods, critical reading of his works still testifies its significance for international landscape research. His influence today can be seen e.g. in the work of the archaeologist Francis Pryor, who's most recent study *The Making of the British Landscape* (2010) can be considered as a bow to his predecessor. Michael Aston with his practical handbook *Interpreting the Landscape: Landscape Archaeology in Local Studies* (1985) must also be mentioned as one of the most influential landscape archaeologists/historians in the British school of local landscape studies. All of the abovementioned studies approach landscape as a linear narrative of interaction between human and nature, where the past is treated as a romantic reminiscence, which has been destroyed by large-scale and disruptive modern developments.

4.4   New archaeology and the processual approach to landscape

The start of the 1960s witnessed a new approach in archaeological landscape studies, which followed a somewhat earlier but similar reform of geography with the New Geograpy. From then, archaeologists of landscape became orientated in a more multi-disciplinary way, seeking

collaboration between different specialists, and combining natural processes with principles of cultural ecology in their explanatory models. Efforts were made to turn the discipline more "scientific" by working together with natural scientists. Instead of describing the ethnic cultures and cultural areas of the deep past, cultural and social processes now came into spotlight, often integrated with theories about environmental adaptation and social evolution (Gkiasta 2008, 24).

With the emergence of the "new archaeology" during the 1960s, and the "loss of innocence" observed by David Clarke (1973), the founding father of analytical archaeology, the understandings and methods in landscape archaeology also changed. While in theoretical archaeology processualism emphasized the importance of deductive explanation in contrast to mere describing, then practical archaeology turned its face towards methods and analyses of the natural sciences, like palaeo-ecology, stratigraphy and absolute dating (Renfrew et al. 2000, 39).

Developments in landscape archaeology as a discipline in western Europe (UK, Denmark, Germany, the Low Countries) were strongly influenced by large-scale interventions in the landscape, such as new infrastructure and sub-urban housing developments, during which enormous amounts of new archaeological sites and ancient landscape complexes were discovered, demanded a large-scale and integrative approach to landscape studies. In the course of these developments landscape studies in archaeology started to concentrate mostly on gathering different scientifically measurable data. Empirical methods (C^{14}, pollen, geophysics, different survey methods) gained more and more importance, and somewhere on the way landscape archaeology lost sight of its most important object of study – the human being as actor and landscape agent.

One of the aims of landscape archaeology became to bridge the gap between nature and culture by studying man-nature relation. Increasing interest in studying flora, fauna, soils and natural water systems under human impact came into focus, and a separate branch of bio- and geoarchaeology emerged. In recent years ecological approaches, which explore long-term landscape changes, have gained more importance (Schreg 2014, 84–85).

4.5   The New Cultural Geography and Post-processual Landscape Studies

At the end of the 1980s the Anglophone culture-historical discourse of *Sauerian landscape* was challenged by a different approach, which focused on the structure, symbolism, politics

and dynamics of the landscape (Cosgrove 1984; Cosgrove & Daniels 1988). This also marked the cultural turn in human geography, where culture, social formations and political ideologies now became the most important subject of study.

With the emergence of the New Cultural Geography the study field broadened, becoming more interdisciplinary, interpretive, and qualitative in its approaches (Gregory et al. 2009, 134). Similar developments were visible more or less at the same time in archaeology. Along with scholars from other fields of study, like social anthropology, geographers and archaeologists increasingly became interested in the relationships between landscape, discourse and text, as well as the politics of vision – which was considered an influential discourse in landscape traditions and ancient landscape as well. For instance, the Finnish geographer Jussi Jauhiainen (2003) indicated that language was the main instrument for studying landscapes, and this is why the concept of landscape can be very differently interpreted in various parts of the world. In its essence landscape as a term is based on culture (Sooväli 2008, 657). At the same time landscape was seen as a dialectical interrelation between people and land, culminating with the works of influential geographers such as Kenneth Olwig (1996; 2002; 2007) and Denis Cosgrove (Cosgrove & Daniels 1988; Cosgrove 2004).

