LANDSCAPE IN THEORY. THE UNEXPECTED VIRTUE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL APPROACH

El paisaje en la teoría. La inesperada virtud del enfoque arqueológico

EDOARDO VANNI *

> "The past is a foreign country; they do things differently out there"
> *The Go-Between* (1953)
> L. P. Hartley

ABSTRACT This contribution offers a perspective on the intimate link that is established between theory, practice and results in the field of contemporary Landscape Archeology. With particular reference to the Anglo-Saxon and Mediterranean academic tradition, the discourse aims to investigate the specific way in which the adoption of broad categories and methodological procedures is key to reading the real and ideal Landscape. This analysis highlights how the many different interpretations of the Landscape represent the reflection of the type of questions pertaining to the context of a specific cultural background. I will pay particular attention to the phenomenological approach that seems to cannibalize the debate. Ultimately, I argues for a vision of landscape as a place of asymmetrical relations between human and non-human that cannot be done justice from too strong a phenomenological or materialistic perspective. Even the neo-materialistic collapse of subject and object must be tempered by this idea of 'asymmetry,' in which a landscape beyond the human must be accounted for. It is in this framework that I must consider time and space not only as contextual coordinates but as articulations of one another, with time structuring to one and space giving form to the other. All of this is done 'in/with/from the landscape'; the landscape is neither solely setting nor actor but can be thought of both as a language, a field in which all resides and of which all is composed, and the sign, the contextual manifestations of this field constantly invoking and at play with the whole, a whole that can never be disassociated from its concretization. A new heuristic tool for investigating landscapes will also be proposed.

Keywords: Landscape, Theory, Contemporary Debate, Archeology, Landplace.

RESUMEN   En esta contribución se ofrece una perspectiva sobre el vínculo íntimo que se establece
entre la teoría, la práctica y los resultados en el campo de la Arqueología del Pai-
saje contemporánea. Con particular referencia al mundo anglosajón y mediterráneo,
se analiza la manera específica en que la adopción de amplias categorías de proce-
dimientos resulta clave para la lectura y después para el juicio. También se incluye
una breve descripción de las premisas teóricas que, de manera más o menos explícita,
guían y condicionan la investigación actual. En este análisis se pone de relieve cómo
las muchas y diferentes interpretaciones del Paisaje representan el reflejo del tipo de
preguntas pertenecientes al contexto de una investigación específica. Prestaremos
especial atención al enfoque fenomenológico que parece canibalizar el debate. También
se propondrá una nueva herramienta heurística para investigar paisajes.

Palabras clave: Paisaje, Teoría, Debate contemporáneo, Arqueología, Lugar de resi-
dencia.

INTRODUCTION (ONLY FOR ARCHAEOLOGISTS)

After decades of alternative challenges and debates between processual and
post-processual archaeology, now it is clear that it is not a matter of what we want
to study and how, but it is matter of place—in other words, from from which angle
we decide to address an object. The crucial challenge is not to "reconcile Reason
and Romans" (Sherratt, 1996:148-149) or to decide between relative and absolute
knowledge (Kristiansen, 2008; 2017:2-3), rather, it depends from where we look
what but what is placed where depends on from where we look. We have to say
farewell to epistemology, and thus, the separation between science and humanities
is ended (Sparti, 1995) as well as the pretentious notion that we are able to build
a discipline rooted in controlled paradigms.

Place-as-category is everywhere (Ingold, 2009). It is physical as well as ideal,
metaphoric or time situated. In this respect, the landscape is not just a field of
studies or an historical object of enquiry, but represents an hermeneutic and heurist
tool from where and through which reality might be addressed. *Place* is a keyword
among the more recent trends in landscape archaeology. It represents a *centre of
meaning constructed by human experience*, a feature of the landscape that has taken
on its *existence* according to a specific culture. Every place is tied to a particular
human (individual or group) involvement and gains a significance that, even if
ascribed to a specific configuration of natural or geographic features, "is never
self-evident but rather culturally determined" (Knapp and Ashmore, 1999:2). Places
(and those paths that link them) are interpreted as articulating the experience of
the landscape and its relative *existence*.

In the following paragraphs, I will not write about Landscape Archaeology or
talk about the Archaeology of Landscapes. The problem at present for Landscape
Archaeologists is not to identify standardized approaches and methodologies—which
have been applied by archaeologists due to their specific national backgrounds
and to the peculiar environmental settings that they have had to face, trying to
overcome that lack of methodological agreement and prospecting *one* "technical
manual identifying [the] best practice" (Barker and Mattingly, 1999:iv; Launaro,

2004:32)—but to fit ourselves in the place of a theoretical movement. Which themes from the considerations about Landscape studies within different field of studies might enrich Archaeology as a whole? Further, reversing the perspective, how might Archaeology contribute to a more comprehensive Landscape perception? In the end, do Landscape Archaeologies exist? To answer these questions, we will start from recent trends on landscape studies, especially analyzing the phenomenological approach that seems to have generated a new vogue in archaeological theory, claiming a return to a new materialism. While remaining aware of the fact that different academic traditions contribute to the study of landscape in different ways, I will try to redeploy (or overcome) these (apparently) irreconcilable theoretical approaches.

