GENERAL PERSPECTIVES

TRADITION AND THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE: AN ARCHAEOLOGY OF PLACE

Christopher Evans

Culture and Landscape

A concept of place or places is fundamental in archaeological analysis -- places are sites or find spots, they are foci or points situated in distribution maps through time; places are plotted episodes through which the past becomes visible. Concerning 'the archaeology of place' Binford has recently written:

The archaeologist 'sees' the past segmentally from the perspective of fixed positions in space. The 'fallout' from the events that 'moved across' fixed places establishes the character of the archaeological remains on sites. To understand the past we must understand places. (Binford 1982, 6)

Certainly, in archaeology there is a recognition of a quality or scale of place -- a flint scatter is a site or place of a different order than, for example, a town. There is a relative 'weighting' of place based on the intensity of contemporary activity and the sequence of use or occupation at a given locale. Similarly, the recognition of entities of given orders (houses, streets, settlements) is a ranking of place according to level at which they frame social activity (private/public) as opposed to features which merely facilitate an activity (pit, dump, or ditches). Furthermore, the archaeological evaluation of places relates to the intentionality of deposition and its social/public significance, and in this manner a temple or cemetery is usually a locale of greater accepted significance than, for example, a four-post granary. The underlying premise behind this informal hierarchical qualification of places is that somehow our value of locations and entities reflects a past reality or ordering. In this regard the recognisable intentionality of deposition (though not necessarily the understanding of the intention) suggests a conscious social definition of a specific location as a 'place' of value and therefore a focus of past social order.

This, however, is to define place as a location from the point of view of its archaeological visibility rather than as a cultural value insomuch as place = activity (debris) = site. This interpretation of place is not entirely satisfactory since it ignores the temporal, cultural and cognitive recognition of places through which they may exist as loci of meaning and not necessarily as foci of activity. In effect, places are locations where culture has humanised 'nature', and in this regard Binford continues "... aside from certain 'absolute' characteristics of the biogeography within the region, there is always a 'cultural geography'" (Binford 1982, 7).

Concepts of 'place' are common to all human-environment studies and are specifically relevant to geography. During the last 20 years in human geography there has been a reaction against the quantitative approaches of the 1950's and 1960's, and as a discipline human geography has found itself in the same crisis of identity that archaeology has undergone -- that is, whether it considers itself to be a positivist science rooted in the physical sciences, or whether it is a humanistic social science (e.g. Gregory 1978; Ley and Samuels 1978). In geography Tuan has seen this as a dilemma between an environmentalism which "seeks meaning in order and finds a largely determined, timeless and tidy world" and existentialism which "seeks meaning in the landscape as it would in literature, because it is a repository of human striving" (1971, 186).

Tuan's own concept of place is in some regards surprisingly close to Binford's; "place is an organized world of meaning. It is essentially a static concept." (Tuan 1977, 179). He considers both space and time as movement, and sees place as a point or pause in the respective paths of time and space, and furthermore that the scale and quality of place is determined by the nature of experience (sensation, perception, conception) associated with a location (ibid. 6ff).

'Place' as such can never have an absolute definition and its value is individually and socially subjective, and therefore the problem of defining place is not dissimilar nor unrelated to the problem of defining what is a site. This, however, does not negate place as being of recognised, if imprecise, value and it is because it is socially relative that its archaeological implications cannot be ignored.

The notion that landscape is somehow structured and can be 'read' is not new and landscape studies abound with language metaphors (Hoskins 1962, 32; Crawford 1953, 51). The physical environment is intrinsically linked to culture and social structure, it is ordered and conceptualised by cognitive systems and its conferred meanings are 'read' by society (Dunham 1976, 392). It is by conceptual systems that the world is made meaningful and it is ordered by classification into domains and places (Rapoport 1976, 23). In this manner the environment is both a social product and a social medium, and "the landscape serves as a vast mnemonic system for the retention of group history and ideals" (Lyness 1973, 303).