The discussion about the essence, or better: *ambiguity* of the term "landscape" achieved its climax during the 1980s and 1990s, when abstract intellectual issues of landscape were introduced to a wider audience. In his profound volume *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape,* Cosgrove (Cosgrove 1984) introduced the idea of landscape as a way of seeing the world – "gazing at landscapes". This meant that first and foremost landscape was an idea, it was something that was in the eye of the beholder, linking the notion back to its 16th century artistic origins. The concept of gazing at landscapes can be considered as one of the theoretical starting points of post-processual landscape phenomenology, which applies vision (and its analysis and interpretation) as its most powerful tool. Cosgrove's *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape* can be considered as the beginning of the "cultural turn" in geography and also landscape archaeology.

In 1988, at the threshold of the "cultural turn" in human geography, Cosgrove and Daniels' *The Iconography of Landscape* very straightforwardly set out to discuss the emotional, religious, and artistic values of landscapes (Cosgrove & Daniels 1988). Since then, "landscape" was not solely considerd a physical entity anymore. The landscape was also

mental and perceived, something that everybody experiences and understand differently, something dynamic that shows immanent change.

In this notion landscape can be equalled to a culture-specific perception of the environment – a contested world that people feel with all your senses (sight, hearing, smell, touch, taste) and remember, conceptualize and give meaning through cultural schemata and unique personalities Thus, in interpretative and post-processual approaches, the perception of landscape is seen as a very complicated issue, utterly individual, and most importantly – part of our imagination.

The idea that landscape is always and necessarily experienced by people – past and present – was a good foundation for post-processual landscape archaeology that set out to interpret landscapes and past environments through the methods of phenomenology. The phenomenological school of landscape archaeology (e. g. Tilley 1994; 2004; Cummings & Whittle 2004) claimed that the only possible solution to understand past societies – and their relationships with "nature" – was to re-experience the landscape with all one's senses, in ways in which the researcher's embodiment would become a medium for engagement. Consequently, such an approach woud also enable a better interpretation of the material landscape, including its archaeological record. Landscape was handled as a cognitive entity – *a visionscape but also a soundscape, a touchscape, even a smellscape, a multi-sensory experience* (Tilley talking to Bender in Bender 1998, 82). The phenomenologists even accused "traditional" landscape archaeologist of superficiality – one that cannot lead to a true understanding of the material world but will ultimately result in "paper landscapes" produced behind the office desks without doing proper fieldwork and challenging personal encounters (Tilley 2004, 27). In recent years landscape phenomenology has been thoroughly revised and criticized (Fleming 1999; 2005; 2006); it has even been disqualified as the "crisis of British landscape archaeology" (Barrett et al. 2009). Andrew Fleming cold showered the whole concept in a very pragmatic manner: it was *difficult to look students in the eye, keep a straight face, and explain, on site, how the ideas of Tilley are supposed to work* (Fleming 2005, 930).

The concept of defining landscape as a result of skilled practice was actually revitalized by Tim Ingold at the beginning of the 1990s. Ingold presented the concept of "taskscape" – the rhythmic and dynamic pattern of dwelling activities in relation to natural cycles inherent in the natural environment (Ingold 1993, 153). Constructing a theoretical framework for the taskscape, Ingold welded together two vital elements – landscape and temporality – ending up with the term "dwelling perspective" (Ingold 1993, 152), which bestowed landscape with the

so much needed human aspect. David Lowenthal also stressed this human aspect, especially collective and individual experiences that make up the landscape as a basis for peoples fundamental heritage (Lowenthal 2007, 635). Lowenthal applies the phrase "living the landscape" to verbalize the concept of landscape and to shift the focus from object to action. According to Lowenthal, people make landscape only while living them as skilled creators and perceivers.

Humanistic geography, the "new cultural geography", and post-processual landscape archaeology thus share the same basic notion of the human agent as the creator of both form and meaning of landscape and place. They construct meaningful landscapes out of anonymous "space" and neutral "land". From this perspective, also notions of "nature" and the "natural" in the landscape are – in the end – human-bound and culturally informed.

4.6   Landscape Biography

The concept of landscape biography has been discussed in relation to Estonian landscape research only once in a book chapter by Helen Sooväli-Sepping (Sooväli-Sepping 2015).

