



The Heritagescape: Looking at Landscapes of the Past

Mary-Catherine E. Garden

To cite this article: Mary-Catherine E. Garden (2006) The Heritagescape: Looking at Landscapes of the Past, International Journal of Heritage Studies, 12:5, 394-411, DOI: [10.1080/13527250600821621](https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600821621)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527250600821621>



Published online: 20 Aug 2006.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1449



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 33 View citing articles [↗](#)

The Heritagescape: Looking at Landscapes of the Past

Mary-Catherine E. Garden

Heritage sites are one of the most visible, accessible and tangible manifestations of heritage and are also some of the essential building blocks of heritage. Yet we are still without a sense of how they operate over time and in relation to each other. This paper will introduce the notion of the 'heritagescape' as a means of interpreting and analysing heritage sites as unique social spaces that offer an experience of the past. In contrast to previous attempts to investigate these places, the heritagescape offers the means to focus both on the underlying similarities and also on the relationships of different sites to each other. As such, heritagescape offers a coherent and overarching methodology by which to identify the universal processes and elements that characterise heritage sites and will allow us to take our examination of heritage as a cultural phenomenon into the future.

Keywords: Landscape; Heritage Sites; Heritagescape; Ecomuseums

After two decades of focused investigations into the phenomenon of heritage, the field of heritage studies is firmly established within the academy and, now, comes with a recognised and solid theoretical foundation. In that time a considerable amount of effort has been directed towards a better understanding of heritage sites. Despite this, our understanding of heritage sites remains at a crossroads. In the barely 20 years¹ that heritage studies has been an established field an enormous amount of thoughtful work has been undertaken. On the whole it has been a vigorous and heady endeavour; however, the speed at which the field has developed has meant that some of the 'details' have been overlooked. Notable among these is a comprehensive understanding of heritage sites as a cultural construct. Since the late 1990s the trend has been to focus on particular sorts of heritage sites and, currently, while references to heritage sites may be

Mary-Catherine Garden, Glasgow Caledonian University. Correspondence to: m.garden@gcal.ac.uk

found within the index of many recent works and within the latest textbooks,² there is a noted absence of any discussion of the notion of the 'heritage site'.

This omission can be linked directly to the failure to develop a coherent and overarching strategy for investigating heritage sites. To date, there is neither a recognised method nor a commonly understood set of terms used to characterise these unique social spaces. At its simplest this issue means that although most people recognise that the experience of 'the past' and the sense of place³ that arises out of specific types of heritage site each may be very different, the absence of a coherent methodology makes it difficult to differentiate between these experiences.

At present, while the term 'heritage site' is widely and intuitively recognised, our sense of what these places 'do' and what it is that characterises heritage sites remains under-explored and poorly comprehended. This has influenced significantly the way in which heritage sites are investigated and also has repercussions at a larger level where it impacts on the notion of 'heritage'. Because 'heritage' and 'heritage sites' are inextricably linked,⁴ a failure comprehensively to grasp how heritage sites work and what they 'do' over time will impact on our understanding of heritage as a social construction and will have a notable effect on the ways in which we understand how both heritage and heritage sites change and grow over time. Together, the lack of generalised understanding and the failure to develop a flexible, replicable and transparent means of analysing heritage sites are responsible for stalling movement forward towards a more comprehensive understanding of these unique spaces. What is needed now in heritage research is a general re-evaluation in order that agreed and widely recognised strategies are developed.

This paper will introduce a new analytical concept—the heritagescape—as a means to begin to initiate a dialogue on what is meant by the term 'heritage site'. The heritagescape has the capability to provide a common language that may be used to describe these sites and also offers a coherent, overarching methodology by which a vast array of different heritage sites may be analysed: both as individual places and also in terms of their relationship to other heritage places. It must be cautioned that the heritagescape may only be applied to places that are widely recognised as a marked out space or site. In addition to the more obvious spaces like open-air museums or battlefields or other outdoor spaces, other 'marked out space' may include cathedrals, 'traditional' enclosed museums or castles. Often, but not always, these spaces will be managed to some degree. What is not included are those spaces endowed with a more personal or individual heritage. Although they may be prominent in one's own map of the past, they are very different sorts of space and they are not what we are considering with the heritagescape.

