Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

This book is about how scholars have thought, and are thinking, about landscape. It is about how scholars have interpreted past landscapes; it takes as its primary focus the work of historical archaeologists working within the "English landscape tradition," though we shall find other archaeologists, prehistorians, anthropologists, geologists, geographers, historians, and others – even poets and artists – entering the scene from time to time, and I hope that its conclusions will be of interest to a much wider audience. It is very far from being a complete account of all the ideas of landscape ever proposed; such a volume would be an encyclopaedia, if it were possible at all. Rather, I shall be looking at a few selected strands of thought, a narrow sample of the literature.

This is not a book about theories or ideologies of landscape as such; nor is it a book primarily about techniques of landscape archaeology. Rather, it is a book about *habits of thought*. It asks the question: why do different communities of archaeologists and scholars habitually think about and do landscape archaeology in the way that they do? Such a topic spans both theory and practice, and moves back and forth between wider ideologies on the one hand (environmental determinism; landscape as subjectively constituted) and "mere techniques" (air photographs; field survey; mapping) on the other.

Part of the problem with writing a general book about landscape interpretation has been its double nature. Landscape studies are simultaneously one of the most fashionable and avant-garde areas of scholarly enquiry, and also, paradoxically, one of the most theoretically dormant areas. Two schools of landscape studies seem to currently exist, each hermetically sealed from the other. It is easy to read the studies in Ashmore and Knapp (1999), Bender (1993, 1998), Bradley (1993, 1998), Adam Smith (2003), Ucko and Layton (1999) and geographers such as Denis Cosgrove (1984,

2000), Stephen Daniels (1992), David Harvey (1990), Derek Gregory (1994), and Felix Driver (2001) and come to the conclusion that wide-ranging discussions of the meanings of landscape sit at the forefront of theoretical debate. Conversely, it is easy to peruse the pages of *Landscape History*, *Journal of the Medieval Settlement Research Group*, and *Landscapes* and conclude that landscape archaeology remains firmly in the grip of the most unreflective empiricism in which "theory" is a dirty word and the only reality worth holding on to is that of muddy boots – a direct, unmediated encounter with the "real world." Mick Aston's *Interpreting the Landscape* (1985), for example, one of the best books on the techniques of landscape archaeology, contains almost no reference to theoretical debate of this kind, while approaches drawing on Foucault and literary theory such as those taken by the author (Johnson 1996) have been seen as "wild" and "mystical" by respected figures in what might be termed the empirical school (Williamson 2000:56).

This mutual ignorance can lead to paradoxical views and statements. When Richard Muir (2000:147), for example, writes that the "sense of place is . . . a subjective phenomenon: it cannot be expressed and gauged with precision by the professional archaeologist or historian . . . The objective approach cultivated in the universities is admirable for most purposes, but the exclusion of emotion from intellect and symbol from reason in Western science does not equip us to recognise and relate to sense of place factors which may have motivated our distant forebears . . . The academic study of the relationship between landscape and human behaviour is in its infancy," he seems to be genuinely unaware of any of the writings of university-based phenomenologists from Heidegger (1953), Gadamer (1975), and Benjamin (1999, though he was writing before 1940) onwards. Conversely, when postprocessual writers speak of the need to develop personal, subjective, and hermeneutic approaches to landscape in contradistinction to "processual" approaches, they often seem unaware of a strong and continuing tradition of finding meaning in local landscapes through traditional forms of landscape history and archaeology. The point I am making here is not an adverse criticism of any of these writers; it is rather to draw attention to the depth and breadth of a divide in scholarship that allows this mutual ignorance to exist.