In archaeological research the notion of landscape biographies has more thoroughly been applied in the Netherlands during the last 25 years. The approach started to gain popularity in the middle of the 1990s with the work of Dutch archaeologists Jan Kolen (Kolen 1993; Kolen 1995; Kolen 2005), Nico Roymans (1995; 1996), Fokke Gerritsen (1999), Theo Spek (1996), and Roy van Beek (Beek 2009), and Hans Renes (Kolen et al. 2015). Since then, Dutch landscape research has embraced the biographical approach, with most of the research directions summarised in the two latest major publications "The Cultural Landscape and the Heritage Paradox" (Bloemers et al. 2010), and a collection of articles edited by Jan Kolen, Hans Renes & Rita Hermans (Kolen et al. 2015).

Very briefly, "landscape biography" can be defined as: a treatment of a certain region, which is analyzed from a long- term perspective on landscapes from prehistory up to the present-day, as a continuous and complex process of interplay between people and their economies, political insitutions, mentalities, and memory cultures (including their heritage practices), and between human-induced environmental transformations and ecological dynamics (Roymans et al. 2009: 337). The results of landscape biographies have successfully been used both in heritage and nature protection as well (e. g. Spek 2006; Elerie & Spek 2010; Palang et al. 2011).

Two of the latest studies by Roymans et al. (2009) and Elerie & Spek (2010) focus on specific regions in the southern and northern Netherlands respectively. The project "Biography of a Sandy Landscape" (Roymans et al. 2009) set its focus on three main problems: 1) the changing use and layout of the landscape 2) the representation and interpretation of the landscape by people through time, and 3) the relationships between these dynamics and the identities of the communities inhabiting the landscape. The underlying assumption of the project was that these three dimensions are key to the long-term history of the landscape (Roymans et al. 2009: 340), and can also inspire heritage practises and the social construction of values and identities in contemporary society. The main idea of their study is the temporality of landscape, which in its "layerdness" has both chronologial, but also synchronic dimensions. The authors attempt to distance themselves from traditional heritage management, which in their view is *a rather closed system, with a small group of insiders deciding which aspects of the past are valuable and which are not. In landscape biography, this system has been prised open to create room for the memories and historical associations of other interested groups* (Roymans et al. 2009, 356).

The study by Elerie & Spek (2010) tries to apply landscape biography as a tool for action research in the Drentsche Aa National Landscape in Northern Netherlands. Although the landscape of Drenthe has undergone several changes and developments in the past, they are considered to be one of the oldest landscapes in the region. The project stresses that nature conservation, heritage management, and public participation have to be tackled in an integrated way. This enables the combination of scientific research with future policy, nature conservation and the management of cultural landscapes (Elerie et al. 2010, 84). Despite the differences between the disciplines involved, "landscape" is the unifying concept between humanities, social and natural sciences in these cases. However, different parties might interpret the landscape also quite differently. Already for some time it has been acknowledged that the positivistic interpretation of landscape is just one branch of the study field, and that the social and more subjective mental aspects (ideas, representations, memories) of landscape should be taken into consideration as well. Against this background, heritage should also be approached in a much broader sense than just the material remains of the past (Elerie et al. 2010, 90). The Drentsche Aa landscape biography combined two vital approaches – historical ecology, and historical anthropology – which both focused on the interaction between people and landscapes, though from a different perspective. Historical ecology concentrated on the physical development of the landscape, historical anthropology examined the social and

mental layers of the landscape, which together produced a highly interesting biography of the cultural landscape.

A completely different approach in landscape research is the *Historic Landscape Characterisation* (HLC) developed and elaborated by English Heritage during the past decade (Rippon 2005; 2012; Rippon et al. 2006; Turner 2006; Fairclough 2008 and references).

HLC is a methodology developed to help people understand the time-depth of landscape focusing on the notion that change is the most vital characteristic of landscape. Methodologically, HLC is a GIS-based environment, which can assess patterns, processes and functions in the landscape[11]. HCL underlines the importance of sustainable future change and maintains the idea that the term "landscape" is something else than "environment". When compared to environment, landscape is an intellectual social construct "created only in the present-day by our cultural and social attitudes" (Fairclough 2008, 409). The concept of HLC is very similar to landscape biography, being interested in all periods of landscape formation from a long-term perspective. Also, it recognises that archaeology is about past material remains in today's landscape (Fairclough 2008, 410), which means that in order to study and interpret the past, we need to know how the present landscape became into being. One of the fundamental ideas of the HLC is that instead of protecting the past selectively at specific places (designated or listed monuments) it turns its focus to managing change in the whole historic environment in its entire variety, guiding it into sustainable directions (Fairclough 2008, 411 – 12). An interesting point put forward by Fairclough is that the landscapes we create are products of change, not continuity, which gives a whole new perspective to landscape development and management (Fairclough 2008, 419). It is impossible to recreate old landscapes.