PHENOMENOLOGIES OF LANDSCAPE: A PROLOGUE

During his last course held in 1984 at the Collège de France of Paris, Michel Foucault addressed the topic of the greek parresia, the rhetorical and ethical act of saying the truth. At the end of the course, he used to affirm that phenomenology was the philosophy which had won (Foucault, 1984), a fact that, at that time, was not taken for granted. Some were convinced that Foucault was the last phenomenologist and, consequently, that phenomenology disappeared and passed with him (Dreyfus and Rabinów, 1984; see Kristensen, 2009 for critics). I am persuaded that the French philosopher in reality was challenging the double nature of modern thought and, in particular, the empirical-transcendental duplicity, or we might better say, the paradox of human subjectivity described as the condition to be a subject for the world and, at the same time, an object in the world (Carr, 1999; Sass and Ploux, 2009). The crisis of Reason and, in general, the crisis of the European sciences led us to realize the impossibility of explaining the totality of reality through strong paradigms and the creation of Great Narratives. The question was methodological as well as epistemological. Some have elaborated on the notion of Weak Thought, which was suitable for micro-analysis of limited and particular contexts (Gargani, 1979; Vattimo and Rovatti, 2013), but it was not just a matter of scale or sample; rather, it was a matter of conceiving and creating a discourse on the materiality of reality that was affected by the subject embedded in that materiality. Who was the guarantor of a true discourse about the world? The transcendental subject, a subject outside the world, was no longer tenable as position (Husserl, 1970). The only subject who had the duty to maintain a coherent perspective about the real was the subject in the world. It was the ethical behavior to say the Truth that Foucault called the courage of saying the Truth (parresia). This is the condition of modernity still embedded within and backdropping phenomenological notions and approaches.

Phenomenology seems to have won as philosophy nowadays, a fact which Michel Foucault was already convinced of in the early eighties. The phenomenology of Landscape in archaeology as well as in anthropology has been championed by several scholars on both sides of the Atlantic and in Northern Europe in general

(Bender, 1993, 1998; Cosgrove, 1984, 1985; Cosgrove and Daniels, 1988; David and Thomas, 2008:38-39; Ingold, 1992; Tilley, 1994, 2004, 2008, 2009), while in Mediterranean archaeology, the debate has been taken well beyond issues of methodology (Bintliff and Sbonias, 1999; Francovich and Patterson, 2000; Gillings *et al*., 1999; Leveau *et al*., 1999; Pasquinucci and Trément, 2000). The phenomenological discourse considers the landscape as not just a mere reified container for human action to take place in but that it itself was a physical as well as symbolic human creation. Overtaking the traditional dichotomy between culture and nature (Walsh, 2008:549-550), "landscape has more to do with human subjective (*concrete*) experience of it than with its own objective (*abstract*) reality" (Launaro, 2004:32). From this point of view, culture and nature are taken to be the same, bound together in the human experience of landscape. People do not take action and decision-making processes by means of an objective appreciation of nature, but rather, they interact through the representation of a particular Landscape, emerging as cultural product, with all its biases, beliefs and ideological contents (Descolá, 2013; Tuan. 1974). This human experience was certainly and primarily that of the societies and the individuals who inhabited those landscapes in ancient times, but it has to do, above all, with the present.

Following the belief that a discourse about the past ignoring the present conditions does not exist, the past itself is literally created by the present which overflows into the future as well as into the past, producing the phenomenon of the Future Past, characterized by the end of history and a constant presentism (Koselleck, 2004). In some post-modern views, this approach leads to a denial of concrete reality (what really Caesar did), not to mention the possibility to say the truth about an historical event or process in sustaining that nothing has an existence before (in terms of temporal logic) or outside (in terms of internal/external dynamic) a discourse on it, as J. Derrida said *il'y a pas de hors text*, there is nothing outside the text (Derrida, 1988:144). This is not the case of Phenomenology applied to landscape studies: There is a physical environment which societies have to face (Meier, 2012). Nonetheless, if the past landscape has to do more with the subjective experience and with the perception that human beings had of the places in which they dwelled and has become the primal link between people and their places, building up *their own* environment in a concrete and contingent dimension (Ingold, 2000), then the only way to perceive it in the right way is from the present. If a discourse is possible after and inside a real reality, the subject becomes, in terms of logic, the absolute origin of its own discourse. The only living subject who is capable of seeing what ancient people saw is the present human being; the body of the researcher is the medium between present and past experience. This connection is partly due to anthropological and biological invariants inherent in human being as such but exists especially because the present experience is the only experience that we can reach. As in astrophysics, where space is folded to join two specific points in the timeline, utilizing this medium is exactly the application of the *genealogical* method (Sherratt, 1996). It has been noticed that such an approach is particularly suitable for prehistoric studies, although this would be

less difficult for historical periods due to the available coeval intentional sources which could offer to archaeologists genuine perspectives from original subjects (Altenberg, 2003; Launaro, 2004). While this is partly true, written and epigraphic sources remove neither our present perspectives or presumptions to know their meanings nor the temptation to use modern categories to fill the subjective gap with the past (Cosgrove, 2012). Sometimes knowing past intentional sources just reveals how distant we are from our alleged ancestors.

THE ONTOLOGICAL TURN

Even though the observations concerning the essence of landscape are extremely significant within the theory of these studies, it is equally true that the methodology concerning the landscape's essence is still far from an acknowledged application in field research. These approaches rely on subjective experience, and consequently they are highly exposed to the risk of producing only an account of the feelings of a modern archaeologist seeing and experiencing a modern (not past) symbolic and real landscape. The archaeologists have taken into account that Landscape has changed throughout the centuries, a product of the interaction of several factors, ancient and modern, stratified in its *body*, who will appear as the final result of all these transformations (Bintliff, 2019). Furthermore, experiencing the landscape from different perspectives could produce completely different pictures, missing an objective reference to evaluate them. Indeed, if it exists the heuristic and programmatic task for an historian or an archaeologist to grasp an objective picture (real, true) of a past subjective experience, the main obstacle seems to be the fact that the only way by which we can recover past meanings and feelings is through a subjectivity which in turn cannot transcend categories derived from *their* cultural contexts.