Definitions of Landscape

Here is a range of definitions of landscape, the majority of which were first collated by Rodaway (1994:127):

> Landscape is a kind of backcloth to the whole stage of human activity. (Appleton 1975:2)
>
> "Landscape", as the term has been used since the 17th century, is a construct of the mind as well as a physical and measurable entity. (Tuan 1979:6)
>
> A landscape is a cultural image, a pictorial way of representing, structuring or symbolising surroundings . . . Landscape is a social and cultural product, a way of seeing projected onto the land and having its own techniques and compositional forms; a restrictive way of seeing that diminishes alternative modes of experiencing our relations with nature. (Cosgrove 1984:1 and 269)
>
> When we consider landscape, we are almost always concerned with a visual construct. (Porteous 1990:4)
>
> Landscape is not merely an aesthetic background to life, rather it is a setting that both expresses and conditions cultural attitudes and activities, and significant modifications to landscapes are not possible without major changes in social attitudes . . . Landscapes are therefore always imbued with meanings that come from how and why we know them. (Relph 1976:122)
>
> A working country is hardly ever a landscape. The very idea of landscape implies separation and observation. (Williams 1973:120)
>
> When collective labour and the struggle with nature had ceased to be the only arena for man's encounter with nature and the world – then nature itself ceased to be a living participant in the events of life. Then nature became, by and large, a "setting for action", its backdrop; it was turned into landscape, it was fragmented into metaphors and comparisons serving to sublimate the individual and private affairs and adventures not connected in any real or intrinsic way to nature itself. (Bakhtin 1986:217)
>
> Landscape came to mean a prospect seen from a specific standpoint. (Tuan 1974:133)

I shall return to these themes again and again in the rest of the text; what I want to note in these initial comments is that any study of the way archaeologists view "landscape," at least within Western traditions of thought, will perforce involve at least two elements:

1 The "land" itself, however defined: the humanly created features that exist "objectively" across space, and their natural context. Landscape archaeology in this sense is a very simple term to define: it is about what lies beyond the site, or the edge of the excavation.

2 How "the land" is viewed – how we, and people in the past, came to apprehend and understand the landscape, and what those systems of apprehension and understanding are, the cognitive systems and processes of perception.

"Landscape" is, in this second sense, a *way of seeing*, a way of thinking about the physical world. This particular way of thinking and seeing is, in many conceptions of the subject including the quotes given above, what transforms the "land" and its study into "land-scape."

In the preface we have already seen these two ideas come into play. A simple description of the physical realities of Swaledale, interesting though it was, was not enough on its own to explain its "land-scape" – in this case, how scholars and popular audiences have viewed it, the meanings that have become attached to it, and the ways of thinking about it that have become habitual and taken for granted. To begin to understand the landscape, we had to make reference not just to its physical features, whether natural or humanly made, but also to the scholarly traditions that had been brought to bear on both, and behind scholarly tradition make reference to popular perceptions and culture.

Part of the enduring problem with landscape archaeology has been that scholars of all theoretical stripes have not always been very careful to distinguish these two ideas of landscape. We talk about "prehistoric landscape use," "landscapes of the mind," "historic landscape characterization," and so on. Clearly both elements rattle around our heads as we use these phrases. Some would say that these two elements should be separated; some would accord one element dominance over the other. Some would argue that the first simply does not exist apart from the second (for example, in the view that objective description of space is an impossibility; or in the view that the creation of a monument or field system was simultaneously a physical action and also part of a changing system of understanding the landscape). Some would add a third concept: landscape as engagement with the world – a process or way of doing things rather than a thing or an idea (cf. David and Wilson 2002:6).

Traditions of thought outside the West, such as those of many "indigenous" cultures, often deny any opposition between land and land-scape, or simply reject the Cartesian system of thought that set the opposition up in the first place. For the indigenous peoples of Australia, for example, the notion of a distinction between a process of living in the world and one's spiritual or emotional preconceptions about it is a quite alien concept (see Ucko and Layton 1999 for this and other examples).

The Origins of Landscape Studies

Humans have tried to observe, monitor, and understand the land around them for many thousands of years. It has been argued that Palaeolithic cave art is in part an attempt to control the environment through sympathetic magic. Certainly the siting of the rock art of many gatherer-hunter communities, for example of Australia, both makes reference to the land around and is very carefully sited within it with respect to visibility, or lack of visibility; and "natural" features such as rocks and hills acquire significance and meaning, meaning often encoded in the action of story-telling (David and Wilson 2002).