Sauer considered the cultural landscape as being "fashioned from a natural landscape by a cultural group" (1963, 343), and it is culture meeting through time in a landscape which creates the cultural landscape. What is important to the archaeological context of 'place' is that, short of ultimate catastrophe (cf. "the Pompeii premise." Binford 1981),
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this process is historical and cumulative (Lowenthal 1975, 10) based on the endurance of landmarks and the vestiges of 'place-value'. It is the cumulative process of culture in the landscape which produces the 'personality' or the Vidalian genre de vie of a region. In archaeology the idea of a cultural landscape must be approached with some caution as its development as a geographic concept is based essentially on hindsight and on the notion that the past creates the 'tapestry' of the contemporary countryside. The risk here lies in the assumption of a predictable continuity which thereby neutralises the historical process which generated the landscape. Equally important is the fact that this approach to landscape studies was duely criticised for its separation of human/culture and nature (Gregory 1978, 89-90), for while the natural landscape creates the framework through which culture acts and transforms itself, there is no absolute primacy of nature. To seek the origins of the continuous interplay of culture and nature is irrelevant, one cannot be conceive of or define a virgin nature than one can establish the first cultural act of hominids. This is not to say, however, that natural domains are not culturally defined, and 'nature' can be demarcated by cognitive frontiers or 'culture' enclosed by boundaries (i.e. rivers, pit alignment, city walls) which can have sacred associations (Leach 1977, 167ff). Of course, in this regard it should be remembered that one culture's 'wilderness' can be another's 'home territory'.

This close mesh between nature and culture, and thereby places, does of course imply that natural features can profoundly influence landscape organisation and that specific rocks, trees, springs, or bogs can be recognised and named as places which can just as well be defined by taboo as by specific activity and depositional practices. While such localities could theoretically be detected by intensive sampling techniques, the chances of their recognition are naturally foreclosed. It is an unfortunate fact of the archaeological record that pits, for example, have greater prominence than trees, even though their social value may be totally disproportionate to their archaeological visibility. However, accepting the severe limitations in the archaelogical record, it is still possible to consider the temporal quality of 'sites' as places in the cultural landscape.

Why Appearances cannot be Mapped

The recording of archaeological entities by section, plan, or through the plotting of the distribution of artefacts, is essentially an abstraction expressed through conventions. The root of this notion of 'mapping' is the rendering of, or the 'saving of appearance', based on two or more points of perspective (Gombrich 1982, 206). The impact of mapping on archaeological studies has certainly been of paramount importance. However, it should be noted that though as a tool of archaeological analysis mapping is presently taken for granted, as a technique its adoption came relatively late to the discipline (Daniel 1978, 303ff) which was rather founded on the concept of strata and sequence (Harris 1979, 8ff). As a method of visual analysis, mapping is culturally relative and must be read within the context of its own subjectivity (Hodder and Orton 1976, 4ff). While within a skeletal framework of an axial grid we are able to express distributions and spatial relationships through a language of coordinates -- does this in any way permit us to express or explore the perceptual framework of the past?

Certainly, the further application of computer graphics in archaeology may in part bridge this as a problem of visual depiction. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that the experience of landscape in the past occurred within a three-dimensional realm and was perceived through a succession of single and personal points of perspect ive and 'natural' co-ordinates (Doxiadis 1976) -- that is the viewpoints of social participants whose perceptions were framed by cultural cognition.

To establish places as plottable entities is to reduce them to locations, places are thereby neutralised into an abstract nomenclature and our focus instead shifts to intervening 'spaces'. As a concept space is usually considered to be abstract and inherently meaningless (void), and, therefore, a more fitting subject of convention without reduction -- we can more readily measure spaces than the values of place. This, however, is to treat 'space' as distance and to ignore the fact that it is culturally defined and articulated within a temporal and dimensional framework (Fletcher 1977; Gould 1973). While concepts of space are culturally variable, "space appears to be a more fundamental prerequisite, built into the environment as forms, matter, and the like ... the relationships between elements, may be more important than the elements themselves" (Rapport 1976, 18).

The issue of the reduction of place/space to location/distance is related to the concept of archaeological cultures and classification. Often, in the interpretation of sites the lack of explicable data and phased sequences are traditionally considered naturally for present and past conditions and on any theory of spatial distribution and location patterns, and as a result ideal models of a given site-type are created. Although the creation and recognition of pattern in the landscape and data is essential, it does not necessarily ensure that we understand places or sites. While, on one hand, this is simply a problem relating to the 'muteness' of the data, at the same time the creation of pattern allows us to sidestep our ignorance of specific locations. Furthermore, there is also a potential risk that by seeking pattern we create 'nation-wide' classes of sites based on only shallow similarities, such as a quarrying technique in the case of causewayed enclosures, rather than their social function which may vary chronologically and regionally. This is not to dismiss spatial analysis or modelling as methodological techniques, but simply to stress that as analytical tools they are relative, and limited by the biases and assumptions we install the very process of measurement. By focusing on generalised patterns we create archaeological cultures, but this does not mean that we understand the historic generation of specific locales and places.
While it can be claimed that maps depict a 'structured' reality which is somehow superior to, or beyond, form and appearance, this is to separate essence and appearance, and to create a false dichotomy between material culture and social action (Barrett 1981, 206). In this regard, the issue or 'impact' of appearances is crucial since they are the physical framework in which social actions are manifested and maintained, and through which they are transformed.