Phenomenology, indicated in Tilley's words (1994:12) as "an understanding and description of things as they are perceived by a subject," is an approach, specifically derived from the thoughts of the German philosophers Husserl and Heidegger, which should investigate the subjective human dimension involved in every landscape. More succinctly put, especially for Heidegger, there is not a material culture, an object, a non-false landscape —let us say, 'a world'— disconnected from the subject that experienced them. A jar does not exist without the person holding it, the person does not exist without the jar, without the objectification of itself, and finally, the two interrelated and ontic entities do not exist without the essence of an action in which they are mutually involved. In other words, the subject does not pre-exist experience, as for Descartes, but must be constituted historically through the action. In Heidegger's own words, this is the *Dasein* or *Being-in* (I have intentionally modified the most used English translation, Being-in-*the-world*, for the German word *Dasein*, because it is closer, in my view, to the original meaning). This sensual involvement is not concerned solely with the feelings of those people that created the landscape in the past but also with people studying the landscape from the present, contrasting with a detached-scientific analysis (Olwig, 2013).

Some archaeologists have recently criticized this theoretical framework from a 'processual' point of view (Fleming, 2006; 2012; Preucel, 2016), also arguing that the archeo-phenomenologists were applying a wrong phenomenology, Husserlian more than Heideggerrian and, consequently, with an a-historical and transcendental attitude (Barret and Ko, 2009:285). However, they recognized that 'postmodernists have sought to replace traditional approaches by new methodologies, such as phenomenology, and new 'ways of telling'—transforming landscape archaeology into an area in which theorists wanted to engage with archaeological data' (Fleming, 2012:463). Barret and Ko (2009:279-280) have synthetized some aspects of the phenomenological approach with landscape archaeology without demonizing but, rather, reinforcing it: the phenomenological position is made by awareness that historical narratives are a cultural product of the present; the archaeological record cannot be understood without the human presence; the body (agency/agent dynamic) is the medium through which the archaeologist can grasp the meaning of the archaeological record. The *habitus* of Bourdieu (1980:3-14), the *agent* for Giddens (1984:284-304), is also the only medium that we have to interact with and modify the world. The subjective past-present experience could explain also the recent immense success of the agent-based approach in archaeological studies also in terms of material cultural agency (Olsen, 2003, 2007, 2010; Robb, 2010; Van Oyen, 2016; Walsh, 2008:551-553).

The essence of the phenomenology of Heidegger was the discovery of historicity as the foundation of every philosophy instead of the transcendental. This view had important consequences in the history of philosophy. With Heidegger ended the millennial discussion on metaphysics started with Greek philosophy about the ultimate foundation of Being. This ultimate foundation is the diverse and emergent products of history itself; thus, ontological discourse decays, and what is left is a world of ontic entities historically formed. After Heidegger, some philosophers did not abandon the enquiry into *Being*, but they grappled with its historicity, including, for instance, Karl Jaspers, who coined the term *periechontology*, or the way to go around and beyond the essence of *Being* without never knowing it as an object (Jaspers, 1947).

The interest on phenomenology in landscape studies and in archaeology is still vibrant nowadays; it is not just an attitude associable to the post-processual movement, but it represents a veritable ontological turn (Hamilakis, 2012:42; Kristiansen, 2017:2). This turn is claimed to be the birth of a New Materialism in the discipline (Alberti *et al.*, 2013; Hicks, 2012; Witmore, 2014), called elsewhere already *Symmetrical Archaeology* (Shanks, 2007; Witmore, 2007, 2020), but is clearly rooted and derived directly from the use of phenomenology of Heidegger in archaeological theory (see reactions in Hodder, 2014; Ingold, 2014; Lazzari, 2014; Hodder and Lucas, 2017). The problems that exist between modern and postmodern are well-known; nonetheless, some have declared for different reasons that we are now at the end of the post-modern era and that it is a fecund moment (or that there is simply a need) to structure narratives using new consolidated paradigms (Braidotti, 2005; Luperini, 2005; Martin, 2013; Nealon, 2012). After relativism,

after the weakness of thought, this 'back to things,' this need of an epistemological shift for the production of solid paradigms to handle reality, has become widespread in every discipline as a manifesto for a new realism (Ferraris, 2013). Effectively, however, it is not simply a matter of going backwards and forwards between attitudes of Rationalism and Romanticism, between processual/rational or object-oriented archaeology and post-processual/interpretative or subject-oriented archaeology. The filiation of phenomenology with this New Materialism is genetically connected, with the latter in some instances carried forward by the former, largely used in interpretative archaeology, although, in both phenomenology itself and symmetrical 'material' archaeology, the premises of historical materialism are notably absent and rendered contradictorily transcendent and a-historical.

THINGS AND NON-*THINGS* IN LANDSCAPE

Things and humans are mutually and equally entangled in reality. They influence each other in a sort of co-evolution process. Prehistorians such as E. Boeda and Leroi-Ghouran (not necessarily post-processual or phenomenologists) have demonstrated how, in the case of lithic production and techniques, the transformations of the object are, in a certain way, deeply influenced by the object in itself and by its capacity to be thinking—like as an intrinsic and personal force that pushes the object towards an independent evolution apart from the human beings who shape and transform it. Reciprocally constructed, things and actors are, in this sense, phenomenologically connected. Humans can be biologically and culturally transformed by objects in turn. Kapytoff and Appadurai have shown that things have a life and, consequentially, a totally independent biography. Epistemologically speaking, the interplay between humans as actors and things (inert or biological, landscape or artifacts) is more complicated and complex with respect to the idea of a simple appropriation of nature for the reproduction of society. Nothing is totally deterministic as in the terms of historic materialism, but the contrary is also true, that nothing is thus totally cultural. This is the good heritage of phenomenology; however, reducing the subject to an ontological non-human does not mean a return to things but an exclusion of one important factor in a relational connection. Once *Being* is eliminated through its historicity, there is a risk of founding historical enquiry exclusively on the present *Human-Being*. As Ingold pointed out: "It seems that in order to level the ontological playing field, […] irreductionsits, symmetricians all, have contrived to reduce agency to the common denominator of bare existence, to which they habitually assign the qualifier "non-human," thus neutralizing the potential of animate life to bring forms into being. Living, sentient creatures, both human and non-human, figure in this account as but warmed-up assemblages, their capacities for action and perception stripped down to the physical presence and tangibility of lifeless objects" (Ingold, 2014:235). What I seek to show is the genealogical-stratigraphical (in a Foucauldian sense, Foucault, 1972) relation between phenomenology and archaeology as being the core of the theoretical debate