More directly physical means of carving up the landscape can be seen in early agricultural societies, for example large-scale woodland clearance and the laying out of field systems (Fleming 1988). Such activities were rarely purely utilitarian in nature; they clearly had a cognitive component and were in part about understanding and symbolically appropriating the land around them. It has been convincingly argued, for example, that new agricultural systems went hand in hand with new ways of thinking about human relations with the environment and with each other (Hodder 1990; Thomas 1991). It has been a recurrent, and highly controversial, theme of studies of early state societies that their origins are bound up with large-scale modification of the landscape through irrigation agriculture (Wittfogel 1957). While the "irrigation hypothesis" has been debated back and forth through the decades, the dimensions of early state landscapes other than those related to subsistence – the religious, symbolic, and political landscape – have been seen as increasingly important by recent scholars (Smith 2003). Much activity within the Roman empire can also be seen in this light: vast schemes of "centuriation" or the creation of grid-like patterns of fields were as much statements of imperial power over the land as they were utilitarian (Schubert 1996).

The classical world also made a contribution to the *ideology* of landscape that can hardly be overestimated. Classical texts, for example the poets Virgil and Ovid and their works in the "pastoral" genre, created a series of images that were reworked by later writers and which indirectly structure much of the way we think about landscape today. Many of these ideas are so much part of our habit of thought that we do not even recognize their classical origin. Discourses with a classical origin include, for example, ideas of productive husbandry (Thirsk 1992), the pastoral, the rural idyll, of Arcadia, and of *genius loci* (the presiding spirit of a locality). More broadly, a conception of "Nature" was forged by

classical authors and kept alive through subsequent centuries of classical learning. Of course, all these ideas actually said more about the realities of living amongst the bustle and squalor of republican and imperial Rome than they did about rural realities; since this date, as we shall see, the city and the country have been intertwined (Williams 1973). Classical writers also established a gendering of Nature and of fertility as feminine, for example through the cult of the corn goddess Demeter. This was a gendering that was continued into Christian thought through the association of the Virgin Mary with fertility (Warner 1976:273–84).

In the Middle Ages, we can see the emergence of a theme that continues to dominate ideas of landscape: that the carving up of the land, whether mental or material, has a close relationship to the carving up of society: that the spatial grid maps on to the social grid, if you will. Kathleen Biddick writes suggestively:

> Before the enclosure and partitioning of time and space in the 12th century of England, personhood and status did not operate as compartmentalised juridical categories . . . [12th-century] enclosure and partitioning . . . partitioned status out as an enclosed space or property, an object . . . Lords, the state, the courts thus conjoined disciplinary practices to grid the English landscape and create places where individuals supposedly could be produced. The fiscal, the juridical, the spatial, and the textual superimposed and overlapped in a palimpsest of disciplinary practices. (Biddick 1993:15–16)

This enclosure and partitioning was carried out through the division of land, the fossil record of which can still be seen in the English and European landscape (Figure 1.1), and also through the deployment of new administrative techniques that have left their trace in medieval estate and court records. Large feudal estates were owned by individual lords, the Crown, or religious institutions. Bureaucratic records of the administration of these estates often survive, to the extent that they overflow the record offices and archives of Europe. They have been used by historians, armed with a knowledge of medieval Latin and palaeography, to reconstruct the workings of the medieval economy (for example Dyer 1980, or the citations in Hatcher and Bailey 2001). The immediate concern of these records was administrative; however, they were also resources of power. The basic administrative unit became the manor, and manorial records recorded customary practices such as who had what rights over which piece of land (Seebohm 1884).