Our own perception of the (pre)historic past is clearly related to the cultural landscape of the present, and the visual impact of monuments. Archaeological remains are a major component in the fabric or 'personality' of the contemporary countryside and as such are largely regarded within an essentially conservative viewpoint insomuch as they express continuity and endurance in the landscape -- the turf-covered barrows of the Wessex Downs might as well be blanketed in tweed. Yet, the original upcast capping of prehistoric barrows or banks in brilliant white chalk or gravel may have appeared as the neon of their time and by today's standards would have been as 'tasteful' as the original painting of the Parthenon Marbles or the quartzite cladding of the Newgrange façade. The countryside today has become such a 'socialised' concept that the remains of the past have become naturalised, and largely meaningless except on the spiritual fringe. This is, of course, a logical consequence of social relations to land, and as such is an expression of the contemporary landscape in which most of the 'social action' has shifted to the urban sphere. What is essential, however, is to consider the past as its own place (relatively) in which social actions were expressed dynamically and structurally and not just in the context of the immediate medium of landscape. In this context the index of visibility and appearance in the landscape is crucial for it created the framework through which the archaeological past and present meet. A concept of visual ranges framed by topographic features (e.g., valley-systems) may, therefore, be an appropriate level of landscape and spatial analysis, and one that is interacted as a visual network may be a relevant factor in their historic generation.

In recent years justified criticism has been directed against the 'flat earth' approach towards excavation in which ploughing and subsequent machine-stripping produces tableau-like lowland sites devoid of upstanding natural and archaeological features (Pryor 1980, 490ff; Bradley 1984a, 73). If we hope to understand the physical and cognitive organisation of settlements, and the influence of upstanding features on artifact distributions (Pryor 1980; Crowther 1983), it is essential that this post-depositional levelling of sites does not dictate our perspective on the cultural topography of the past. Furthermore, to consider sites through a two-dimension 'flatland' framework is to ignore the temporal dimension in the post-functional lifetime of sites. Through the processes of post-medieval agricultural development the past often becomes something which is 'discovered' and is rarely visible. While this alienation from the cultural past is partially the product of Renaissance metaphysics and contemporary landscape attitudes (Leone 1978), this concept of a hidden past is also due to a physical

trunecation of the (pre)historic landscape. What is important in this context is an awareness that the difficulties encountered by archaeologists in the detection of 'sites' were not necessarily the case in the past itself, because most sites would have survived as obvious and works in the prehistoric and early historic landscape longer beyond their 'functional' duration. This implies that the physical remains of the past would have participated to a greater extent in the cultural organisation of early landscapes. An obvious example of this is seen in the survival of prehistoric barrows and the prominent role they have in folk-lore and historic place-names (Ashbee 1970, 4f; Lawson et al. 1981, 4ff). This apparent time depth in the development of the past as an absolute or empirical value, but rather that the 'past' through tradition would have both structured and been itself recreated by society. This is in no way to argue for direct population or cultural continuity, but rather that cultures create their own context and that this is reflected in relationships within a landscape and in the respective abandonment, re-occupation, veneration or desecration of earlier sites.

Monuments and the afterlife of sites

A monument as such can either be consciously created (commemorative statue or folly), or it can be a value which through the agency of time is associated with a human work or structure. What is shared by these different kinds of monument is a reference to time, and particularly the past, even if this may be in the context of an event that we are consciously aware that work will have a lasting value. However, the question of at which point a site becomes a monument is not as obvious as it would first appear. We assign the quality of 'monument' to sites which physically endure and by their survival is implied indirect meaning and often some degree of social veneration insomuch as endurance is a value. A discontinuity of function is often implied by the term 'monument' but the action of 'naming' and the recognition of them as landmarks or as locale does, to some extent, assign them a place-value and thereby an indirect continuity.

