What we nowadays label landscape archaeology emerged as a distinct subdiscipline during the early 1970s. Widespread use of the term can be traced back to Mick Aston and Trevor Rowley’s book *Landscape Archaeology*, in which they attempted to expand the field of landscape history through the promotion of fieldwork techniques for the investigation of post-Roman landscapes (Aston and Rowley 1974). In a very real sense, the term caught the spirit of the moment, consolidating various strands of thinking about how archaeology could better connect broad notions of time and space within the prevailing processualist paradigm that had emerged out of the New Archaeology on both sides of the Atlantic in the late 1960s. Very quickly, landscape archaeology advanced beyond a methodology and became much more than simply about doing archaeology over a wide area or with an emphasis on time-depth. Embedded within the very idea of landscape archaeology right from the start was an interest in the eponymous defining concept of “landscape” itself, a matter that during the last quarter of the 20th century kept it alive and now provides the motor that powers the subject forward. Uniquely, landscape archaeology has kept pace with changing theoretical and philosophical positions over the last 30 years or so and now displays considerable heterogeneity in its practice and articulation (Darvill 1999; Lemaire 1997; Sherratt 1996).

In the following sections, three main phases to the development and expansion of landscape archaeology in Europe are briefly considered. First, attention is directed to the roots of the subject in Britain especially, mainly in terms of the influences, traditions, and pressures that contributed to the flood of interest evident from the mid-1970s. Second, emphasis is given to the changing theoretical paradigms within archaeology over the past 30 years as the tenets of processual archaeology were challenged and new tracks developed for the pluralistic approaches of postprocessual archaeology. And third, something of the multiplicity of traditions old and new that now subsist under the banner of landscape archaeology is sketched out as the subject achieves what for practitioners and theorists alike has become a Golden Age, with implications for archaeology across our planet.

**Before the Flood**

A school of landscape archaeology did not come about suddenly, nor for a single reason; it emerged in parallel with work taking place in other disciplines and ultimately depends for sustenance on several deep intellectual roots. One prerequisite was the idea that human activity, societies, and culture have a spatial dimension. The application of geographical models and principles to an understanding of
the past can be traced back to the early 20th century in the works of H. J. MacKinder (1907), Cyril Fox (1932), and O. G. S. Crawford (1953), among others. Gordon Childe's clear expression of culture as an entity situated in space and time played a major part in articulating what archaeologists find (artifacts, monuments, and so on) with recognizable communities and the occupation of specific areas and territories (Childe 1929; Renfrew 1977: 92). Carl Sauer was among the first geographers to express the view that under the influence of a given culture the landscape became the repository of that culture's striving against its environment and the tangible record of human adaptation to their physical milieu. Culture was the agent, the natural environment was the medium, and the cultural landscape the result (Gold 1980: 34; Sauer 1925). Time and space became fundamental components of many social models (e.g., Gurevich 1969).

Another formative influence was an appreciation of the aesthetic and perceptual dimensions of landscape through language, placenames, folklore, literature, and poetry. Occasionally, artists such as Heywood Sumner (1913, 1917) and Edward J. Burrow (1919, 1924) used archaeologically rich landscapes as themes for illustration, continuing a tradition that Peter Howard has traced well back into the 18th century (Howard 1991).

A third influence was the recognition that so much archaeology was visible in the contemporary landscape of fields, heathland, pasture, upland, and woods and that its future was bound up with the very evolving fabric of the countryside. As far back as the 18th century, William Stukeley was lamenting the impact of agriculture on the ancient monuments around Stonehenge (1740: 1), and in the 19th century much attention was given to the reconstruction of monuments as a means of preserving them while also enhancing the visual aesthetic of the landscape. Luckily, much remained untouched, and in the early 20th century Adrian Allcroft noted in the introduction to his rather neglected volume *Earthwork of England* “that not a year passes without the discovery of new earthworks which have waited for hundreds, nay, thousands of years for mere recognition” (1908: 22). It was a view that in many ways cleared the ground for the development of an archaeology of landscape.

Through the late 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s these interests in “reading the land” (Fowler 2001) combined with three far-reaching developments in archaeology to provide the first focus for landscape archaeology. The developments are expanding horizons, cross-disciplinary exchanges, and

### Expanding Horizons

By the mid-20th century, attention began to be paid to relationships between sites and their environmental setting, a concern that also spilled over into the wider interpretation of settlement patterns and processes of long-term change. Investigations at Star Carr, Yorkshire, in 1949–1951, for example, clearly show the emergence of these approaches wherein ecological setting, vegetation history, and the local lake stratigraphy were given as much prominence as the more traditional aspects of the site (Clark 1954).