Heritage Sites and the Heritagescape

The need for a common methodology has not gone unnoticed and, over time, significant effort has been made towards resolving this problem. However, in most cases, these attempts have taken place in more confined contexts and have been aimed towards specific types of sites.⁵ Unfortunately what has not occurred is a more

generalised approach focused on creating an overarching methodology that is able to consider the wide range of different places that are usually recognised as heritage sites. As a result, the current trend is more towards an ad hoc approach to analysing heritage sites where the absence of a methodology means that much of the same ground is covered repeatedly and, because the focus is often an individual site or, at most, a small number of similar places, the outcome is a number of small studies, none of which are easily comparable to each other. This is best reflected in the definitions that have arisen as researchers attempt to characterise different sorts of heritage site.⁶ As a result, much of the discourse surrounding heritage sites continues to be based upon an innate understanding of these places.

While this inherent sense of heritage should not be discounted and has much to offer in terms of understanding both the diversity and the personal stakeholding that are hallmarks of heritage, it does create problems when these understandings become the mainstay of the field and come accompanied by a poorly developed set of methodologies. At present this is exactly where heritage studies finds itself.

As physical places heritage sites are relatively easy to recognise; as a cultural phenomenon they are much more difficult to grasp. As a category of place, they can be problematic because the term ‘heritage site’ includes so many different types of spaces and, like other spaces within the landscape, they suffer from a failure to define them as either spaces or places. Within this paper heritage sites are described as both spaces and places. As the former they are described as unique social spaces as a means of acknowledging both the tangible and experiential qualities that make up these sites as a place.

A heritage site is a complex social space constructed by the interaction and perceptions of individuals who visit the site. Neither wholly museum nor entirely landscape, heritage sites incorporate elements from both, making them a unique social space. While the visitor experience may be shaped by prior knowledge or, indeed, the novelty of the space, the vision held by the staff may be influenced by the ‘envisioned’ site and likely will be quite different. Any means of analysis, therefore, must be able to account for a variety of perceptions and/or experiences and must also be able to offer room for this range of perspectives and interpretations.

The lack of a full appreciation of the heritage site as a place will also have serious repercussions because without this it will remain difficult to break down the heritage site and examine its constituent parts. Without an easy or established means to look at the essential qualities of a heritage site it will be difficult, if not impossible to identify or evaluate those underlying processes that accompany a heritage site over time.

Recognising that there are universal and underlying processes that accompany heritage sites over time is an important aspect of the task of analysing heritage sites; yet it remains under-explored. In part this oversight has developed because of a lingering inclination to regard a heritage site as a largely static⁷ out-of-context⁸ and/or homogeneous⁹ entity. This, and a tendency to locate analyses of heritage sites without the site, has imposed a ‘sameness’ on them. One author, who has observed this sense of sameness, notes in a discussion of open-air sites—what he calls ‘museums of buildings’—that ‘when you’ve seen one Skansen, you have seen them all’.¹⁰

The Heritagescape

Admittedly, the idea of a heritage site as a landscape is not new;¹¹ however, most of the work undertaken, to date,¹² has failed to grasp completely the complexity and the individuality of heritage sites as unique social spaces. Similarly, research considering the physicality of interior space in museums¹³ has either not been universal enough or else has been unable adequately to account for important and ongoing processes.¹⁴ What is novel about this new way of thinking about the heritage site as a landscape is the way in which the analytical concept of landscape as a social construction¹⁵ is applied to the question of what qualities affect the heritage site as a coherent and convincing entity.