The issue of archaeological continuity is related to the concept of place, and can be investigated through the character of a sequence at a site. In this regard it is important to recognise that, among sedentary societies, the continuity of occupation and society at a given locale is a very different matter from their original construction. While both primary and later phases of construction/action exist within a framework of historic processes, in the re-occupation or re-definition of a site the concept of that locale as a place has already taken root. For instance, to state that historic towns continue to exist primarily because of a continuing economic function relating to their location is an obvious over-simplification. 20th century London does not rely only on the same reasons that 12th century London developed; while both may fulfill separate social-economic functions, we cannot ignore the fact that the concept of London itself historically exists. Moreover, this historic identity is today enshrined in the City's symbolic landmarks...
and is consciously maintained through archaic social rituals ("Beating of the Bounds"). In much the same manner, medieval cathedrals also continue to exist and are to a greater or lesser degree venerated even though the conditions for their existence may have long since altered. It is the conceptual and concrete existence of places which establishes the material and cultural framework for their future development.

Given, however, that the character and temporal length of site sequences vary considerably, the continuity of a site's locale may relate to its contemporary recognition and ranking as a place. That, for example, the Late Bronze Age settlement at Potterne, Wiltshire was sealed by a massive midden (Gingell and Lawson 1983) is a very different form of site re-use than the sequence of rebuilding at the middle and late Iron Age complex excavated at Thetford (Current Archaeology 1981, 294–297). The 'desecration' of the former site and maintenance and re-definition at the latter obviously relate to their respective functions as a domestic site and a socio-religious 'centre'.

Why sites are abandoned is, of course, relevant to this discussion: discontinuity may be due to disaster (environmental and human), the collapse of economic or social functions, the inability to maintain living space (Binford 1981), or the onset of spatial disorder due to differential rates of constructional deterioration (Fletcher 1984). Naturally, given scenarios of discontinuity will relate to the specific function or character of a site.

At a pragmatic level the maintenance or discontinuity of a site will relate to what extent it interacts with society as a whole, in other words in relation to its ranking as a social entity. Quite simply, the survival of a 'town' or 'market' will be related to a greater number of its inhabitants than the maintenance of a private residence. However, the higher the ranking of an entity the less direct will be the self-interest of an individual in its survival and as a result there is a greater potential for disorder and chaos at this level (i.e. streets or civic defences). The construction and maintenance of higher level entities will, therefore, reflect to what extent social life is being stabilised and maintained. We are referring to Neolithic Wessex. Bradley (1984b) has recently suggested that larger monuments (long barrows, causewayed enclosures, henges) through their lasting character and ritual associations may embody a different conception of time than that of the everyday. This idea that 'monuments', (and Bradley uses this term to describe the existence of large communal ritual sites and not just their post-functional phases), exist within a different conceptual framework than domestic sites do through a relationship to rituals and with reference to the past, obviously relates to the social recognition of place. In this regard, the degree to which a place conveys and creates cultural identity will relate to the manner in which society consciously recognises it as such and collectively maintains it, and to this extent sites as places can be contextually defined (Case 1973, Hodder 1982). Therefore, while a domestic settlement will always be a 'central place' to those who inhabit it, its recognised participation within contemporary social identity may not be as great as that of a shrine or cemetery, the maintenance of which may have more profound communal consequences than that of a given farmstead.

The conscious historic identification of and investment in place is not just a modern phenomenon and can be seen in the conspicuous creation of monuments in the past. For example, the long and round mounds which seal Neolithic mortuary structures are effectively monuments without an apparent function except as a social landmark. While these barrows may have functionally served as territorial markers, the presence of non-domestic activities in their immediate vicinity (Kinnes 1981, 86) suggests their continuing existence as enduring places of recognised value even though they may have ceased in their original mortuary function. This idea that barrow mounds are effectively monuments in themselves which commemorate or symbolise a former action (mortuary rites), may help us to understand other sites of the second and third millennia BC. For though it is widely accepted that barrows, causewayed enclosures, cursus and henges are somehow interrelated, there is usually little evidence to explicitly link them apart from an extraordinary input of labour which increases with their sequential construction through time. Moreover, these sites all display a discrepancy between the apparent investment of labour in their construction and the relative scale of activity/function suggested by them. What may, in fact, be common to them all is the conscious creation of a monument as such and the actual or implied participation of the community in the construction of a visible landmark. While perhaps not an end in itself, it may have been as important as the specific functions associated with them (Hodder, pers. comm.). In this fashion the conspicuous appearance of these sites in the landscape is relevant to their apparent role as places of communal identity.