Peasants knew the power of these written records. A recurring feature of late medieval peasant revolts was the burning of such documents,

Figure 1.1 Appleton-le-Moors, North Yorkshire, a village on the edge of the North York Moors. The modern land divisions fossilize a medieval partitioning of land including "tenements," church, manor house, back lane, and fields beyond. *Copyright reserved Cambridge University Collection of Air Photographs*

in order to destroy the basis of evidence used to keep peasants in unfree status or to legitimate the extraction of rents and services (Hilton 1977). It has been argued that medieval peasants had their own different tradition, which might be seen as complementary to that of the landlord or set up in resistance to it, of common land and of rights over the land enshrined not in documents but in everyday action and social memory (Shoard 1999:164).

If the everyday landscape of the medieval world was conceived of in a complex and contested way, the same was also true of the

representation of the world through medieval geographical thinking. Medieval knowledge of the world was, of course, mediated through the Church, but was not as unsystematic or as divorced from a modern Cartesian appreciation as non-medievalists might think. For example, the practice of creating *mappae mundi* (maps of the world) was widespread across medieval Europe. Jerusalem was always at their centre, but they were not simply primitive distortions of geographical "reality" (Harvey 1996). Much of this cartographic knowledge was bound up with religious experience, the world being God's creation; thus the three continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa were often placed in geometrical harmony and symmetry around the Holy Land.

Renaissance Landscapes

Historical geographers, most notably Denis Cosgrove (1984), have argued cogently that the rise of "modern" views of landscape is bound up with the ideas and attitudes that were part and parcel of the Renaissance, however that historical period is defined. In particular, they argue for a connection between the idea of land-scape, in the second sense defined earlier, with that of the gaze from a single, often elevated, viewpoint and of perspective in art. Several different ideas are bound up in this general proposition.

First, the very term Renaissance implies "rediscovery," for example of the classical authors described above, and with that rediscovery a new encounter with the ideas of landscape first framed by those authors. It is not the case that classical ideas of landscape were forgotten in the Middle Ages; the choice of sites for medieval monasteries, for example, was influenced by classical texts in their manipulation of the landscape, as well as by the hermetic tradition of St Augustine. Many monasteries were sited in locations that might be described as rural retreats, and some even evicted the residents of medieval villages in order to create these (Greene 1992). However, it is certainly true that European gentlemen, taught to spend time reading Latin and Greek and to model themselves on the great Hellenic and Roman heroes, became more aware of some of the classical ideas and models described above.

One such classical theme was taken from Livy's history of the rise of Rome: that of Horatius at his farm (Luce 1998). The Roman warrior Horatius, after doing his duty to Rome and becoming a hero on the battlefield, left the public life and retired to his country retreat; he is

presented by Livy as making an active decision to forsake the worldly bustle and political ambition of the metropolis for a simpler country life. Texts such as Livy's became more and more widely known in 16th- and 17th-century Europe. The 17th-century English poet John Milton rewrote the story of Horatio at his farm; Virgil's poems about bee-keeping were given an increased circulation. Joan Thirsk has shown elegantly how, in the later 16th century, the increased circulation of such ideas marked a shift away from the cultivated lack of interest of the medieval knight. English gentlemen became more aware of such poetry and sought to live after models such as that of Horatius. The result of this awareness was increased gentlemanly interest in the everyday practicalities of farm management, an interest which fed directly in to the pace of agricultural innovation and agrarian change in the early modern period (Thirsk 1992).

However, the reading of classical texts was not simply an intellectual process: it was tied up with secularization and changes in culture in the gentry classes. As these classical texts were produced in printed editions for the first time, they became less and less the exclusive preserve of the manuscript libraries of the Church. Further, they were often translated into the vernacular, so that a knowledge of Latin and Greek was no longer a prerequisite. The printing press meant books were more freely and cheaply available, and rising levels of literacy in the 16th and 17th centuries meant that those of the gentry and middling social classes were better able to read them. Advice books and agricultural manuals contained information on sowing crops, household management, and care of the agricultural landscape. For example, Thomas Tusser's *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry*, published in 1586, contained advice (expressed in execrable verse) on household management and cultivation of the fields. This genre continued through the 17th and 18th centuries (Johnson 1996:84–6). And perhaps most significantly, the Bible could now be read in socially middling homes across much of Europe (16th-century authorities attempted to legislate against its printing and dissemination, with little success). Ordinary people could now read of landscapes, particularly in the Old Testament, that were bound up with powerful and religious and political meanings – the Garden of Eden, the Promised Land, the wilderness (Hill 1993).