Although the term "landscape biography" was first used in 1979 by a cultural geographer Marwyn Samuels (1979), it is possible to trace the roots of the idea back to the works of Paul Vidal de la Blache and Carl Sauer, cited earlier. From Sauer's work the most influential I find his classic geographical essay "The Morphology of Landscape" published in 1925, which in my view is underestimated as one of the starting points for landscape biography. Sauer makes several observations, which are vital to the elaboration of the biographical landscape approach:

---

[11] In the context of the current chapter the overall philosophy of HLC prevails its methology.

The objects which exist together in the landscape exist in interrelation. We assert that they constitute a reality as a whole which is not expressed by a consideration of the constituent parts separately, that area has form, structure, and function, and hence position in a system, and that it is subject to development, change, and completion./.../ By definition the landscape has identity that is based on recognizable constitutions, limits, and generic relations to other landscapes, which constitute a general system (Sauer 1925).

The "biographical" side of landscape biography has mostly been attributed to the work of Arjun Appadurai (1986) and Igor Kopytoff (1986), the social anthropologists. Kopytoff demonstrates that every object has its cultural biography, which is defined by the objects use and exchange value in the process of commoditization (Kopytoff 1986, 64). In this sense, the cultural biography of things is characterized by the history of ownership. Kopytoff continues to argue:

The perfect commodity would be one that is exchangeable with anything and everything else, as the perfectly commoditized world would be one in which everything is exchangeable or for sale. By the same token, the perfectly decommoditized world would be one in which everything is singular, unique, and unexchangeable (Kopytoff 1986, 69).

In the same way we can approach places, monuments, landscapes and heritage, considering that heritage is something singular, unique, inalienable. Yet, at the same time, heritage is becoming a commodity in many cases, something that can be bought and sold – we are even talking about heritage resource management. In this theoretical framework we can argue that, for example, if a unique archaeological site (singular uncommodity) has been reconstructed, it has actually been recommoditized, turned back into something common with a price tag. Thus, heritage can be considered at the same time uniquely valuable and uniquely worthless, meaning it is so precious that its value cannot often be determined.

The rationale of the biographical approach is to assess the values that make a landscape worth considering as heritagescape. The biographical approach helps us to find common ground between the scientific assessment of archaeological data and the values of the local communities, which in practice can be used effectively in heritage management. Therefore, for this thesis, the concept of landscape biography is not simply applied to outline the (pre)history of a certain region, but primarily to outline the complex of values that different stakeholders attribute to archaeological sites and landscapes. In theory this means that

landscapes area addressed as "biographical entities", which have their own life histories and as well as their current position in human society, which leads us to the question of values: how and why different landscapes are valued. Are archaeological sites part of the landscape "identity"? How does archaeology contribute to local communities' understandings of the landscape? How does the "landscape identity" relate to the "local identity"?

4.7   The Concept of Palimpsest

In the culture-historical paradigm landscapes are very often referred to as palimpsests (Johnson 2007; Bailey 2007; Muir 2003; Hoskins 1955) , where some of the features and objects vanish and are replaced or are over-written by others. The idea of landscape as a palimpsest was first introduced by the historian Frederic W. Maitland in 1897 (Maitland 1897).

I think the comparison of landscape to a reusable palimpsest is apposite: although the vanished or deleted features are replaced by others, something from all the layers remains, be it visible or not. This evokes a thought that ruins and other worn-out features, such as archaeological sites, have always been important elements of inhabited landscapes. The abandoned village of Kurese with many archaeological sites in south-western Estonia is an excellent example (Figure 11).

Figure 11. Kurese village in south-western Estonia. Once a lively village surrounded by different archaeological sites has become an archaeological monument itself. Photo: Martti Veldi.