By the very fact that large monuments endure, there is a temptation to consider them as static forms after their establishment and to assume that their final form/plan was inherent to their original construction. Bradley (1984b) on the other hand has noted that monuments are often re-defined and can be added to by later generations expressing their links with a past embodied in the original monument.

As an example of this process of re-definition, during recent excavation of an early Neolithic causewayed enclosure at Haddenham, Cambridgeshire, a block of perimeter ditch segments were found to have been re-used in the later Neolithic and quantities of Peterborough tradition pottery were recovered from their fills (Evans and Hodder n.d.). This localised later Neolithic recutting of an early Neolithic enclosure appears to represent a re-definition of the monument. It is because the earlier monument already existed both conceptually and physically that the scale of this later re-working appears so totally disproportionate to the initial investment of labour, and in this manner the action of later generations works within or resonates in relation to the original monument. This can lead us to enquire into the presence of Beaker and Peterborough wares, recovered from the upper ditch fills of other cause-
wayed enclosures but not found in association with a phase of structural re-cutting (e.g. Windmill Hill). Often the presence of such later pottery is either not interpreted or else dismissed as artifactual ‘background noise’. It is, however, possible that such evidence of later activity without structural re-use could represent a conceptual continuity of it as a monument or at least a recognition of it as a historic place, since it survived as an earthwork.

**Intention and Tradition**

It has been argued that ritual practices and the construction of monuments may relate to the establishment of common or competitive ideologies (Bradley 1923b; Braithwaite 1983b). Monument construction could reflect the extent to which society is threatened or internally divided. Consequently monument construction can be considered as an act of social unification. Regardless of why monuments were initially constructed, it is essential to bear in mind that the physical association of later monuments or the redefinition of existing monuments does not necessarily imply a continuity in the intention of their construction. The excavation, in 1983, of a complex Bronze Age barrow by the Haddenham Project provides an example of this variability in the intended association of monuments. The barrow was located some 150m west of the early Neolithic causewayed enclosure on the Upper Delph--a gravel peninsula which projects into the peat fens of southern East Anglia (Evans and Hodder 1984: n.d.). This barrow is an outlier of the main Haddenham-Over barrow cemetery and lies approximately one kilometre east of the main barrow mentioned. The causewayed enclosure had been locally redefined in the later Neolithic and there is evidence to suggest that it survived as an earthwork at least until the early Bronze Age. Therefore, there is reason to suggest that this barrow was consciously situated in relation to the Neolithic enclosure. Moreover, during the course of its excavation a Romano-Celtic shrine was found to have been constructed on the flank of this barrow. This sequence of Neolithic enclosure, barrow, and Romano-Celtic association can be functionally interpreted as reflecting the need for a relatively dry and prominent location in a largely flat and often wet landscape. However, within the context of the historic or cultural landscape it can also be suggested that the barrow was located in relation to the Neolithic enclosure so as to form a cultural link between the barrow field and the earlier monument, perhaps with the intention of re-inforcing rights to seasonally available territory/pasture through the agency of ancestors. Clearly there is no evidence that the relationship of the Roman shrine to the barrow involves a different form of cultural association, and it may represent an act of social legitimation in the establishment of the Fens as an Imperial estate (Evans 1984). However, even if the location of the shrine is interpreted as a political gesture, its intentions as such can only be fully understood if the site and barrow had retained some social vestige or cognitive manifestation of place-value.

Within their historic context it is therefore possible to recognize that there is an internal logic of monuments insomuch as they are not simply the direct product of their parent communities. However, set against 'monumental interaction' (cf Bradley's spatial 'leapfrog', 1984b) it is also possible to discern a background of cumulative place-value and community participation which gives content to what at a superficial level may have begun as an ideological response. The interaction between these dual processes -- creation and accretion -- relates to how we conceive the historic process as shaping the landscape. If it is envisaged as a given or abstract prime mover, then we do no more than replace a predictive continuity with an historic inevitability and this vulgarisation of history (Leone 1982) will effectively become yet another 'black box' by which we explain the given trajectories of known entities (ideal site-types, historic region or nation-state). This is to negate the potential of selection and choice of action in the past (Wolf 1982, 37f), and in this regard Marx declared: "History, does nothing, it possesses no immense wealth, fights no battles. It is rather man, real living man who does everything, who possesses and fights" (quoted in Carr 1961, 49). Within this range of potential social action, material culture must be seen as creating the conceptual and physical framework in which this action can be conceived and through which society manifests its own form or reaction.