in the (post) post-processual and imminently changing archaeology. This core is epistemologically, physically, narratively and metaphorically placed (*dwelled*) in the Landscape, the subject/object of the debate.

FROM LANDSCAPES TO *PLACESCAPES*: ARCHAEOLOGY ON THE STAGE

'Landscape' is usually regarded as a key element and a fundamental means towards the comprehension of past cultures, but it is also our Landscape in the present as the coherent anthropology of place (Anschuetz *et al.*, 2001:160) or in other words, Landscape is usually regarded as a key element and a fundamental means towards the comprehension of past cultures, but it is also inextricable from our Landscape in the present, forging a coherent anthropology of place. Once theorized as a passive backdrop or forcible determinant of culture, it is now seen as "an active and far more complex entity in relation to human lives" (Knapp and Ashmore, 1999:2), encompassing the conceptualization of landscape simply as analytical unit or geographical space. Human involvement is what distinguishes landscape from environment (Ashmore, 2004:255). Landscape is multi-layered, and it has this peculiar quality of fluidity and permeability together with the persistence of places; in such a Landscape the simultaneity is material as well as temporal. Reflecting on Landscape, archaeologically and anthropologically, has led us to question our concepts of time and past (Ingold, 1993; Van Oyen, 2016). Within the Landscape, past and present interact continuously and permanently in negotiated processes with their materials and symbols, mutually transforming themselves; thus, because time cannot be traced linearly in the landscape and multiple moments are continuously in dialogue, our period-oriented studies must be let go. Instead, times are materialized in particular places (Gardner and Wallace, 2020:13). Through the medium of landscape and the manipulation of temporality, archaeologists can explore new dimensions and spaces of enquiry. For instance T. Ingold called those places with a high gradient of temporality *taskscapes*. Past-oriented narratives must be integrated into new present and future focused narratives. The historic dimension of the past and present landscape is understandable only through the medium of contemporary landscape (Fairclough, 2012:479). This simultaneity must be taken into account together with the need to handle and face a multi-related and layered (Bergsonian, we could say) temporality (Hicks, 2016). This perspective has not only put into question our perception of the past, deeply embedded in the present, but has opened up new dimensions of time in developing the capacity to think about the past in the past, the past in the present and the future in the past as also a way of praxis for anticipating the needs for both continuity and change in present and ancient societies.

The impact of the concept of time has generated the awareness that meaning in landscape is always temporal and has produced a renewal in studies into the archaeologies of Landscape. This concern for new-temporal perspectives about landscape, developed especially in Northern Europe, combines archaeological research with

historical and historio-geographical research in order to extend the biography of a landscape into modern times (Roymans, 1995; Roymans *et al.*, 2009:349). The term 'biography' was developed by the geographer Marwyn Samuels (1979) in reaction to the approaches of New Geography which tended to see the landscape as a passive by-product of anonymous economic and social developments in a morphogenetic sense and refers to the fact that landscapes cannot be conceptualised without taking into account the individuals and groups that have shaped them over time (Sütünç, 2017:39).

Focused on the ideologies and cultural representations of space and place, Samuels' vision of landscape was essentially phenomenological. In anthropological studies of material culture, biography was used as metaphor to describe the life paths of goods, including land (Appadurai, 1986; Kopytoff, 1986), which are exchanged frequently within society and thereby go through modifications and shifts in their social meanings and economic functions.

The use of the biography tool-box in archaeological research has grown in a more comprehensive and complex paradigm that stresses the long-term dimension (*longue durée*) of transformations in landscapes, viewing landscape at each point in time as the interim outcome of a longstanding and complex interplay between the history of mentalities and values, institutional and governmental changes, social and economic developments and ecological dynamics (Roymans *et al.*, 2009). The multi-layered nature of landscapes and its physical and ideal simultaneity does not make a sharp break between past and present, present-day heritage practices and related landscape discourses and researches. In the modern period, too, dealing with the past within the landscape is an integral part of the spatial condition of societies and hence of spatial transformations (Kolen, 1995). This implies that heritage, understood in its monumental (Archaeology) as well as in its ecological (Historical Ecology) sense, is always the dynamic work of people, with processes of cultural transmission and the construction of values and identities being inextricably bound up with one another (Crumley, 2017). The present Landscape is the product of processes of remembering and forgetting, dynamic choices of preservation or destruction in which all the society is involved. Archaeologists and historians have been able to make reconstructions, and societies have always been fascinated by things in their environment which they knew, or intuitively sensed, had survived many generations (Bradley, 2002; Roymans *et al.*, 2009:339). In other words, we live and modify the present landscape starting from and together with the historical heritage that physically bounds us, and we are able to imagine at the same time the future landscape as a palimpsest of different stratified temporality and materiality.