In all such texts, the linking of land and social order was especially apparent. However, such thinking about landscape could be double-edged: it could carry both authoritarian and subversive meanings. Richard Helgerson (1992) has shown how, in the Middle Ages, ideas of the monarch and of the kingdom were coterminous. As a result, he suggests, it was intellectually inconceivable to lead a revolt

Figure 1.2 The "Ditchley Portrait" of Elizabeth I. Elizabeth stands on a map of England and Wales, with one foot resting on Ditchley in Oxfordshire; the south coast and Isle of Wight are visible in the foreground. The composition is obviously symbolic and allegorical, with the pairing of light and dark and the flat rendering of Elizabeth's body. © *National Portrait Gallery, London*

against monarchy, on the one hand, and in the name of the kingdom or commonwealth on the other. He shows how a conceptual divide between monarch and the idea of the nation arose in the 16th and 17th centuries, in part due to the production and dissemination of the map. Maps of the kingdom showed how the nation-state had a geographical existence in its own right, independent of that of the monarch. This potentially subversive divide between the idea of monarch and nation is expressed in the famous "Ditchley Portrait" of Elizabeth I, in which the queen stands on a map of England, one of her feet directly upon Ditchley (Figure 1.2): the point being that the divide between nation and monarch is subtly reinforced in a stylized and allegorical propaganda portrait of Elizabeth's sovereignty. By the 1640s, argues Helgerson, this intellectual divide had become so great as to allow the English Parliament to put on trial and proceed to execute King Charles for treachery, in the name of the "nation." The parliamentary leaders could make an argument that would have been alien to the Middle Ages: that loyalty to the nation was quite separate to loyalty to the monarch.

Enclosure

At a national level, then, appreciation of the physical landscape was bound up with that of the social and moral – and changes in that appreciation were driven in part by the production of maps. The same was true at the local level, and was especially true in England with the early development in that country of rural capitalism. From the 15th century onwards, the customary, medieval landscape of England was under attack from material and social forces both within and without. A generation of landlords, famously seen by the historian Richard Tawney and others as the first harbingers of the new capitalist order, carved up the medieval landscape and gave much of it over to sheep-runs. In the process, great numbers of medieval villages were deserted (Figure 1.3), a phenomenon that caused anger, condemnation and ineffectual legislation from the authorities (Tawney 1912; Dyer 1994 summarizes the historical reassessment of this process and takes the position that the phenomenon of aggressive "depopulation" by landlords has been exaggerated, a position that is now largely undisputed).

More generally, the population and other changes of the later Middle Ages were tied up with the transformation of large parts of the

Figure 1.3 A deserted village: Hamilton in Leicestershire. Parts of Hamilton were excavated by W. G. Hoskins and his students in 1948. *Copyright reserved Cambridge University Collection of Air Photographs*

landscape. Landlords and wealthier peasants enclosed fields, switched from arable to pasture, and built up wealth in the countryside. They were assisted in this process by the techniques of the survey and in particular the local map. The surveyor was seen in popular discourse as the landlord's friend and the enemy of the peasant farmer; popular sentiment correctly identified the drawing up of an apparently objective survey as the first step towards enclosure and dispossession. Norden's famous treatise on surveying consists of a dialogue between a surveyor and a farmer, in which the former tries to persuade the latter of the validity of his pursuit and elaborates on how the survey is done (Richeson 1966:93).