As archaeologists, we seldom realize that ruined stone graves, abandoned villages and hillforts or fallow crop lands have always been part of the landscape. Especially, after times of conflict when some parts of settled areas were abandoned for decades or even centuries. It is pretty much the opposite: we rather tend to think about past landscapes as romantic reminiscence where everything is logically structured as a whole, without any broken elements. We are afraid of errors in the coordinated and arranged landscapes. In the same manner we generally try to interpret the monuments in their contemporary time setting, without paying much attention to the fact that earlier Bronze and Iron Age stone graves were also part of the Viking Age landscape conveying certain meanings to its inhabitants. At the same time, Bronze Age people might have attached a specific meaning to the hill, which in later centuries became a centre of power and trade.

As a palimpsest, the landscape is layered vertically and horizontally: features and layers are added and deleted, at the same time they exist together, and also separately (Renes 2015). Time thickens the palimpsest, and there is a constant need to remind ourselves that we do not study past landscapes, but today's landscapes with elements from the past.

4.8   The Concept of Heritage

Everything that derives from the past and is valued in the present can be considered heritage. Still, we have to make choices, and show in which direction the understanding of values should go. Therefore the fundamental questions in heritage studies are: 1) how the process of selection to become heritage operates, and 2) why some specific features are considered as heritage but others are not (Pearce 1998, 86). It is also important to note that the values and value systems are constantly changing, and due to that over now and then the concept of heritage needs to be revised and freshly defined.

One of the bases of heritage is values: heritage is what the present values in the past, and the value of the past lies in the contribution to contemporary senses of worth and identity. The debate about heritage is about values (Shanks 2005, 222). The only problem with these values is that the traditional heritage management is a rather closed circle with only a few inaugurated "insiders" who have taken the position of deciding, which parts of the past are more valuable than the others (Kolen 2009, 220). This leads us to the point that heritage, being part of cultural tradition, represents the values of the ruling political ideology. In archaeology the ideological aspects of the heritage are not that sharp, although e. g. questions on ethnicity have been addressed to archaeological material during every political order. Although heritage values are defined and legitimized in laws by the ruling authorities, these values are constantly questioned and contested by different interest groups (stakeholders).

Heritage has also been handled as a kind of buffer zone between science and society, were archaeological discoveries are interpreted and presented to the public by professionals, while at the same time archaeology is kept clean from pseudo-scientists (Kolen 2009, 210). From the perspective of heritage protection archaeology as a scientific discipline is very controversial – destruction is the presumption of knowledge. Therefore, archaeological excavations stand for both the construction and deconstruction of values (Kolen 2009, 212).

In their 2009 publication on heritage studies Sørensen & Carman (Sørensen et al. 2009, 15) have pointed out the two main ideas behind the general evolvement of the concept of heritages: 1) the development of a distinct public sphere with the associated idea of the public 2) development of positive values associated with remains of the past. The growth of positive values of the past had a strong connection with the 19th century industrial revolution, which influenced and changed large areas of land to quench the thirst for timber and coal. The birth

of the conservation movement can be seen as a reaction to the industrial destruction of landscape.

The idea of heritage and heritage management is commonly thought to be administrative and bureaucratic in its nature. However, heritage is foremost a social, not a political concept, making it much more ambiguous than just material culture protected by law, which is carried out by a government department. It must be taken into account, that actually only a small part of what we call heritage is regulated and protected by law. Therefore, the whole understanding of heritage has a larger social importance, where unwritten laws have a significant role to play. How heritage is constituted is one of the focal research problems in heritage studies (Sørensen & Carman 2009, 17). The recognition of heritage as a value is also a part of the general development of the society.

4.9   Heritage and identity

The concept of heritage is strongly connected to the questions of one's identity. In its essence, heritage should reflect the values of the society, and *vice versa* – meaning that we value our heritage, and things we value are worth being considered as heritage.

Depending on the context the term *identity* can have several sides to it. Most generally identity can be understood as *the sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances; the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and not something else; individuality, personality* (OED 1999). To put it in other words: a person defines oneself through one's identity – identity should tell us and others what we are like, and where we belong. Similar personal identities based on similar affections can format in group identity.

The problem with identity is that the concept itself is very multileveled: one person has many simultaneous identities, which sometimes can be overwhelmingly conflicting. A word often used in the same phrase with identity is "crisis", meaning that a person's real identity can be very difficult to figure out, especially for the person him/herself. This is one of the aspects of identity that most successfully can be studied by "out standers", who are not involved with the process. The problem with "out standing" observers is that they might signify the identities through their own personal interpretation based on their own identity, and end up creating a whole new world, that does not correspond to the reality. The "identity crisis" can be a real threat while studying past or archaeological identities, which can only be generated through the study of material remains.