The fast developing field of Rescue Archaeology (or Salvage Archaeology) during the early post-war period also had an influence. Although work initially focused on specific sites under immediate threat of destruction, as developments grew bigger, and the full extent of the threatened archaeology became better understood, things began to change. Work in Britain on the M4 and M5 motorways especially highlighted the density of sites even in unprepossessing areas (Fowler 1979), while gravel extraction at Mucking, Essex, for example, unpicked a zone of cropmarks 350 m wide and over 1 km long to reveal an almost continuous human presence from Neolithic times up to the present day with all the activity sites of a single community represented in many periods (Jones 1973; Jones, Evison, and Myres 1968; Jones and Jones 1974).

Also relevant was the gradual switch from reactive responses to proactive planning and the developing tradition of strategic resource surveys such as those for the river gravels (Benson and Miles 1974; Gates 1975; RCHM 1960) and new town development (e.g., RCHM 1969). The preparation of these documents served to broaden perspectives and provided the context for introducing the concept of landscape to provide an academic structure to the collection and presentation of information that was applied to very practical ends.

### Cross-Disciplinary Exchanges

Stimuli from other disciplines continued, especially geography, anthropology, local history, and placename studies. In Britain, the work of Maurice Beresford (1954, 1957) was a landmark in the study of medieval settlement and landscape, but the single most widely acknowledged stimulant was undoubtedly W. G. Hoskins’s seminal book *The Making of the English Landscape* (Hoskins 1955). The way in which Hoskins charted the development of the countryside, drawing mainly...
for archaeological sites and monuments and struck a chord with a number of young archaeologists (Aston 2000: 49). However, Hoskins was not the only commentator on landscape in the 1950s. Contributions from those with interests in the artistic and aesthetic elements of landscape continued and in one particular case found expression within an archaeological context through the pen of Jacquetta Hawkes in her book *A Land* (1951).

**Access to Source Materials**

A third contribution was the increasing availability of relevant source material and the innovative application of appropriate techniques to their analysis. Landscape studies relied on an ability to see large tracts of countryside or townscape at one time and to recognize and document patterns and relationships in the data. Aerial photographs and early cartographic sources provide just such views. Aerial photographs began to become widely available and easily accessible from the early 1950s onward. O. G. S. Crawford, J. K. St. Joseph, G. W. G. Allen, D. N. Riley, and others pioneered the use of aerial photography, but it was John Bradford in his book *Ancient Landscapes* (1957) who provided one of the first systematic accounts and eloquent demonstrations of how the techniques could be applied to the same kinds of problem that Hoskins was addressing. In Bradford’s own words, his book arose from “an ultimate desire to explore thoroughly complete social units, advancing from single sites to regions” (1957: 3, original emphasis). At about the same time, public record offices adopted a higher profile by making archives of early maps and documents easily accessible.

**Blood on the Tracks**

Landscape archaeology as it emerged in Britain during the mid-1970s drew on the rapidly accumulating wealth of archaeological and historical material by emphasizing the time-depth inherent to every patch of countryside. Mick Aston and Trevor Rowley (1974: 14) noted that:

> The landscape is a palimpsest on to which each generation inscribed its own impressions and removes some of the marks of earlier generations. Constructions of one age are often overlain, modified or erased by the work of another. The present patchwork nature of settlement and patterns of agriculture has evolved as a result of thousands of years of human endeavor, producing a landscape which long and slow development, but an inexhaustible store of information about many kinds of human activities in the past.

Such approaches provided academic underpinning for many extensive survey projects yielding high-resolution understandings of defined territories and regions with reference to prehistoric and historic times, and could also be tied to questions about subsistence strategies, economic organization, changing belief systems, and the development of social complexity. Dartmoor (Fleming 1978, 1983, 1988), the Somerset Levels (Coles and Coles 1986), and the Stonehenge Environs (RCHM 1969) were among many such areas studied in this way. In the Americas, similar objectives were being pursued at this time, albeit with rather different kinds of baseline data drawn from formal sampling procedures and predictive modeling to document surface scatters and monuments alike (Flannery 1976: 31–224), and these made their influence felt (e.g., Shennan 1985). Throughout much of mainland Europe, archaeological interest remained firmly focused on individual sites and monuments, although as in Britain and America the number and scale of investigations increased dramatically through the 1970s and the 1980s.