The feature of simultaneity in Landscape does not concern temporality exclusively but spatial entities as well. A new view on the concept of space has come to light due to Landscapes studies. A space is a geographical or physical entity inert and reified, but once it is addressed, used and shaped by humans, it is performed in a historical process that transforms spaces into significant places. Each place is connected by movement along the pathways which connect them, not just roads or river systems but also cultural connections used to create network maps within

webs of human movement (Bintliff, 2012:3; Ingold, 2009:29). Archaeologically speaking, this original concern about places has been pragmatically translated into a new wave of studies, this time especially in the historical-anthropological Mediterranean tradition, attempting to fill the 'emptyscapes' in the Landscape, reconciling the archaeological *continuum* and restoring the social and material network of places (Campana, 2019). As argued before, human behaviour is 'placed'—but not spatially confined— and characterized by movement producing a network of knowledge, memory and transformation. The idea that the archaeological record is spatially continuous (Foley, 1981) has forced the discipline to move from what we might call 'site-based' archaeology to a more comprehensive and holistic concept of archaeological record. Gaps in the time-place data have effective consequences on discourses and interpretations of past and present Landscape. As recalled by S. Campana, "while the concept of continuity continues to play a progressively key role within the development of stratigraphic archaeology, mainly within the practice of archaeological excavation, the concept never established itself to quite the same extent within archaeological investigations and interpretations at the landscape scale" (Campana, 2019:32). The concept of *black hole* became popular in contemporary and historical American archaeology but was confined to the discourse on the building of the discipline. The concern was focused particularly on the legislation of heritage. In the *Archeological Resources Protection Act* of 1979 in the United States, for example, it was declared that "no item shall be treated as an archaeological resource [...] unless such item is at least 100 years of age". The gulf between archaeology and contemporary societies was about to be obliterated: "[U]nlike archaeologists who study the Classical Maya or Etruscan Italy, both of which retain relatively stable places in time, the time coordinates of study for the archaeologist of contemporary society are constantly changing. In fact, no matter how quickly such archaeologists turn data observations into analyses and interpretations, the society they have just characterized will already have morphed into something else" (Rathje *et al.*, 2002:519). The perspective here was still dualist between a static-past landscape confronting a dynamic-present. The global and holistic approach to time and place is not aimed at a total recovery "but rather at a fair representativeness, or a reasonable representation, of landscapes created or influenced by the impact of past human activity (economic, social and political), as well by natural environmental transformations over time" (Campana, 2019:32). The 'archaeological continuum' is the active behavior once we have faced the negative 'emptiness' in Landscape— a trend behavior towards continuity that implies a trend towards the real history and archaeology of Landscape.

In archaeological maps and landscape studies, woodlands as well as mountains, pastureland or wetlands appear to be more or less 'empty' or, at least, to provide evidence of human activity that is severely limited in scale and/or intensity (Campana, 2019:19). These places are all but marginal and belong to Landscape (Vanni and Cristoferi, 2018:208-213). The holistic urgency is not confined solely to temporality but is invested in the physical and cultural network between meaningful places. If a concern for a *longue durée* (the long-run perspective) exists, I must say

that a spatial counterpart is equally necessary, one that invests the Landscape as a whole and which we could call a placing continuum perspective. In this respect, Archaeology is a particularly well-suited discipline to fill the spatial gaps with material (big) data through the integration of different techniques (GIS, Lidar, remote sensing, surveys, excavations, archaeobotany and palynology, Hu, 2012). The use of digital techniques to visualize historical and present Landscapes, 3D modelling and augmented reality, have created a new medium, a third kind of Landscape (Gillings, 2012; Hacıgüzeller, 2012; Llobera, 2012; Lock and Pouncett, 2017; Rennell, 2012; Richards-Rissetto, 2017; Vanni, 2017). After the material and the perceived Landscape, we have to face the visualized Landscape. In this case the perception of the subject is not mediated by the subject through the real, but through a new digital entity, a virtual, but at the same real, Landscape in which time and space are converging. Maybe it is time to shift from Landscape to *Landplace* studies.

CONCLUSIONS: THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN MATERIAL AND IMAGERY OF *LANDPLACES*

Places in Landscape are real but also metaphorical at the same time. *Landplace* is the product of multiple histories constructed by present communities within a geographical and symbolic area. The tactics and strategies that they use to interact with and survive in their environments belong to the decision-making processes; it is a matter of intentional preservation of the network of places within the Landscape. We live in the landscape that we inhabit, and we act constantly through this medium in time and space. Our concerns about the vanishing traditional cultural landscape have consequences on our consideration about the heritage, planning and controlling of these changes (Antrop, 2005:22; Turner, 2006). This means a loss of history but, at the same time, the awareness that this loss is unavoidable due to the fact that we intentionally modified the historical Landscape physically and symbolically to reproduce and transform our society. Once we realized this, we had to acknowledge that our heritage is not only material but intangible, nor is it passive to just preserve or restore but an active component in the making of the present and in the preservation of the past (Breglia, 2006; Gillman, 2006; Harrison, 2013; Smith, 2006). For instance, recently, transhumance has been declared as UNESCO cultural heritage. This practice is not totally material nor intangible, but it is an economic, social and cultural practice run within and through the Landscape from one place to another along a network of places. It is an historical process but, at the same time, a present and concrete practice still vibrant in some places of the globe. The fact that transhumance has been awarded the rank of a protected heritage lays the foundation for its survival in the future. On the one hand, this practice is preserved in its historical consistency, and as a monument it is considered worthy to be studied; on the other hand, it it helps to factually preserve the historical landscape produced by its millenary existence, and at the same time, it generates new networks and new places in the present Landscape. This perspective

is rooted in the Faro Convention and in the prescription of the European Landscape Convection (Fairclough and Rippon, 2002:27-36; Antrop, 2005:29-30; Butler and Berglund, 2014; Dalglish and Leslie, 2016) for which the heritage is not solely the objects and the materials that surround us but the human beings with their actions continuously reenacting their history in the present. Paradoxically, the only way to preserve our historical Landscape made by objects, nature and humans and to manage future Landscapes is to live it, transforming and changing it. In a sentence we can summarize such a practice as a way for *transforming while preserving* or *preserving for transforming*.