Any methodology that is developed to deal with any of the issues raised so far must take into account the unique qualities of heritage sites as particular and highly experiential social spaces. Where past attempts have failed is through an adherence to the tendency to define sites (with an emphasis on categorisation).¹⁶ Often, this is accomplished by relying on a set of fixed attributes¹⁷ that have been derived from a template site and which are, in turn, used to compare one site to another. This is rarely wholly successful; heritage sites are too diverse and too complex to be reduced to a set of 'ingredients'. Moreover, this more quantitative approach rarely recognises the intangible qualities of a site and none completely accounts for the equally important but less observable, envisioned site.¹⁸

The heritagescape allows different types of sites to be compared in a coherent, replicable and flexible fashion. Using the heritagescape as a baseline and examining how it is manifested within an individual site should make it possible to understand three basic aspects: (i) how the individual site operates and portrays the past, (ii) how one (or more) site(s) operate relative to another and finally (iii) lead to a better understanding of the heritage site as a larger concept and as a cultural phenomenon.

Based upon a set of 'guiding principles' the heritagescape allows us to identify the tangible components that make up a heritage site and to recognise the nature of the heritagescape as it is manifested at an individual site. This is a critical aspect of the methodology as, like any other landscape, it is the set of individual components that, together, create a particular place. These elements play key roles in identifying the underlying processes and significantly highlight the process of change where it most often first occurs. Each of these three principles, based around ideas of (i) boundaries, (ii) cohesion and (iii) visibility, together make up the heritagescape. It is the relationship and interplay of these three principles together that is a key component of this methodology. Thus, whilst all three must always be present (in order to have a heritagescape) it does not necessarily follow that they will always operate in exactly the same way or assume the same resonance relative to each other. These three guiding principles allow sites to be evaluated against a constant.

In turn, the guiding principles are identified by applying them to tangible features, site criteria, that are found at each site. These features will consist of basic elements, including fences, signs, objects and pathways, that make up all sites. As there is no set list, the evaluation of the presence and or nature of the site criteria remains very much at the level of the individual site where they can be identified and considered on their

own qualities. It is the second step, the application of the site criteria against the constant of the guiding principles, that makes it possible to evaluate sites within the larger context of heritage sites and to assess their relationship within other sites.

When thinking about the heritagescape it is important to remember that it is both a method and a concept. As a concept it is a means of describing and thinking about those specific landscapes that make up a heritage site. Whilst the heritagescape incorporates some of the basic constructs of landscape theory it is a particular idea that relates wholly to heritage sites. It is distinct from but at the same time an integral part of the larger landscape in which it is located. Like the larger landscape, the heritagescape is more than the sum of its physical components and, while centred on the site itself, it may not necessarily be restricted to the physical limits of the place.

The heritagescape as a method is structured enough to offer a replicable and transparent means of analysis, yet it is also flexible enough to be able to accommodate the particular 'personalities' of individual heritage sites. Rather than being overwhelmed by the differences, this methodology looks for underlying qualities that characterise these places. Second, the heritagescape is not meant to provide a single incontrovertible answer. Thus, rather than creating a set definition, the heritagescape offers a measure—a constant—against which individual sites may be evaluated both as specific places and in relation to other sites. Inevitably there will still be disagreement among scholars but critically the heritagescape provides a common vocabulary. Because it is based on a constant it is possible to use the heritagescape to evaluate how and why conclusions were reached. In the past not only did the methods vary from one analysis to another but often the criteria varied within the same analysis.¹⁹ This made it virtually impossible to evaluate results or to compare sites with any sort of coherence.

There are two key points that need to be understood about the heritagescape. First, the key attribute of the guiding principles is that each of these three principles always will be present at every site. As noted above, like the heritagescape, the guiding principles themselves may be broken down into the site criteria. In the main these are composed primarily of the tangible constituents that make up the landscape of heritage at each site; however, while there are also more ephemeral aspects to each of the guiding principles, these tend to be grounded in the physical components. Second, rather than being focused on an individual site the heritagescape is a constant—an overarching construct. All sites will have a heritagescape in order for them to function as a heritage site; not all heritagescapes will, however, necessarily appear similar. The resonance that each individual heritagescape will have and, indeed, the final shape of the heritagescape will be influenced by the relative strength of each of the three guiding principles and by their relationship to one another.