Even while many of these projects were unfolding, the hard empiricism of the New Archaeology was giving way to the softer processualist approaches of Social Archaeology (Renfrew 1973, 1977), with its inherent focus on people and places and its interest in relationships between “man [sic] and the landscape.” Contributions from geography and various branches of the social sciences, especially anthropology and ethnography, added further dimensions to the conceptualization and interpretation of ancient landscapes. Spatial archaeology in particular drew heavily on the work of the New Geography and provided a wealth of tools and approaches that were widely explored and tested by Ann Ellison and J. C. Harriss (1972), David Clarke (1977a, 1977b, 1978), Ian Hodder (1978a, 1978b, 1981, 1982), Claudio Vita-Finzi (1978), and others. Site catchment analysis (SCA), central place theory (CPT), Thessian Polygons (TPs), and trend surface analysis (TSA) and more found applications that provided thought-provoking understandings (Hodder and Orton 1976) but shared an essential detachment from the landscape itself.

Rather different were the emergent humanistic approaches. In a perceptive paper at a conference in 1974, Frances Lynch examined the way that people had real and sensitive appreciations of the landscape, noting that people’s relationship with
exploitation and struggle but was also one in which the beauty and grandeur of the rocks and mountains and the broad views over valleys and plains had an importance and value in their own right" (1975: 124). It was a perspective that chimed with emerging postmodernist views elsewhere in academe (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988; Nuttgens 1972; Tuan 1977; Wheatley 1971) and would eventually find a place in archaeological discourse (see below), but not before other avenues had been explored. Some understanding was needed of the way that landscapes might have been perceived, understood, and utilized by extinct communities, and how spatial patterning of material culture might relate to such matters. Ethnoarchaeology at the landscape scale provided some of the answers—Lewis Binford's work on the archaeology of place (1982) and on hunter-gatherer communities (1983: 109–143) being fundamental.

Among the most important lessons of ethnoarchaeology and spatial archaeology was the recognition that, in social terms, space is essentially continuous and that what varies is the way that people differentially value, categorize, subdivide, and use the spaces available to them. The implication, of course, is the need to move away from looking at monuments in isolation and instead consider much larger tracts of land. As Peter Fowler once suggested, Britain should perhaps be seen as one enormous archaeological site (1977: 48)—a sentiment applicable to many parts of the world. In this sense, the gaps between what in conventional thinking might be called sites are just as important as the hotspots themselves. Rob Foley put his finger right on the problem when he spoke of “off-site” archaeology (1981a), pointedly subtitling one of his papers “an alternative approach for the short-sited” (1981b). His analysis examined both the incremental pattern of artifact accumulation within space, and the systematic and nonsystematic taphonomy of postdepositional transformations.

Less than a decade after Aston and Rowley introduced their methodologically grounded view of landscape archaeology, the field had not only expanded rapidly but also diversified markedly. Such was the multiplicity of interest that Coones (1985) raised the question of just how many landscapes there were. In archaeology it became widely accepted that although there was one land available for study, there were many landscapes that could be developed and explored (Darvill and Gojda 2001). Through the later 1980s, 1990s, and the first few years of the 21st century, traditions of landscape archaeology have multiplied still further, and the overall approach spread to studies in

**Planet Waves**

There is no single consolidated tradition of landscape archaeology in Europe, rather a series of related approaches under a single banner (Gojda 2001). Some are grounded firmly in conventional empirical traditions, whereas others articulate with shifting visions of the landscape across a wide range of intellectual frontiers. Three interconnected factors appear to be driving an interest in landscape archaeology forward, each deriving insights from the other.

First is the continuing imperative to understand past societies and the recognition that people exist within worlds far larger than the confines of a particular “site” or “monument,” even though aspiring to a “totalizing” perspective is fraught with paradoxes and tensions (Johnston 1998a, 1998b). Reflexive archaeologies provide one solution, well exemplified at Çatalhöyük in Turkey, where the examination of a Neolithic tell provides the focus for more extensive surveys and investigations (Hodder 2000). The balance between theoretical and ideological positions is also highly relevant to the realization of shared objectives in archaeology, especially in the case of landscape archaeology, where real differences are visible. Smyntyna (2006) has usefully compared and contrasted the physiographic paradigms that dominate thinking in eastern Europe (especially post-Soviet Europe) with the social paradigms employed widely in western Europe. Terminology remains problematic, and debates about the analytical categories identified with such studies continue (Meier 2006). However, the biggest single development in recent decades surrounds the recognition that natural places in the landscape have specific meaning and significance for prehistoric and later communities and that they are often connected with rock art, votive offerings, special sources of raw material, and monuments (Bradley 2000).