In the archaeological sense, the study on identity is used to define and understand status of individuals and groups in the past based for example on their gender, rank, status or place within society. At the same time the results of archaeological research are used to promote, support, and even propagate specific agenda generated in the present to consolidate local, regional or national identity (Darvill 2008, 205). In this perspective archaeology can be used and also abused as a powerful tool for political and ideological reasons.

Group identity is very often defined by "others", especially by opposing to the "others". Thus, the notion of identity always involves danger of losing something. It can be even stated that the feeling of losing something or fear of becoming a social outcast is one of the bases of group identity. Therefore, while discussing group identity, somebody is always on the position of "defence", and somebody is always on the position of "offense".

4.10 Heritage and interest groups (stakeholders)

There have always been opposing understandings of archaeological sites, their interpretations, and cultural values. As it was stressed before, heritage is mostly about values, and these values are the bases for one's identity. Similar values generate common affections that represent conflicting interest groups (stakeholders). While discussing archaeological record, we can say that heritage values reflect the interest groups' identities – different values make the interest groups distinctive. In this case I have chosen six most distinctive interest groups who all have their own viewpoints on archaeological landscapes and their management At the same time all of these groups define their claims over the ownership of archaeological sites on different levels based on their values.

Archaeologists constitute the professional interest group concerned with the scientific developments of archaeology as a discipline. They have the legitimate right to study and excavate archaeological sites with whatever methods and means they consider to be appropriate. Therefore, most archaeologists are socially accepted as specialists on their field, and their methods and results are generally not questioned by others. At one point this gives archaeologists the notion that they are the only ones who have something to say about archaeological record, and they have the right to deal with it as they please. In cases this might end up with possessive feelings for archaeological heritage: e. g. while excavating a stone grave, the leading archaeologist might feel that everything in that grave belongs to him, not personally but scientifically. He has the right to study, to interpret, and to publish the

material he has discovered. This means that archaeologists identify themselves with the sites and landscapes on a scientific level. They don't own the sites physically, but mentally. They own archaeology on the landscape and identify themselves through archaeology. This may result in a conflict with the actual landowner, who has legal rights and also obligations towards his property.

At the same time professional archaeologists produce the narrative of the past using scientific methods, approaches and theoretical frameworks. In this sense, through books, journals, school and university study programs they give birth to the canonized version of a country's past, which is very often defined by one nation and its identity. They create the canonized archaeological identity for the whole nation, though they very often tend to dispute it, and identify themselves in quite a different manner through professional circles. As a result, public is deceived twice: archaeological material is interpreted to consolidate common identity, but archaeologists don't identify themselves with it.

Landowners very often know nothing about archaeology, and do not always understand the scientific value (or scientific heritage) of the site, although I have seen very good opposite examples. In this framework their value system is more based on property ownership than the above-mentioned archaeological identity. They tend to relate to archaeological sites as landmarks on their property, and always don't consider the sites as valuable heritage from the past that needs to be protected for future generations. As property owners they are more interested in the agricultural and economic value of the land, and in their mind on their own land nobody can tell them what to do or how to do it. They own the land, and as stakeholders identify themselves mainly through private property. On the whole, there are very few landowners who identify themselves as owners of archaeological sites. This is very much based on value systems, and with the development of society the approach towards archaeological heritage will hopefully improve.

Local community depends very much on individual landowners. If they have strong feelings for their land and traditions, the individual landowners may identify themselves through the local community and local landscapes. In this case archaeological sites may have an important place in the community's life, although they usually have quite a different understanding of the sites from the professional archaeologists, and it very often tends to base on everyday folklore that has nothing to do with reality or archaeological interpretations. The point being that local identity is formed by local landscapes with all of its features, not by individual professional interpretations published in scientific journals. Archaeologists may have a small

57

impact on local communities but only through the so-called canonized version of the archaeological past, they very often do not believe themselves.