Finally, it is important to recognise that the heritagescape as a method is a multi-stage process. The first is located at the site level where the tangible components—the site criteria—of the landscape are analysed. This consists of noting the presence/absence of elements as well as assessing how and which devices are used in such things as marking the site, directing visitors, conveying information and creating a sense of place. The next step considers the 'envisioned' site—the site as it was or is currently perceived by museum staff. This information may be found in a variety of sources,

including ‘mission statements’ or introductions to the site often found within the public interpretation material (e.g. guidebooks or maps) and, ideally, can be gleaned from interviews with staff. At both these stages the analysis is unashamedly located at the site level. It is the analysis of the envisioned and/or perceived site against the site as experienced by visitors (and others) who interact with the site that will provide a sense of how the tangible components of a heritage site are used to create a sense of place and, ideally, a place ‘of the past’. Once the site has been evaluated as a particular space and the site criteria identified, the analysis will move to the next stage where it will be possible to discuss more than one site. Because the guiding principles will always be present it is possible to use them as the constant against which different sites might be compared. Rather than creating rigid definitions, as did many of the previous approaches, the guiding principles and the heritagescape provide the language that allows us to engage in a coherent and transparent dialogue about heritage sites.

Before discussing some case studies in order to explore how the heritagescape works in practice, it is useful to look briefly at the three guiding principles:

- (i) *Boundaries*. The fencing off, demarcating or acknowledgement of the landscape of heritage is a seminal act that defines the site. Entrances (into a site) are key components. Boundaries are an important aspect of the ongoing *and* original size, shape and appearance of the site. Comprehending the boundaries, how they subsume change and what they represent underlies the methodology of the heritagescape. While the physical boundaries of the site must not be dismissed, the significance of the envisioned and/or understood limits of the site must be underscored. It is very likely that this latter set of limits may turn out to have greater resonance than their tangible counterparts.
- (ii) *Cohesion*. Stated simply, cohesion is how the site holds together. It is this that imparts a sense of ‘place’ to the site. This seemingly elementary statement is actually quite complicated and, of the three principles, may be the most complex. At one level, cohesion refers to how the site works together in a physical sense and here it is most closely linked to the concept of boundaries. In order to be cohesive, there must be a recognisable link that ties the individual components together. The distaff of this statement is not that the elements are similar; in fact, it is the very point that they are dissimilar that is a hallmark of cohesion. Central to the idea of cohesion is that all components—visible and invisible—of a site are interconnected.
- (iii) *Visibility*. Visibility has two components: physical visibility and cultural (in)visibility. Beyond the more obviously physical visibility (i.e. what we see) there is the idea of cultural (in)visibility which refers to the way in which tangible elements within the landscape may assume a greater or lesser presence depending on their roles and whether they are recognised or have been designated as ‘heritage’. Cultural (in)visibility tends to emerge out of a changing vision of the past. Physical visibility is the means by which we recognise the tangible features that create a cohesive site and it is the way in which we identify the physical limits of a site. Importantly, visibility also encompasses the idea of a view and it is a critical aspect

of visibility to consider where and how the line of sight is employed at a particular heritage site.

The actual analysis which begins with site visits where the tangible components of the landscape are identified and assessed moves on to a point where it becomes possible to begin to identify how the guiding principles may be applied to the individual components present at a site. In turn, by understanding the various strengths of the guiding principles a sense of the heritagescape begins to emerge. Ultimately, this means that not only is a site being analysed on its own merits but because it is reliant upon the constant of the guiding principles it is possible to compare any number of sites using a single, coherent and overarching method. It no longer matters that the individual elements that make up one site are quite different from those making up another because, ultimately, it is the constant of the three guiding principles that will be used as a means of comparison.

Two open-air museums, on first glance both very similar and both comprising buildings collected from a number of different locations, provide good examples of the sort of information that may be yielded when the methodology of the heritagescape is applied. As noted above, like other heritage sites, open-air museums have tended to be defined rigidly and seen as largely homogeneous. Coupled with a lingering sense that all open-air museums are essentially the same²⁰ these factors have shaped our perceptions of these places. Whilst it is becoming increasingly apparent that they are, in fact, multi-component spaces, until now we did not have the means to allow investigations to move beyond this point.