Second is the increasing scale of the opportunities available for the detailed investigation of large slices of landscape. Research projects have certainly adapted to this possibility, but the largest single contribution arises from the pan-European success in integrating archaeological work with the spatial planning system so that predetermination studies can be undertaken, often under the rubric of the European Union’s environmental impact assessment regulations (EC 1985, 1997; Jones and Slinn 2006) and mitigation strategies agreed and implemented as part of a broader management cycle (Darvill 2004a: 415–20; Darvill and Gerrard 1994; Waugh 2006; Willems 1998: 195–96). Major infrastructure
one country, stand at the top of the list in terms of their scale, as with the Betuweroute rail-freight line between Rotterdam and Zevenaar in the Netherlands (Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten [RAM] 2000–2002), the motorway building program in Ireland (O’Sullivan 2003; O’Sullivan and Stanley 2005, 2006), and the open-cast lignite mining around Cottbus in eastern Germany (Bönisch 2001), to mention just three. But the value of smaller schemes must not be underestimated. Many states have signed and ratified the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage, opened for signature in Valletta (Malta) in January 1992, whose concern is with all kinds of archaeological materials, sites, and landscapes “as a source of the European collective memory and as an instrument for historical and scientific study” (CoE 1992: article 1.1).

Third is a deepening concern for the management of the European landscape through the structured deployment of conservation, preservation, protection, and controlled exploitation. A Council of Europe recommendation on the integrated conservation of cultural landscape areas was approved in 1995 (CoE 1995; Darvill 1996), followed by the more powerful and wide-ranging European Landscape Convention opened for signature at Firenze in October 2000 (CoE 2000; Fairclough 2006; Högborg 2006). All are powerful instruments not just in advancing the interests of archaeology but also in fully integrating archaeological interests with broader environmental concerns and the creation of social policy and a European identity (Fairclough 2006; Lozny 2005; Machat 1993; Tzanidaki 2000; Willems 2000). Arising from these developments is an increased concern for the establishment of research networks and dedicated periodicals. The Man and Nature Centre at Odense University, Denmark, was one organization that provided an innovative interdisciplinary approach to landscape between 1993 and 1997 (Juel 1997). Its place has partly been taken by Landscape Europe, based in the Netherlands. This comprises a network of about 20 national research institutes in more than 15 countries with expertise in landscape assessment, planning, and management at the interface of policy implementation, education, and state-of-the-art science in support of sustainable landscapes (LE 2006). Mention may also be made of the interdisciplinary journals Landscape Research, published by Taylor and Frances for the Landscape Research Group at Oxford Brookes University, and Landscapes, published since 1999 by Windgather Press.

To classify the myriad strands of investigation, perspective would require enumeration of all that is happening, but seven very broad and partly overlapping strands can be recognized and deserve attention in terms of their recent history and development. Many of the themes and approaches covered by these strands are explored in more detail in later chapters of this Handbook.

**Total Archaeology**

This traditional approach, the name for which was coined by Christopher Taylor (1974a), developed the fundamental axiom of historical geography that the landscape we see today is the product of prolonged evolution involving both human and natural agencies and that to understand and decipher it requires, at the very least, “reading” all available archaeological and related evidence including fieldwork, aerial photography, cartographic sources, historical documents, placenames, folklore, and so on (Aston 1985; Aston and Rowley 1974; Rippon 2004; Steane and Dix 1978; Taylor 1974b). Throughout, it is assumed that human impact increases from the almost insignificant in early prehistoric times through to very significant in recent centuries, while the effect of the natural environment on human activity decreases inversely.

The result of such landscape archaeology is typically a series of maps summarizing the distribution of sites and land-use for each defined phase. As a general rule, many overlays tend to be rather bare of sites until the relatively modern period when detailed cartographic sources become available. A commentary outlining the historical evolution of the block of landscape in question is usually provided to accompany the maps and plans. An early example is Taylor’s study of Whiteparish, a forest edge parish in Wiltshire (1967). More recent is a study of medieval and later agriculture and tin working in St. Neot Parish, Cornwall (Austin, Gerrard, and Greeses 1989). This analysis was confined to a particular chronological period (A.D. 1100–1700) and just one community (an upland parish), with a view to understanding human interactions with natural resources.

**Palaeo-Environments and Palaeo-Land-Use**

A variation on total archaeology is the development of models that focus on the changing environment, land-use patterns, and settlement systems within a given territory. In a sense, such work emphasizes the relationships between the physical environment and human communities, although recognizing that the relationship is two-way (Evans, Limbrey, and Cleere 1975; Limbrey and Evans 1978). Factors as an instrument for historical and scientific study"
such as the nature and extent of tree cover, and the composition and abundance of the natural fauna, soil fertility, microtopography, geomorphology, and climate are fundamental dimensions of the landscape addressed through such work, although not necessarily all together.