In the early modern period, early scholarly understandings were bound up with the politics of rights and access. Opponents of enclosure

Figure 1.4 Enclosure "by agreement," later fields running along the lines of earlier ridge-and-furrow at Brassington, Derbyshire, showing how medieval land divisions can be preserved in the process of small-scale enclosure. *Copyright reserved Cambridge University Collection of Air Photographs*

and defenders of common land, standing in local courtrooms attempting to defend their rights, routinely cited "custom since time out of mind," or in other words a particular conception of traditional usage of the land justified with reference to the past. Drawing on traditions going back to the Middle Ages, ordinary people engaged in resistance to enclosure through modifications to the landscape – specifically, throwing over and destroying, often in a small-scale and symbolic way, the hedges and ditches of enclosed land (Thompson 1991). The Levellers, the radical and proto-socialist group thrown up by the upheavals of the English Revolution, took their name not from an egalitarian desire

as such, but rather from the action of levelling these ditches and fences (Hill 1993:133). Similar views were attributed to other rebellious groups: "Shall they, as have brought hedges about common pastures, enclose with their intolerable lusts also all the commodities and pleasures of this life, which Nature, the parent of us all, would have common? . . . Now that it comes to extremity, we will also prove extremity: rend down hedges, fill up ditches, make way for every man into the common pasture" (cited in Patterson 1989:42–3). By the 17th century if not before, the landscape had become an established metaphor for the state of the political realm. Denham's poem "Coopers Hill" referenced the landscape against protagonists in the English Revolution: the narrator of the poem, standing on Coopers Hill, lifts his gaze upwards to the prospect of the noble seats of royalist families and lowers it again to the sites of parliamentarian iniquity: "the mist of aerial perspective corresponds to the malignant fog of Puritan business, and the romantic horror of the ruin-piece to political thuggery" (Turner 1979:55).

At the same time, the everyday actions of surveyors and map-makers were closely tied in both to an emerging sensibility to landscape and to the antiquities contained therein and to the politics of the state. The great 16th-century topographers Leland and Camden wrote their descriptions of England in a context dominated by the rise of the Tudor state; the increased frequency of the production of national and regional maps (Helgerson 1992:105–46). Norden published *The Surveiors Dialogue* in 1618, in which the surveyor explicates the methods of surveying in justification to a farmer whose view is that the former is a stooge of the landlord whose aim in drawing up a survey is simply to find an excuse to extract more rent (Richeson 1966:93; Johnson 1996:70–96). Norden's anxieties were a symptom of a deeper sense in which topography presented itself as neutral, but was actually ideological:

> Topography claims to be a "science", that is, a discourse of technical, objective, rational Enlightenment knowledge. Such knowledge is often claimed to be universal in its scope and free of cultural or political interests. But topography (like cartography) also is a "practice", knowledge put to use, knowledge in the service of power that is deeply intertwined in the cultural, social and political webs of a society. Such knowledge is intended to describe the way in which a social formation is made visible on the face of the earth. It is a practice which describes boundaries, including property relations, and thereby objectifies them, rationalises them and makes them seem like objects of nature through the legitimising tropes of the discourse of science . . . Topography is also therefore a science of domination – confirming boundaries, securing

> norms and treating questionable social conventions as unquestioned social facts. (Duncan and Ley 1993:1)

If topography was complicit with a nascent science of domination and dispossession, much of 17th- and 18th-century English literature was a culture of protest against that process. Many of the classic evocations of landscape in the history of English literature were written in the context of direct opposition to landscape change. The Anglo-Irish writer Oliver Goldsmith's classic poem "The Deserted Village," written in 1770, is a moral condemnation of enclosing landlords and the social and economic forces behind them.