Greenfield Village (part of the Henry Ford Museum) in Dearborn, Michigan and Den Gamle By in Århus, Denmark share a number of similar attributes. Both comprise a variety of structures gathered throughout their respective countries and each is located in an urban environment, one amid the Ford motor plants, the other at a busy city intersection. Yet they are quite different. At Den Gamle By there has been a concerted effort to create a distinct space; not only are the interior spaces ‘of the past’, here they consider that ‘the streets are rooms too’²¹ (see Figure 1) and visitors tend to remain ‘in’ the past. This speaks to a strong sense of cohesion and the site, despite being in the middle of a city, manages to be both distinct and yet, at the same time, part of its larger environment.

At Greenfield Village, the exterior spaces are just that—spaces (see Figure 2). This means that one tends to move in and out of the past, making any encounter brief, and an inconsistent approach to signage means that there is no chance to be fully engaged with ‘the past’. Both Den Gamle By and Greenfield Village mark their buildings with information signs: at the former these signs are a standard size and shape whereas at the latter there is a huge variety of sign. Although the signs at both sites are clearly modern and easily visible, at Den Gamle By because there is a robust heritagescape with each of the guiding principles operating at roughly the same strength, the landscape of the past is able to subsume these (and other) modern elements. The regularity and visual familiarity of the signs renders them, in one sense, almost invisible. In contrast, there is a much weaker heritagescape at Greenfield Village and even a strong, physical boundary



Figure 1 Den Gamle By: creating a place. (Photo: author.)

like the red brick wall (see Figure 3) that surrounds much of the site fades and the sense of the site as a distinct place begins to blur. Against this, the huge variety of sign means that not only is the cohesion weak but also the signs, through their individuality, take



Figure 2 Greenfield Village: main intersection. (Photo: author.)



Figure 3 Greenfield Village: view outwards beyond site limits. (Photo: author.)

on a greater visual prominence and some begin to take on the appearance of giant labels on display cases, and the site soon feels like a ‘museum of buildings’.

Similar work at Beamish North of England Open-Air Museum suggests that the methodology can be applied at an intra-site level and is equally useful in identifying areas of the site where the heritagescape might be operating at different strengths. Here, two of the areas, the Town and the Pit Village, both appear to have achieved a strong sense of a past place and, like Den Gamle By, are both able to subsume modern elements and portray a cohesive and distinct landscape of the past (see Figure 4). In contrast, the Home Farm—ironically one of the original, *in situ* areas of Beamish—presents a much more diffuse heritagescape (see Figure 5). Museum staff had noted that this was one of the areas of lesser visitation;²² the application of the heritagescape suggests that a lack of cohesion, an ill-defined sense of place (both visually and in terms of boundaries) and its location across a road—suggesting it lay outside the site—made this a less vivid experience for visitors. The question remains whether Beamish is indeed one big site or whether it operates as four smaller, connected places.

One of the problems encountered by previous methodologies was the question of what to do with the awkward sites. Many sites do not always fit easily into any of the conventionally recognised subgroups of heritage site. Archaeological parks, for example, are just such places. Depending on the site, these can either appear more like open-air museums or more like ruins that one might most often associate with ancient monuments. Again, this is where the heritagescape can provide a means of incorporating these places into a larger analysis of heritage sites. The Bronze Age Centre at Flag Fen is typical of these less immediately identifiable places that, previously, might not



Figure 4 Beamish: 'town' area. (Photo: author.)



Figure 5 Beamish: 'Home Farm'. (Photo: author.)



Figure 6 Flag Fen: view outwards beyond site limits. (Photo: author.)

have been considered. Calling itself an archaeological park, Flag Fen is made up of a series of archaeological features, reconstructed structures and museum buildings. At its best Flag Fen could never have been considered the most cohesive of sites. For many years one of the most critical issues contributing to this was the difficulty experienced in trying to gain a good visual sense of the site; the visual limits were difficult to discern and the eye tended to be drawn well beyond the site out to the fens and the factories sitting on the horizon (see Figure 6).