Excavation and survey-based projects that integrate archaeological and palaeo-environmental evidence within a landscape framework are increasingly common and have moved from being multidisciplinary in their execution to being rather more interdisciplinary. Examples in Britain include Fisherwick, Staffordshire (Smith 1979), the Essex coast (Wilkinson and Murphy 1995), the Stonehenge area of Wiltshire (Allen 1997), and the Severn Estuary (Bell, Caseldine, and Neumann 2000). This integrative approach is also an increasingly recognized in the study of landscapes in central and eastern Europe (Suhr 2006)—for example, studies of the Sobiejuchy area of Poland (Ostoja-Zagórski 1993), the Ljubljansko Barje region of Slovenia (Budja 1997), the Upper Tisza valley of northeastern Hungary (Gillings 1997), the Gyomaendrőd Project in southeast Hungary (Bökönyi 1997), and the hinterland of Novgorod in northwest Russia (Brisbane and Gaimster 2001).

### Cultural Landscapes and Community Areas

Almost the converse of palaeo-environmental studies of landscape are those that foreground human communities and the way that they inhabit a world of their own creation. Often based on the results of total archaeology, regional surveys, or palaeo-environmental archaeology, the cultural landscape is built as a “snapshot” image at some defined moment in time.

Relatively recent landscapes lend themselves to such study, especially historic parks and gardens (Pattison 1998). A rather good, and very detailed, piece of work on an extensive cultural landscape is the study of Blenheim Park at Woodstock in Oxfordshire by James Bond and Kate Tiller (1987). Very large-scale excavations such as those in the upper Thames Valley around Claydon Pike, Gloucestershire (Miles 1983) and Yarnton, Oxfordshire (Hey 2004; Hey, Bayliss, and Boyle 1999), and in the Welland Valley at Fengate, Cambridgeshire (Pryor and French 1985), provide exceptionally detailed insights and high-resolution views of cultural landscapes. Broader surveys coupled with selective excavation give a still bigger picture, as with the study of 450 km² of chalkland around Danebury, Hampshire (Cunliffe 1995, 2000; Palmer 1984), sample of a study area covering 4200 km² in eastern England (Hall 1987; Hall and Chippindale 1988: 305–80; Hall and Coles 1994). In Ireland, the Discovery Programme’s work around the prehistoric and early medieval site of Tara provides a benchmark for the execution and presentation of extensive landscape surveys (Breathnach 1995, 2005; Newman 1997).

Many studies of cultural landscapes are essentially regional surveys closely tied to broader research agendas. Examples are legion, and in many parts of Europe this approach is the mainstay of landscape archaeology (Barker 1996: Dommelen and Prent 1996). Although this approach is rooted in processual archaeology, there are of course opportunities to apply other perspectives:

- In England: the central Welsh Marches (Whimster 1989), the Yorkshire Wolds (Stoertz 1997), the Berkshire Downs (Ford 1987), East Hampshire (Shennan 1985), Bodmin Moor, Cornwall (Johnson and Rose 1994), and Cranborne Chase, Dorset (Barrett, Bradley, and Green 1991)
- In Scotland: Perthshire (RCAHMS 1990, 1994)
- In Ireland: the Neolithic of country Sligo (Bergh 1995)
- In Denmark: the Bronze and later maritime landscapes of the island of Fyn (Crumlin-Pedersen, Porsmose, and Thrane 1996)
- In the Netherlands: the Maaskant Project in the Meuse Valley (Fokkens 1996)
- In Italy: the Biferno Valley (Barker 1995); later prehistory of the Pontine region (Attema 1993); the middle Tiber Valley (Patterson 2004); and Etruria and Umbria (Christie 2004; Terrenato 1995)
- In Spain: the Tarragona hinterland survey (Carreté, Keay, and Millett 1995)
- In Turkey: the Amuq Valley Regional Project in the Plain of Antioch and the Orontes Delta (Yener 2005)
- In Greece: the Aegean Islands of Keos (Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991); Melos (Renfrew and Waggstaff 1982); and Laconia (Cavanagh et al. 1996)

Aerial photography established in some parts of Europe during the 1920s plays an increasingly important role in the location and the mapping of relict cultural landscapes. In England, the National Mapping
earthwork and cropmark features based on the analysis of more than a million images (Bewley 2001). In Belgium, several thousand pictures have been analyzed to provide a database for the study of prehistoric landscapes, notably the Bronze Age and the early Iron Age (Bourgeois and Verlaeckt 2001). And in eastern Europe, the easing of restrictions imposed during communist times is now beginning to pay off with extensive work in Bohemia (Gojda 2006) and Romania (Hanson and Oltean 2005), among others, and innovative approaches in Armenia (Faustmann and Palmer 2002).