The re-definition and visual association of monuments does not necessarily imply a direct continuity of social or cultural function and could as well be a matter of 'inventing traditions' as cultural nostalgia and a set of ‘black boxes’ by which we explain the given trajectories of known entities (ideal site-types, historic region or nation-state). This is to negate the potential of selection and choice of action in the past. It is because tradition and places relate so directly to cultural identity, and thereby are a potential of source of social unity or coercion, that their values can be so multi-faceted. It is for these reasons that we cannot always assume a social continuity in the cultural landscape.

Hobsbawm has written concerning 'invented traditions' that they are "essentially a process of formalisation and ritualisation, characterised by reference to the past if only by imposing repetition" (1983, 4). Moreover the conscious use of tradition, rather than reflecting stability and continuity may be used to establish social cohesion during periods of social upheaval: "We should expect it (the invention of tradition) to occur more frequently when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which 'old' traditions had been designed" (Hobsbawm 1983, 4). In this context we can question to what extent the reworking of previous monuments may represent an attempt to bridge social changes through tradition, whereas new forms of monument construction may be in response to more fundamental cultural or religious changes.
The attitudes taken by a society towards the cultural landscape it inhabits and the associations it cultivates within it, will reflect a society's sense of history and its own cultural origins. The issue here is where does a society envisage its own past to lie? In this context, a society's landscape cognition will relate to the extent to which the society is historical or mythical in the recognition of its past (Tuan 1977, 187ff) -- does a society recognise or chronicle its own historic origins, whether they lie locally or abroad, or does it submerge the past in the present through the agency of myth? Similarly, a society's appreciation of time-depth will relate to the battle of metaphor or reality, which will determine what needs to be culturally explained either through myth or history. Of course, this division between historical or mythical cultures, which Levi-Strauss has termed 'hot' or 'cold' cultures (1966), is not absolute and historic cultures will create their own altered or mythical past where their history ends, and as contemporary needs determine (Lowenthal 1975, 27ff). For this a comment made by John Stow, who introduced his Survey of London (1663) with Geoffrey of Monmouth's calculation that the City was founded in 1108 BC, is relevant: "herein antiquity is pardonable and has an especial privilege, by interlacing divine matters with human, to make the first foundations of cities more honorable, more sacred and, as it were, of greater majesty" (quoted in Schofield 1984, 3f).

It has not been the intention of this paper to establish a means or absolute scale by which 'place' can be measured, for by its cultural relativity it can only be contextually defined (Hodder 1982). In this manner an evaluation of place will be determined by the level at which entities resolve themselves (e.g. house, settlement, 'visual network', etc.), and this is directly related to the scale and intensity of regional survey and excavation. However, given a spectrum from the locally specific to the universally general, and the nature of archaeological evidence, it can only be assumed that we only have a bird's eye view, as we are looking for, whether this is generalised locational patterns or, for that matter, continuity. Therefore, what is required is a scale of research which allows meaningful units of analysis to emerge and resolve themselves (local 'visual network', valley-system, or regional cultural group). In this regard what is necessary is that we do not just consider 'sites' in relation to a standardised criterion of an archaeological culture, but rather as communities interacting within and with landscapes.

What is perhaps most important in terms of this discussion of past landscapes and 'places' is recognition of the limitations of approaching the past as either an ecological wilderness devoid of culture or as an ideological battlefield of content, as these polar stances represent gross simplification -- of past societies and their acts in the landscape. Furthermore, we cannot hope to fully understand past cultures by simply studying and mapping the foel of communities as is represented in the distribution of major monumental monuments, as they shift through time and space as given areas flare-up as would-be central places or communal foel. To just approach

prehistoric cultures and landscapes in terms of their episodic display of intense communal centralisation as is reflected in their primary phases of monument construction is to take a perspective towards past cultures which is based on archaeological or historical cases, and which is neither sequential nor meaningful with regard to the inter- relationship of culture and nature. Succeeding generations of communities which continue to inhabit these monument-strewn landscapes, after their localite has fallen from the archaeological limelight, will continue to invest in, and relate to, their region within a framework of cultural associations, which is both perpetual and continuously redefined. It is this on-going historical process which through the framework of tradition interweaves community and landscape and thereby creates the cultural landscape.
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Notes

1. It is relevant to note that as human geography and archaeology begin to see themselves as disciplines rooted in the social sciences, authors in these fields have begun to introduce and illustrate their texts with a greater frequency of literary quotations: e.g. Lowenthal 1975; Gregory 1978 in human geography and in archaeology, Bradley 1984; Chapman, Kinnes and Randsborg (eds) 1981. This recent phenomenon is interesting since it suggests a failure in the academic language of the two disciplines to convey any sense of the essence or experience of their respective content -- places and the past.