In 2002, Flag Fen opened its new Heritage Centre, consisting of a visitor centre and shop and forming the new entrance to the site. With this, the entrance moved 180 degrees, making what used to be the back of the site, the front. Along with a bank of windows (in the centre) that faces onto a busy area of the site, this serves to focus the view into the middle of the site (see Figure 7), giving visitors an anticipatory sense of the experience to come. At the time of the visit in 2002, work was still very much in progress but it was interesting to note that staff identified a mandate to put in place new and more signs in order to create 'a more cohesive site'.²³

Whilst the heritagescape has been applied most often to built sites, it also offers potential for sites that possess few or no built remains but which are recognised spaces. Preliminary work, as part of a larger project being carried out by the Heritage>Futures Network (Glasgow Caledonian University) at Culloden Battlefield near Inverness, Scotland, suggests that the heritagescape has much to offer this type of heritage site. Considering this site as a heritagescape draws attention to the use of boundaries, cohesion and visibility. Here, the sense of place is palpable and the surrounding hills and peaks of the Scottish Highlands appear to provide a frame around the views over the



Figure 7 Flag Fen: view into sites from 'Heritage Centre'. (Photo: author.)

battlefield (see Figure 8). The main area of the site is held together primarily through a set of standard signs and by a tarmac path that runs throughout. The site is marked out by fences (both for management and for safety purposes); however, it is clear that the museum sees the site extending beyond the physical boundary. In more than one instance, visitors' eyes are drawn purposefully out of the site, across the main road to the (now) forested area that played a role in the battle of Culloden (see Figure 9). It is possible, however, that some of the most important elements at Culloden rest in the visual aspects and most particularly the view. No doubt further work will offer



Figure 8 Culloden: view outwards beyond site limits. (Photo: author.)

important clues to the role of visibility at sites such as this. Again, this example highlights the importance of looking at heritage places as closely linked to (yet distinct from) the larger surrounding. It also speaks to the growing interest and recognition of the role that the setting plays at heritage sites.²⁴

Discussion and Conclusions

Heritage sites are complex social spaces and beginning the process of taking them apart to view their inner components, in order to start to understand how they 'work', is an intricate endeavour. Assessing the inherent qualities of heritage sites has been further complicated by a number of trends that have emerged out of the approaches that researchers have espoused in the past. Most of these problems can find their roots in (a) the lack of a coherent and consistent means of analysis and (b) the tendency to locate any investigations outside the site and at a distance. Combined with a strong inclination to *define* sites, this has limited our understanding of heritage sites as particular experiential and social spaces.

The heritagescape was developed specifically to address these and other issues which have long plagued those investigating heritage sites and it is defined both by its ability to offer a flexible, yet consistent means of analysis and also by its role as a constant, offering a common language which makes it possible to engage in a widely understood



Figure 9 Culloden: directed view outside site limits. (Photo: author.)

dialogue. In thinking of heritage sites as heritagescapes—i.e. as landscapes—it draws attention to their qualities as dynamic, changing spaces. It also offers the opportunity to locate sites in the context of their larger environment and draws attention to the importance of the setting.

A fundamental aspect of the application of the heritagescape (as a method) is that it enables us to take apart each site to look at its components. This allows the underlying processes to emerge and, in turn, be analysed. Included among these processes is the idea of change. Thinking of a space as a landscape usually suggests that there is a built-in acceptance of change as a significant and determining influence and most would agree that ‘[t]he landscape is never inert, people engage with it, rework it, appropriate and contest it’.²⁵ Accepting the heritage site as a landscape locates these places in their rightful place as a fluid, changing space with which people regularly interact. Like more conventional landscapes, heritage sites are ‘not so much artefact as in process of construction and reconstruction’.²⁶ This is a fundamental point as, previously, discussions of change at heritage sites have been limited²⁷ to those changes that come about as part of the evolving storyline or in the face of developing ideologies.²⁸

The heritagescape also brings to light the consuming issue of authenticity. Although alluded to only briefly, this notion has long been recognised as an important aspect of heritage sites and has been discussed comprehensively for many years.²⁹ However, those who have used authenticity as a marker for heritage sites have been mistaken and

authenticity has been misidentified as a criterion that defines the past rather than as a universal and underlying structure. Were authenticity indeed a defining trait, it would be able to offer a consistent means of distinguishing between sites such as theme parks and open-air museums.