Geophysical and geochemical survey increasingly plays a role in understanding landscape patterning for particular periods where it can be applied extensively and where the signatures relevant to particular arrangements are distinctive (Sperry 1992). Investigations in the Walton Basin of the Welsh Borderland (Gibson 1999) and Billown in the Isle of Man (Darvill 2004b with earlier references) illustrate the potential for Neolithic landscapes, while work around Wroxeter, Shropshire, has begun to unravel a very detailed picture of the Roman landscape (BUFAU 1996; van Leusen 1992). Overall, the range of approaches that can be brought to bear on the mapping and the investigation of cultural landscapes is now very considerable. Indeed, the EU-funded POPULUS project had as one of its aims the development of coherent research goals, methods, and standards for work on landscapes around the Mediterranean (Barker and Mattingly 1999–2000).

In central Europe, studies of cultural landscapes have found a theoretical background in the idea of “community areas” as spatial units occupied by identifiable social groups in prehistoric and later times and reconstructable through studying distributions of archaeological sites and materials (Neustupný 1991). Such units do not necessarily coincide with modern administrative areas, and indeed the development of this thinking was in part an attempt to move away from the common practice of imposing modern patterns on the archaeological evidence to support the idea of continuity in a fast-changing landscape. Martin Kuna’s (1991) investigation of prehistoric habitation areas in Bohemia provides an example of community area analysis applied from the household scale through to the settlement pattern found in sampled river valleys.

Social Use of Space

In the course of developing the spatial theme, we have given some attention to modeling the ways conceptualize space at the landscape level in a way that shifts the focus of analyses away from the purely functional aspects of landscape and its development through time toward the realm of cognition and meaning. Developments in the field of geography (Wagstaff 1987) and anthropology (Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995) have been influential here, as well as case studies such as that by Christine Hugh-Jones of the Tukanoan Indians in northwest Amazonia (1979). Building on some of this, Tim Ingold (1993) has usefully introduced the idea of the “taskscape” as the entire ensemble of tasks or actions that a society, community, or individual performs—a seamless spread of events and experiences.

In thinking about differences in the form and layout of occupation sites of the later first millennium B.C. in the upper Thames Valley, for example, Richard Hingley (1984) showed that differences in settlement type and the use of material culture could be related to contrasting modes of production within the landscape. Elsewhere, attention has focused on the way that people and places were bound together through belief systems, cosmologies, views of the world, and many other determinants of social action (Barrett 1994; Bradley 1993, 1998). Experience, structuration, memory, and the creation of place have become themes running though much postprocessual discussion of landscape—for example, the way that people perceive space as they move through it and have different views of significant structures, objects, and places (Thomas 1993). The question of cosmological referencing in the landscape and the resultant patterning of activity has been explored with reference to Stonehenge (Darvill 1997) and the arrangement of Neolithic monuments on Orkney (Richards 1996). More generally, Cooney (2000), in his book on Neolithic Ireland, has utilized the concept of landscape as a constructed relationship between people and the places they inhabit, how they perceived the physical world of soil, water, rocks, and air and made it a lived-in place to explore. And, more recently, he has extended the vision of landscapes to embrace the idea of “seascapes,” too (Cooney 2003).

Landscape Theory

In the United States, the postmodernist critique of earlier views of human-environment relationships opened up the possibility of new approaches to the landscape. The history of landscape theory has been discussed in some detail (Jackson 1984; Norton 1989) and draws on four key sources (see Whittlesey 1997: 18–19 for summary). First, cultural landscapes, as they move through it and have different views of significant structures, objects, and places (Thomas 1993). The question of cosmological referencing in the landscape and the resultant patterning of activity has been explored with reference to Stonehenge (Darvill 1997) and the arrangement of Neolithic monuments on Orkney (Richards 1996). More generally, Cooney (2000), in his book on Neolithic Ireland, has utilized the concept of landscape as a constructed relationship between people and the places they inhabit, how they perceived the physical world of soil, water, rocks, and air and made it a lived-in place to explore. And, more recently, he has extended the vision of landscapes to embrace the idea of “seascapes,” too (Cooney 2003).