At this point, we can argue that, in practice, Landplace studies could be seen as an emerging super-discipline (Fairclough, 2012:473) while Archaeology could be seen as being not only a discipline, but as the holistic method to gain cross-temporal access to significant places through multi-modal techniques of inquiry, addressing material, ecology, and human relations to these hyper-places. Archaeology must be seen as a relational method which puts *things* (human and non-human or objects and non-objects) in connection through time and place. Through Landplace studies, we could bridge theoretical perspectives by going beyond false rhetoric and divide and incorporate the dynamic of historical and present society, while Archaeology itself truly might be "the pattern which connects" (Bateson, 1978).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALBERTI, B., JONES, A. M. and POLLARD, J. (2013): *Archaeology After Interpretation Returning Materials to Archaeological Theory*, Taylor and Francis.

ALTENBERG, K. (2003): *Experiencing landscapes: a study of space and identity in three marginal areas of medieval Britain and Scandinavia*, Almqvist & Wiksell, Stockholm.

ANSCHUETZ, K. F., WILSHUSEN, R. H. and SCHEICK, C. L. (2001): "An Archaeology of Landscapes: Perspectives and Directions", *Journal of Archaeological Research 9:2,* pp. 157-211.

APPADURAI, A. (1986): *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

ASHMORE, W. (2004): "Social Archaeologies of Landscape", *A Companion to Social Archaeology* (L. Meskell and R. W. Preucel, eds.), pp. 255-271.

BARKER, G. and MATTINGLY, D. J. (1999): "General Editors' Introduction: the POPULUS Project", *Reconstructing Past Population Trends in Mediterranean Europe* (J. Bintliff

and K. Sbonias, eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. iii-ix.

BARRETT, J. C. and KO, I. (2009): *"A phenomenology of landscape: A crisis in British landscape archaeology?", Journal of Social Archaeology* 9:3, pp. 275-294.

BATESON, G. (1978): "The pattern which connects", *The Co-Evolution Quarterly Summer*, pp. 4-15.

BENDER, B. (1998): *Stonehenge: Making Space*, Berg, New York.

BENDER, B. (ed.) (1993): *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, Berg, Oxford.

BINTLIFF, J. (2012): "The Immense Respiration of a Social Structure: An Integrated Approach to the Landscape Archaeology of the Mediterranean Lands", *Landscape Archaeology* (W. Bebermeier, R. Hebenstreit, E. Kaiser and J. Krause, eds.), *Proceedings of the International Conference Held in Berlin, 6th – 8th June 2012, 3*, pp. 1-9.

BINTLIFF, J. (2019): "Mapping Historical Landscapes in Transformation: An Overview", *Mapping Landscapes in Transformation. Multidis-*

ciplinary Methods for Historical Analysis (T. Coomans, B. Cattoor and K. De Jonge, eds.), Leuven University Press, Leuven, pp. 349-366.

BINTLIFF, J. and SBONIAS, K. (1999): *Reconstructing Past Population Trends in Mediterranean Europe*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

BOURDIEU, P. (1980), "Le mort saisit le vif. Les relations entre l'histoire réifiée et l'histoire incorporée", *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* 32, pp. 3-14.

BRADLEY, R. (2002): *The Past in Prehistoric Societies*, Routledge, London.

BRAIDOTTI, R. (2005): "A Critical Cartography of Feminist Post-postmodernism", *Australian Feminist Studies 20* 47, pp. 169-180.

BREGLIA, L. (2006): *Monumental Ambivalence: The Politics of Heritage*, University of Texas Press.

BUTLER, A. and BERGLUND, U. (2014): "Landscape character assessment as an approach to understanding public interests within the European landscape convention", *Landscape Research* 39, pp. 219-236.

CAMPANA, S. R.L. (2019): *Mapping the Archaeological Continuum. Filling 'Empty' Mediterranean Landscapes*, Springer, London.

CARR, D. (1999): *The Paradox of Subjectivity: The Self in the Transcendental Tradition*, Oxford University Press, New York.

COSGROVE, D. (2012): "Modernity, community and the landscape idea", *Journal of Material Culture* 1:2, pp. 49-66.

COSGROVE, D. E. (1984): *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape*, Croom Helm, London.

COSGROVE, D. E. (1985): "Prospect, perspective and the evolution of the landscape idea", *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 10, pp. 45-62.

COSGROVE, D. E. and DANIELS, S. (1988): *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

CRUMLEY, C. L. (2017): "Historical ecology and the study of landscape", *Landscape Research* 42.1, pp. 65-73.

DALGLISH, C. and LESLIE, A. (2016): "A question of what matters: landscape characterisation as a process of situated, problem-orientated public discourse", *Landscape Research* 41:2, pp. 212-226.

DAVID, B. and THOMAS, J. (2008): *Handbook of Landscape Archaeology*, Routledge, London.

DERRIDA, J. (1988): *Limited Inc.*, Northwestern University Press, Evanston.

DESCOLÁ, P. (2013): *Beyond Nature and Culture*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

DREYFUS, H. and RABINÓW, P. (1984): *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Chicago University Press, Chicago.

FAIRCLOUGH, G. (2012): "Look the other way – from a branch of archaeology to a root of landscape studies", *Landscape Archaeology between Art and Science. From a Multi- to an Interdisciplinary Approach* (S. J. Kluiving and E. B. Guttmann-Bond, eds.), Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 471-483.

FAIRCLOUGH, G. and RIPPON, S., eds. (2002): *Europe's Cultural Landscape: archaeologists and the management of change*, Archeolingua, Brussels.