In part this also comes back to the critical notions of a place 'apart' and a place 'of the past'. It has already been established that heritage sites are recognised as a distinct space within their surroundings. As part of this these places must create a sense of the past; just what form this takes and how strong this sense of the past is will depend on how a particular place is conveying or using the past. Likewise, this space must also create an experience of a past place which is (ideally) both vivid and credible to those who visit the site. Whilst these ideas are closely related, both are distinct. Alone neither of these—or any of the other processes discussed—are unique to heritage sites; it is the combination of these elements working together that result in a heritage site and in the heritagescape.

Finally, a related issue is the trend towards defining heritage sites—and particularly those which employ some form of reconstruction—as 'good' or 'bad', 'real' or 'not real'. The latter two are particularly problematic. Although 'real' is in common usage, very few researchers have managed to define this attribute in a way that is either completely satisfying or overarching. 'Real' in the context of heritage sites tends to be applied in a manner that suggests it defines whether a site is credible and/or whether it presents a factual account of the past. Trying to reduce a complicated entity like a heritage site to one extreme or another is unsatisfactory and usually fails to produce new data.

The way forward with heritage sites will lie in moving away from oppositional definitions such as 'good' or 'bad' and concentrating instead on looking at 'how' and 'why'. Rather than locating an analysis in whether a site is 'good' or 'bad' or whether it offers a 'real' version of the past, it is much more useful and rewarding to consider how a site uses the components of its tangible landscape to create a distinct place of the past.

Future Directions

Over the course of this discussion it has been advocated that a number of the key notions bear further investigation. This has been demonstrated by the case studies that have both illustrated the usefulness of the heritagescape (as a method) and also have highlighted the need to re-examine many of the current assumptions (particularly the concept of authenticity, change and the quality of reality) associated with heritage sites. All of these terms are complicated and most are laden and, in the future, investigators will need to reflect on the impact they each have upon our understandings and interpretation of heritage sites.

The heritagescape also tenders a process by which to bridge the current gap between theory and practice within the discipline. The perspective of the methodology—focused on the tangible landscape of a particular site but at the same time acknowledging its relationship to other sites—means that the heritagescape offers considerable potential to inform day-to-day management and policy decisions. For a field where

academy and practice have traditionally been polarised this is an important component of the methodology.

What the heritagescape does not do is provide a single and/or all-encompassing answer, description or list. What it does do is provide a common language and offers a coherent and transparent means of discussing these sites. It draws upon ideas inherent in the study of cultural and natural landscapes to offer a radical new approach for analysing heritage sites that is able to expand and deepen our understandings of heritage places. Until now, we have not been able adequately to capture both the tangible and intangible landscapes nor have we been able to understand how these places may change over time. Thinking of the heritage site as a distinct yet integrated landscape allows us to begin to comprehend the heritage site not just as a specific place but also as a cultural phenomenon. Perhaps, most importantly, the heritagescape offers an inclusive framework in which to locate a dialogue about heritage sites. Ultimately, it will enable the opportunity to move research forward and to gain a better and more comprehensive understanding of heritage sites as a cultural construct.