Landscape Theory

In the United States, the postmodernist critique of earlier views of human-environment relationships opened up the possibility of new approaches to the landscape. The history of landscape theory has been discussed in some detail (Jackson 1984; Norton 1989) and draws on four key sources (see Whittlesey 1997: 18–19 for summary). First, cultural landscapes, as they move through it and have different views of significant structures, objects, and places (Thomas 1993). The question of cosmological referencing in the landscape and the resultant patterning of activity has been explored with reference to Stonehenge (Darvill 1997) and the arrangement of Neolithic monuments on Orkney (Richards 1996). More generally, Cooney (2000), in his book on Neolithic Ireland, has utilized the concept of landscape as a constructed relationship between people and the places they inhabit, how they perceived the physical world of soil, water, rocks, and air and made it a lived-in place to explore. And, more recently, he has extended the vision of landscapes to embrace the idea of “seascapes,” too (Cooney 2003).
geography and environmental design; second, biological approaches to landscape ecology and dialectical biology; third, the Marxist notion that human history is part of natural history; and fourth, the use of enculturated approaches to human-environment relationships. Cognition and the symbolic meanings attached to landscapes through art and language are important ingredients, as is the elimination of artificial barriers between nature and culture and between culture and environment.

Following Zedeño and colleagues (1997), landscapes are seen as having three basic dimensions: formal (physical characteristics and properties); historical (sequential network links that result from transformational processes); and relational (interactive elements such as behavioral, social, and symbolic links that connect people and the land). Thus, in seeking to explore explicit research themes in relation to particular landscapes, suitable methodologies can be developed to explore each. This has successfully been achieved, for example, in the case of work by the Lower Verde Archaeological Project between 1991 and 1996 in central Arizona, where the story of a vanishing river and its place in the lives of Hohokam, Sinagua, Yavapai, Western Apache, and Euroamerican peoples over a period of more than 1,500 years is unfolded (Whittlesey, Ciolek-Torrello, and Altschul 1997).

In Europe, landscape theory as such is less visible than in north America, but a variant based on the cultural biography of a particular landscape has emerged, including, for example, studies of the Avebury (Pollard and Reynolds 2002) and Stonehenge (Darvill 2006) areas in southern Britain and the urnfield landscapes of the Meuse-Demer-Scheldt of southern Netherlands and northern Belgium (Roymans 1995). In these works attention focuses on the unfolding life of the area, relationships among people and the world they have created for themselves, an acceptance that cultural and natural worlds are indivisible, and an interest in tradition, memory, and way in which past events give meaning to later actions.

Phenomenology

The publication by Christopher Tilley in 1994 of A Phenomenology of Landscape opened a whole new range of possibilities for landscape archaeology that many have since followed. At its core is an essentially humanist view of landscape, not so very different from that espoused by Frances Lynch, Denis Cosgrove, Stephen Daniels, and others a decade or more earlier, in which simple binary divisions between culture and nature are Cartesian rationalism put to one side. As Tilley notes (1994: 26):

A fundamental part of the daily experience in non-industrial societies is the physical and biological experience of landscape—earth, water, wood, stone, high places and low places, wind, rain, sun, stars and sky. The rhythms of the land and the seasons correspond to and are worked into the rhythms of life. A landscape has ontological import because it is lived in and through, mediated, worked on and altered, replete with cultural meanings and symbolism—and not just something looked at or thought about, an object merely for contemplation, description, representation and aestheticization.

What differs is the means by which such matters are explored with reference to past societies. Unlike landscape theory, the methodology adopted by phenomenologists involves using a contemporary experience of the landscape to consider how earlier people might have thought about the world as a socially constructed reality involving the embodiment and the communication of cosmologies, economic relations, power structures, and social order. Tilley himself reviewed three contrasting landscapes in Britain—southwest Wales, the Black Mountains, and the chalklands of northwest Dorset—to look at changing themes of ancestral power and meanings, and their appropriation by individuals and groups through the construction of monuments (1994). Subsequent studies include the use by Neolithic communities of distinctive rocks on Bodmin Moor, Cornwall (Tilley 1996a), and the study of stone in the landscape (Tilley 2004). Elsewhere, cursus monuments of the 3rd millennium B.C. have been used widely as case studies in phenomenology, physically (Johnson 1999) and through GIS-based modeling (Chapman 2005). Beyond Britain, phenomenology has variously been applied to the problem of megalithic tombs in Galicia, Spain (Criado Boado and Villoch Vázquez 2000) and the Neolithic of southern Scandinavia (Tilley 1996b), and from a central European perspective the potential for using aerial photography as a way of seeing lost worlds in this way has been highlighted by Włodzimierz Rączkowski (2001).