Landscape developer or spatial planner usually acts according to certain economic interests, and archaeological sites for them are just time and money consuming obstacles. Although spatial planning is supervised by government authorities, usually nothing goes exactly as written or drawn on paper. Another problem is that spatial planners very often lack in local knowledge, and the might not be aware of the sites valued by the locals. As an interest group, landscape developers act on the notions of money and time, and their primal interests are definitely not concerned with the heritage. Without enough knowledge, developers can be most harmful to the heritage.

Hobby archaeologists generally use metal detectors or other similar survey devices to locate archaeological sites in order to search for antiquities. The situation changed with the amendments of the Conservation Act in 2011, when §30 – 33 were added to regulate the use of metal detectors. Now, in order to use a metal detector for hobby purposes it is compulsory to complete a special training course, apply for a permit, and every object of cultural value has to be reported to the Estonian National Heritage Board. Since 2011, when the state started to regulate hobby detecting through legislation and buying lawfully discovered archaeological items for their real market value, metal detecting has become extremely popular. While the number of legal detectors with state given permit summed up around 600 in 2017[12], the exact number of searchers remains unknown. Even though the state is buying lawfully discovered archaeological items, the illegal black market is still considerable, and lot of findings never reach archaeological collections in museums. In the process, a significant amount of scientific data gets lost, and cultural values end up in private collections unreachable for the public. "Black archaeologists" represent a considerable threat to archaeological landscapes and have all the implications of becoming an organized interest group, who might even have social ambitions concerning archaeological heritage. So far through the means of printed press and the Internet "black archaeologists" have propagated their hobby with significant success, projecting to the public an image that they are merely doing the job the archaeologists don't find time or interest to do. At the moment, a lot of professional archaeologists find themselves at the crossroads of decisions: weather to ignore the problem by banning all kind of detectorism or to figure out solutions by regulations and positive engagement. Although, archaeologists and the National Heritage Board have made good progress in the recent years

---

[12] According to the National Registry of Cultural Heritage

with positive engaging of hobby searchers, the black market still has quite a share, and there's still a long way to go.

Estonian National Heritage Board is a ministry department that tries to regulate and channel heritage management as much as the law allows. The interest group identity of the National Heritage Board should be based on actual heritage values, but in real life the most strategic decisions are affected by the choices of ruling political parties. In this way all the mentioned interest groups can influence the construction of heritage.

General public and tourists are an important part of heritage management. Heritage as a whole is meant for general public and every member of the society should have access to heritage values, including archaeological heritage. The problem here is that excessive tourism can pose a considerable threat to vulnerable sites – very often landscape must be adjusted to "host" the tourists, meaning that actually authentic archaeological landscapes are altered or even destroyed.

The paradox is, that these characters are all part of quite similar groups who have overlapping identities with very different strategies: one can be simultaneously part of all the above-mentioned groups. In this case the conflict could become overwhelming, and one could end up in an identity crisis.

4.11 Conclusion: components of landscape

The four most important components of landscape include:

1. <u>Human dimension</u>. People create, perceive, interpret, and exploit the landscape. Without the human dimension, landscape cannot exist, for landscape is created in peoples' imaginations. Landscape without people is just **land** with its various measurable characteristics and features.

2. <u>Place and space (area)</u> in the definition of landscape equal to **nature** or **environment** observed, perceived and designed by people. Landscape as such is always bind to a certain place, be it wild or utterly urban. Again, it is not possible to talk about place or space without human dimension. Fundamentally, nature untouched by human interaction does not exist – barely thinking about nature involves landscape creation, which in its essence is a process of culturalization. From here we can proceed, that a **place** on the face of the earth becomes space

through structured human-induced activities. Similar to the idea of landscape, space without human presence remains only a place. As Owig points out (Olwig 2006, 26), the creation of landscape evolves through attending to certain places, resulting in the sense of place, which can be depicted as landscapes in texts or paintings. In the same way people create taskscapes rooted in specific places, as discussed by Ingold (Ingold 1993).

3. <u>Time</u> characterises the dynamics or processes in landscape evolution. Landscape is never a constant, but in imminent change. Landscape is both at the same time, a beginning point and a result of various activities. In order to study the present and the future of certain landscapes, we have to look into the past.

4. <u>Interaction between people, places and time</u> create landscapes, which can be perceived by all human senses, and as a result are always individual. Strictly, a landscape can never be the same, for every time it is encountered, new values are created.