Landscapes of Colonialism

As Europe reorganized itself internally, so it redefined its physical, moral, and political landscapes with reference to the lands and peoples outside its boundaries. European explorers and colonists had to accommodate to the shock of the "discovery" of new continents, upsetting the medieval symmetry of the world discussed above. They then had to come to terms with what they saw on those continents. For many, most famously the Puritan settlers of New England, this accommodation was a struggle for mastery. Just as the Puritan was engaged in constant struggle to discipline his own wills and desires, and just as the Puritan head of household struggled to discipline his family and servants, so Puritans perceived themselves as engaged in a struggle to master a wild, untamed landscape, a savage howling wilderness (Johnson 1993a:170–6). The conceptual challenge these landscapes presented, in the view of many historians, set off a ferment of theorizing among the intellectual circles of early modern Europe (Greenblatt 1991).

Of course, the "wilderness" encountered by European settlers was not a real one in any sense, but a constructed idea. From Ireland to Virginia to New England, the land had been settled and occupied by human societies for millennia. But the indigenous inhabitants appeared to the narrow-eyed English settlers to have failed in the God-given duty to cultivate the landscape. Cultivation in this view meant not simply use of the land, but arable agriculture, with fields bounded and divided by hedges and fences. These indigenous people had no bounded landscapes, no fences, no idea of property, no cultivation; a failing indissolubly linked with their lack of true religion (the Irish, being Catholic, were barely better, in the Protestant view, than the pagan

Americans). Their lack of imprint on the landscape, in the view of English Protestants, was testament to their savagery and ample moral justification for their dispossession (Vaughan 1979).

The Birth of Landscape Archaeology

I have dwelt on the social and cultural changes of the Renaissance, and their implications for the study of landscape, at some length because the intellectual frame of this period helps us understand a series of practices and disciplinary techniques that were central to the development of the modern academic and popular understanding of landscape, and of modern archaeology.

Perhaps the most central element to all these practices was the map. We have seen how the production of local and national maps by surveyors was tied in with the history of enclosure, and must be seen in the context of developing ideas of the nation-state. Most early maps were bounded with ideological representations that referred back to a past of ancestry and genealogy – coats of arms, dedications to the wealthy and landed families of the areas portrayed. Bound up with the production of maps, then, was the emerging discipline of topography. The task of the "topographer," usually a gentleman or a man of socially middling origins, was to translate the natural and humanly made landscape of a locality into words. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines topography as "the science or practice of describing a particular place" (1603); its definition occurs around the same time as the term "mapping" (1586). The closely related practice of "chorography," defined as "the art of describing, or of delineating on a map, particular regions or districts," is also later 16th-century in date. The role of the early topographers and chorographers in studies of the landscape and the elements in it, and the way these studies fed into the development of what would later be termed archaeology, is well known (Daniel and Renfrew 1988; Trigger 1989:47–52). Arguably the first of these, John Leland, gained a commission from the great Tudor centralizer, Henry VIII; it is no coincidence that Henry and his ministers also went on to oversee and implement an explosion of bureaucratic record and control in the service of the creation of an early modern nation-state. Leland travelled the length and breadth of the country, writing down what he saw.

The development of the language and habits of thought of topography and chorography shows an intimate connection with the class

struggles of the early modern period. By the 17th century, the "descriptions" written by topographers were privileging "vision," or the direct evidence of one's own eyes, above what they saw as "hearsay" or the traditions upheld by local, rural communities. These latter traditions of "hearsay," relying on ideas of customary practice "since time out of mind," may have incurred the disfavour of learned antiquarians, but they were the cornerstone of the assertion of rights by such local communities against the forces of enclosure discussed earlier. By the 18th century, the roles and definitions of the topographer and chorographer had coalesced into that of the antiquarian; again, this evolution has been well charted by historians of archaeology. The famous figure of William Stukeley, recorder of Stonehenge and Avebury, stands not just at the origins of modern archaeology, but at the end of a long line of topographical tradition going back to the Renaissance.

However, I am going to argue that the later 18th century also saw a break, and the establishment of a new horizon of ideas about the landscape. This set of ideas is associated with a new intellectual movement, that of Romanticism. In the next chapter I will begin to look at the values, strengths, and discontents of Romanticism, and begin to sketch out the argument that English Romanticism forms the backdrop to a large part of archaeological thinking about landscape today.