Walking through monuments to record views (Tilley 1994: 172), mapping skylines (Cummins, Jones, and Watson 2002; Cummings and Whittle 2004), or replicating doorways to assess intervisibility (Bender, Hamilton, and Tilley 1997) offers...
obvious practical difficulties relating to viewpoints, the effect of vegetation cover (Chapman and Gearey 2000), and the physical changes that have taken place over intervening millennia. Inhabitation and bodily engagement are central to all applications of the phenomenological approach and provide exciting interpretative narratives (e.g., Chadwick 2004). To some, however, hyper-interpretative approaches to landscape archaeology lack rigor and are increasingly being criticized for their selective and misleading use of observations (Brück 2005; Fleming 1999, 2005, 2006). There is no doubt, however, that the phenomenological approach has much potential and that perhaps what is needed to make it more useful in archaeological situations is further middle-range research on perception and experience under a variety of social conditions.

**Historic Landscapes**

In conceptualizing past landscapes as sets of meanings and differentially valued spaces, structures, and things, archaeology has equipped itself, both intellectually and practically, with the means to contribute to larger ongoing debates about landscapes now and in the future. Barbara Bender has explored the issue of contested landscapes past and present, focusing on political and social issues (Bender 1993; Bender and Winer 2001). Criado and Parcero (1997) look at how landscapes and archaeology relate to heritage in Galicia, northwest Spain, while Zedeño and colleagues (1997) consider similar issues of landscape in relation to Native Americans.

In Britain and Ireland, the focus of much cultural resource management work in the 1980s and 1990s moved away from what might be called large sites or archaeologically rich countryside and townscape toward a more holistic approach with broadly defined “historic landscapes” (Aalen 1996; Countryside Commission 1996; Darvill 1987; Darvill, Gerrard, and Startin 1993; Goodchild 1990; Haynes 1983; Swanwick 1982; Wager 1981). Instead of subdividing the landscape into particular segments or blocks on the basis of some special interest, there is increasing emphasis on the integration of archaeology with other environmental and conservation disciplines. This is closely bound up with two trends. First is the integration of archaeology into the green movement (McInnes and Wickham-Jones 1992; Swain 1993). Second is the way in which multidisciplinary consultancies and government departments at all levels have put archaeologists alongside their counterparts from disciplines such as ecology, nature conservation, to planners, land managers, and the public. Similar developments are happening elsewhere in Europe as interest in the broader issue of managing change replaces earlier simple but stultifying ideas of landscape protection (Tzanidaki 2000; Willems 2000).

Much emphasis is now being placed on the recognition of local “landscape character” (Clark, Darlington, and Fairclough 2004; Countryside Commission 1991, 1996; Fairclough 1999; Herring 1998), while regionally and nationally the role of parks and extensive designations has come to the fore in Wales (Cadw 1998, 2001) and Spain (Méndez 1997, 2000), among other places. In more than a dozen countries across Europe attempts are being made to characterize and to model historic landscapes as an aid to future management (Clark, Darlington, and Fairclough 2003; Fairclough and Rippon 2002). Much of this depends on direct observation of the modern landscape in relation to inventories and records of archaeological finds, but in the Netherlands attention is also being given to predictive modeling in order to develop a more robust archaeological resource management (Leusen and Kammermans 2005).

At a global scale, the introduction of cultural and natural landscapes to the designations possible within UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1972) brought new and wide-ranging discussions about the conceptualization, definition, and valuation of potential examples of international importance. Three categories of cultural landscape were eventually defined: intentionally designed and created landscapes; organically evolved landscapes; and associative cultural landscapes (Cleere 1995). In 2003, the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage extended this interest from the physical remains to the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills, and cultural spaces that communities, groups and individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage (UNESCO 2003), which together represent another key strand in the understanding and appreciation of landscape.

**Conclusions**

The development of landscape archaeology during the later 20th century has been one of the most exciting and dynamic developments within the discipline as a whole. As the papers in collective works such as those edited by Ashmore and Knapp (1999) and Ucko and Layton (1999) show, landscape archaeology is a central component of most large-scale archaeological projects, a widely taught subject in university courses, and a perspec-
the unifying concept has been widely, and differently, defined according to the orientation and purpose of the work being carried out. Such diversity in the way that the idea of "the landscape" is conceptualized within archaeological research is healthy to the debate and serves to sharpen thinking and expand ways of understanding. Uniting them in their application to archaeological problems is dependent on our ability as archaeologists to recognize pattern, order, context, association, and repetition in the various constituent components (whether physical, ideational, or experiential) defined through any preferred theoretical perspective.

Three issues connected with questions of scale and temporality emerge from discussion of the scheme set out above that in future perhaps deserve more attention:

1. Landscapes for archaeologists are as much about spaces and gaps in the archaeological record defined in the traditional way as about defined sites and monuments.

2. Order, structure, and pattern may be perceived from many different directions according to the position of the observer.

3. Landscapes do not have defined physical limits either in time or space, except where imposed by archaeological procedures and intellectual traditions.
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