FLEMING, A. (2006): "Post-processual Landscape Archaeology: a Critique", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 16:3, pp 267-280.

FLEMING, A. (2012): "The future of landscape archaeology", *Landscape Archaeology between Art and Science. From a Multi- to an Interdisciplinary Approach* (S.J. Kluiving and E. B. Guttmann-Bond, eds.), Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 461-470.

FOUCAULT, M. (1972): *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, Routledge, London.

FOUCAULT, M. (1984): *Le Courage de la vérité: Le gouvernement de soi et des autres*, Gallimard, Paris.

FRANCOVICH, R. and PATTERSON H. (2000): *Extracting meaning from ploughsoil assemblages*, Oxbow Books.

GARDNER, A. and WALLACE, L. (2020): "Making Space for Past Futures: Rural Landscape. Temporalities in Roman Britain", *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, pp. 1-16.

GARGANI, A. (1979): *La crisi della ragione*, Einaudi, Torino.

GENSCHEL, P. (2003): "Globalization as a problem, as a solution, and as a part of the landscape", *European Review* 11:4, pp. 505-518.

GIDDENS, A. (1984): *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

GILLINGS, M. (2012): "Landscape Phenomenology, GIS and the Role of Affordance", *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 19:4, pp. 601-611.

GILLINGS, M. VAN DALEN, J. and MATTINGLY, D. J. (1999): *Geographical Information Systems and Landscape Archaeology*, Oxbow Books.

GILLMAN, D. (2006): *The Idea of Cultural Heritage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge

HAC GÜZELLER, P. (2012): "GIS, Critique, Representation and Beyond", Journal of Social Archaeology 12, 2, pp. 245-263.

HAMILAKIS, Y. (2012): "From ontology to ontogeny: a new, undisciplined discipline", *Current Swedish Archaeology* 10, pp. 47-55.

HARRISON, R. (2013): "Forgetting to remember, remembering to forget: Late modern heritage practices, sustainability and the crisis of accumulation of the past", *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19:6, pp. 1-17.

HICKS, D. (2012): "The Material-Cultural Turn: event and effect", *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies* (D. Hicks and M. C. Beaudry, eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 25-98.

HICKS, D. (2016): "The Temporality of the Landscape Revisited", *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 49:1, pp. 5-22

HODDER, I. (2014): "The Asymmetries of Symmetrical Archaeology", *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1:2, pp. 228-230.

HODDER, I. and LUCAS, G. (2017): "The symmetries and asymmetries of human–thing relations. A dialogue", *Archaeological dialogues* 24:2, pp. 119-137.

HU, D. (2012): "Advancing Theory? Landscape Archaeology and Geographical Information Systems", *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 21, pp. 80-90.

HUSSERL, E. (1970): *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology: An Introduction to Phenomenological Philosophy*, Northwestern University Press.

INGOLD, T. (1992): "Culture and the perception of environment", *Bush Base: Forest Farm: Culture, Environment, and Development* (E. Croll and D. Parkin, eds.), Routledge, London, pp. 39-56.

INGOLD, T. (1993): "The Temporality of the Landscape", *World Archaeology* 25:2, pp. 152-174.

INGOLD, T. (2009): "Against space: place, movement, knowledge", *Boundless Worlds: An Anthropological Approach to Movement* (P. W. Kirby, ed.), Berghahn, Oxford, pp. 29-43.

INGOLD, T. (2014): "Is There Life Amidst the Ruins?", *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1:2, pp. 231-235.

JASPERS, K. (1947): *Von der Wahrheit,* Piper, University of Massachusetts.

JOHNSON, M. (2012): "Landscape studies: The future of the field", *Landscape Archaeology between Art and Science. From a Multi- to an Interdisciplinary Approach* (S. J. Kluiving and E. B. Guttmann-Bond, eds.), Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 515-525.

JOHNSTON, R. (1998): "The Paradox of Landscape", *European Journal of Archaeology* 1, pp. 313-325.

KNAPP, A. B. and ASHMORE, W. (1999): "Archaeological landscapes: Constructed, conceptualized, ideational", *Archaeologies of Landscape: Contemporary Perspectives* (W. Ashmore and A.B. Knapp, eds.), Blackwell Publishers, Malden (MA), pp. 1-30.

KOLEN, J. (1995): "Recreating (in) nature, visiting history. Second thoughts on landscape reserves and their role in the preservation and experience of the historic environment", *Archaeological Dialogues* 2, pp. 127-159.

KOPYTOFF, I. (1986): "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process", *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (A. Appadurai, ed), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 64-91.

KRISTIANSEN, K. (2008): "Do we need the 'archaeology of Europe?, *Archaeological Dialogues* 15:1, pp. 5-25.

KRISTENSEN, S. (2009): "Foucault et la Phénoménologie: Le problème de l'unité du sujet", *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 141:1, pp. 29-46.

KRISTIANSEN, K. (2017): "The Nature of Archaeological Knowledge and Its Ontological Turns", *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, pp. 1-4.

KOSELLECK, R. (2004): *Future Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Columbia University Press.

LAUNARO, A. (2004): "Concerning Landscape", *Agri centuriati: an International Journal of Landscape Archaeology* 1, pp. 31-41.

LAZZARI, M (2014): "Old and New materialism", *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1:2, pp. 336-338.

LEVEAU, P., TREMENT, F., WALSH, K. and BARKER, G. (1999): *Environmental Reconstruction in Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology*, Oxbow Books.

MEIER, T. (2012): "Landscape', 'environment' and a vision of interdisciplinarity", *Landscape Archaeology between Art and Science. From a Multi- to an Interdisciplinary Approach* (S. J. Kluiving and E. B. Guttmann-Bond, eds.), Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam, pp. 503-514.