2. Combrich 1982, 206. In his essay "Mirror and Map: Theories of Pictorial Representation" Combrich discusses the impossibility of duplating appearances in relationship to the variability of distant vision and the curvature of the phenomenal world. An analogy from art history is relevant here concerning the distinction of 'mapping' of past appearances: for the prehistoric landscape we are attempting to understand may have been perceived within a framework not unlike the cognitive structures (i.e. in/out) of the art of preliterate societies (Greenhalgh and Megaw 1978), yet our analysis and rendering of the past is from a post-Renaissance perspective and works within an axi/arithmetical logic.

3. Concerning the relationship between monuments and landscape it is interesting to what extent monuments and their topographic setting were interlinked in post-medieval antiquarian depictions (e.g. cover of ARC, 1984, 3:1). Working within a cartographic tradition without the benefits of photographic imagery, this use of landscape to
provide perspective and scale is not unexpected, though clearly their landscape style also relates to contemporary Romantic tastes and a market for images of ruins in a sympathetic setting (Piggott 1976, 112ff). It has, however, been argued that the origins of English antiquarianism are related to the development of a national identity (McVear 1984). This is seen here as contributing to the creation of a ‘national’ cultural landscape. Conversely, to compare the style of antiquarian illustrations with current tastes and conventions in archaeological draughtsmanship does emphasise the extent to which ‘sites’ have been divorced from their landscapes.

4. It should be noted that in later prehistory and thereafter a continuity in the location of public ‘places’ and monuments/structures is to some degree ensured as a result of private rights to land. In densely settled areas established public/communal areas may be situated on the only arable land large enough for further monument construction. On the other hand, in periods of cultural change, but without social collapse, existing monuments or public structures are obvious sites for new public structures, not only as an ideological gesture, but by the very fact that they are not subject to private ownership, and their ownership/guardianship can thereby become ambiguous or non-existent. This ambiguity of public places as property is reflected in the fact that houses and monuments often host squatters and transient population because their ownership is not precisely defined or maintained.
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AN UNLOVELY CHILD: THE PROBLEM OF UNPUBLISHED ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Paul Callow

introduction

This paper stems from a research seminar given at the Department of Archaeology at the University of Cambridge, and takes as a case study the writer's experiences during 1979-84 in preparing a final report on the Department's excavations at the Old Stone Age site of La Cotte de St. Brelade, Jersey, directed by the late Professor Charles McBurney (Callow and Cornford, in press). The wider importance of the issues raised here was made apparent by the problems caused, during the search for appropriate comparative data, by the very high proportion of key European Lower and Middle Palaeolithic sites remaining unpublished many years after the close of excavations, and by the simultaneous existence, under the same roof, of two other posthumous publication projects (Kathleen Kenyon's work at Jericho and that of Eric Higgs on the Palaeolithic of Epirus). Though the issues are addressed from the perspective of a worker in the field of early prehistory, it is clear from the comments of colleagues studying later periods that they are for the most part of general relevance. Similarly, although discussion centres on unpublished excavations (arguably the area needing most urgent reform), many of the points touched upon relate to other types of investigation.

The magnitude of the problem posed by non-publication may be appreciated from the current state of play regarding some British Lower Palaeolithic sites at which major excavations took place 10-20 years ago. Of Caddington, Clacton, High Lodge, Hoxne, Northfleet, Swansecombe and Le Plan, only the first has been fully published (Sampson 1978); the others, namely Swansecombe (Watson) and Le Plan (Watson), have been published in only one instance each (Le Plan in Watson, Swansecombe in Le Plan). The other are still unpublished: in the case of Caddington, the situation is little if at all better, notwithstanding the much clearer unity of direction afforded by both the cirenscription system and the existence of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, which provides both funding and a regular career structure for researchers.

The La Cotte Project, as it became known, is a particularly interesting subject for examination in some detail because of the range of complications that were encountered, many of them associated with the...