NEALON, J. T. (2012): *Post-Postmodernism: or, the Cultural Logic of Just-in-Time Capitalism*, Stanford UP, Stanford.

OLSEN, B. (2003); "Material Culture After Text: Re-membering Things", *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 36:2, pp. 87-104.

OLSEN, B. (2007): "Keeping Things at Arm's Length: A Genealogy of Asymmetry", *World Archaeology* 39:4, pp. 579-588.

OLSEN, B. (2010): *In Defense of Things: Archaeology and the Ontology of Objects*, AltaMira Press, Walnut Creek.

OLWIG, K. R. (2013): "Heidegger, Latour and the reification of things: the inversion and spatial enclosure of the substantive landscape of things – the Lake District case", *Geografiska Annaler* 95:3, pp. 251-273.

PAPANTONIOU, G. and VIONIS, A. K. (2019): "Central Places and Un-Central Landscapes. Political Economies and Natural Resources in the *Longue Durée", Land* 8:36, pp. 1-21.

PASQUINUCCI, M. and TREMENT, F. (2000): *Non-destructive techniques applied to Landscape archaeology*, Oxbow Books.

PREUCEL, R. W. (2016): "Pragmatic Archaeology and Semiotic Mediation", *Semiotic Review* 4, Im/materialities; article published November 2016, https://semioticreview.com/ojs/index.php/sr/article/view/11.

RATHJE, W. L., LAMOTTA, V. M. and LONGACRE, W. A.: "Into the *black hole*: Archaeology 2001 and beyond…", *Archaeology: The Widening Debate* (B. Cunliffe, W., Davies and

C. Renfrew, eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 497-540.

RENNELL, R. (2012): "Landscape, Experience and GIS: Exploring the Potential for Methodological Dialogue", *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 19:4, pp. 510-525.

RICHARDS-RISSETTO, H (2017): "What Can GIS + 3D Mean for Landscape Archaeology?", *Journal of Archaeological Science* 84, pp. 10-21.

ROBB, J. (2010): "Beyond Agency", *World Archaeology* 42:2, pp. 493-520.

ROYMANS, N. (1995): "The Cultural Biography of Urnfields and the Long Term History of a Mythical Landscape", *Archaeological Dialogues* 2:1, pp. 2-24.

ROYMANS, N., GERRITSEN, F., HEIJDEN, C., VAN DER BOSMA, K. and KOLEN, J. (2009): "Landscape Biography as a Research Strategy: The Case of South Netherlands Project", *Landscape Research* 34:3, pp. 337-359.

SAMUELS, M. S. (1979): "The Biography of Landscape: Cause and Culpability", *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes. Geographical Essays* (D. W. Meining, ed.), Oxford University, Oxford, pp. 51-58.

SASS, L. A. and PLOUX, M. (2009): "Foucault et l'autoréflexion modern", *Les Temps Modernes* 5:656, pp. 99-143.

SHANKS, M., (2007): "Symmetrical Archaeology", *World Archaeology* 39:4, pp. 589-596.

SHERRATT, A. (1996): "Settlement patterns or landscape: Reconciling Reason and Romance", *Archaeological dialogues*, pp. 140-159.

SPARTI, D. (1996): *Epistemologia delle scienze sociali*, Carocci, Roma.

SMITH, L. (2006): *Uses of Heritage*, Routledge.

SÜTÜNÇ, H. S. (2017): "A New Research Approach for Past Landscapes: Landscape Biography", *Current Trends in Science and Landscape Management* (R. Efe, M. Zencirkiran, J. A. Wendt, Z. Tumsavas, H. Unal and B. Borisova, eds.), St. Kliment Ohridski University Press, Sofia, pp. 91-98.

TILLEY, C. (1994): *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*, Berg Publisher, Oxford.

TILLEY, C. (2004): *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations*, Landscape Phenomenology, Berg Publisher, Oxford.

TILLEY, C. (2008): *Body and Image: Explorations*, Landscape Phenomenology 2, Berg Publisher, Oxford.

TILLEY, C. (2010): *Interpreting Landscapes: Geologies, Topographies, Identities, Explorations*, Landscape Phenomenology 3, Berg Publisher, Oxford.

TUAN, Y. F. (1974): Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.

TURNER, S. (2006): "Historic Landscape Characterisation: A landscape archaeology for research, management and planning", *Landscape Research* 31:4, pp. 385-398.

VAN OYEN, A. (2016): "Historicising Material Agency: from Relations to Relational Constellations", *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 23, 354-378.

VANNI, E. (2017): "Archeologia e web 2.0. Verità e dinamiche di potere nell'era digitale", *Archeologia e Calcolatori* 28, pp. 291-310.

VANNI, E. and CRISTOFERI, D. (2018): "The role of marginal landscape for understanding transhumance in Southern Tuscany (twelftht-wentieth century AD): a reverse perspective integrating ethnoarchaeological and historical approaches", *Historical archaeologies of transhumance across Europe* (E. Costello and E. Svensson, eds.), EAA Themes in Contemporary Archaeology 6, Routledge, Oxon, pp. 197-218.

VATTIMO, G. and ROVATTI, A. (2013): *Weak Thought*, State University of New York Press, New York.

WALSH, K. (2008): "Mediterranean Landscape Archaeology: Marginality and the Culture–Nature 'Divide'", *Landscape Research* 33:5, pp. 547-564.

WITMORE, C. (2020): "Symmetrical Archaeology", *The Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology* (C. Smith, ed.), Springer, New York.

WITMORE, C. L. (2007): "Symmetrical Archaeology. Excerpts of a manifesto", *World Archaeology* 39:4, pp. 546-562.

WITMORE, C. L. (2014): "Archaeology and the New Materialisms", *Journal of Contemporary Archaeology* 1:2, pp. 203-246.