Notes

- [1] Cf. Fowler, *Landscapes for the World*; Hewison (1987).
- [2] Among the more recent are Carman, *Archaeology and Heritage*; Howard, 'The Eco-museum'; Skeates, *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*.
- [3] Tuan, *Space and Place*, *passim*.
- [4] Dicks, *Culture on Display*, 121.
- [5] Jameson, *The Reconstructed Past*; Stone and Planel, *The Constructed Past* (reconstructed sites); Young and Riley, *Theme Park Landscapes* (theme parks).
- [6] In addition to the above, cf. Chappell, 'The Museum and the Joy Tide'; Leask and Yeoman, *Heritage Visitor Attractions*; Trinder, 'A Philosophy for the Industrial Open-air Museum'.
- [7] See, for example, Cooper (1997, p. 157); Laenen (1988); Shanks and Tilley, *Reconstructing Archaeology*, 85.
- [8] Hewison (1987); Walsh (1992, p. 137).
- [9] Prentice (1991).
- [10] Howard, 'The Eco-museum', 67.
- [11] The 2005 UNESCO University and World Heritage Education Forum took this notion as a central theme. It has also been adopted by researchers in a variety of disciplines, e.g. geographer Paul Rodaway's work with 'themescapes'. See Rodaway, *Sensuous Geographies*.
- [12] *Ibid*.
- [13] Psarra, 'Spatial Culture, Way-finding and the Educational Message'.
- [14] McLeod, 'Rethinking Museum Architecture', 12.
- [15] Although this is quite common with archaeological sites (for a recent example see Jones et al., 'Artefacts, Monuments and Cultural Identity', 80–86) but has yet to be applied fully to extant heritage sites.
- [16] Trinder, 'A Philosophy for the Industrial Open-air Museum'; Young, 'Virtue and Irony in a US National Park'.
- [17] Cf. Stone and Planel, *The Constructed Past*, xix.
- [18] For a more detailed description see M.-C. Garden, 'The Heritagescape: Exploring the Phenomenon of the Heritage Site', unpublished PhD diss., Department of Archaeology, University of Cambridge, 2004.

- [19] Shanks and Tilley, *Reconstructing Archaeology*, 83.
- [20] Howard, 'The Eco-museum', 67.
- [21] Pers. comm., Brigitte Kjær, Curator Den Gamle By, Århus, Denmark, April 2001.
- [22] Pers. comm., Simon Woolley, Keeper of Education, Beamish North of England Museum, County Durham, UK, April 2003.
- [23] Pers. comm., Toby Fox, Manager, Flag Fen Bronze Age Centre, Peterborough, UK, December 2002.
- [24] ICOMOS, *Burra Charter*, 1999, and underlies policy papers from English Heritage (2000, 2003) and Historic Scotland (2000).
- [25] Bender, 'Landscape', 3.
- [26] Ibid.
- [27] Davis (2005) does acknowledge the role and importance of change but only within the context of ecomuseums.
- [28] Cf. Handler and Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum*.
- [29] Bruner, 'Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction'; Fowler, *Landscapes for the World*; Handler and Gable, *The New History in an Old Museum*; ICOMOS, *Nara Document on Authenticity*; Worsley, 'Changing Notions of Authenticity'.

References

- Bender, B. 'Landscape—Meaning and Action'. In *Landscape, Politics and Perspectives*, edited by B. Bender. Oxford: Berg, 1993: 1–17.
- Bruner, E. 'Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism'. *American Anthropologist* 25, no. 2 (1994): 397–415.
- Carman, J. *Archaeology and Heritage*. London: Continuum, 2003.
- Chappell, E. 'The Museum and the Joy Tide: Williamsburg Landscapes and the Spectre of Theme Parks'. In *Theme Park Landscapes. Antecedents and Variations*, edited by T. Young and R. Riley, Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Studies in Landscape Architecture, 2002: 119–56.
- Cooper, M. 'The Representation of Time at Two Shaker Village Sites', *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 8(3): 225–245.
- Davis, P. 'Places, "Cultural Touchstones" and the Ecomuseum'. In *Heritage, Museums and Galleries*, edited by G. Corsane. London: Routledge, 2005: 365–376.
- Dicks, B. *Culture on Display. The Production of Contemporary Visitability*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003.
- English Heritage. *Power of Place: The Future of the Historic Environment*. London: English Heritage, 2000.
- . *Heritage Counts*. Swindon: English Heritage, 2003.
- Fowler, P. *Landscapes for the World. Conserving a Global Heritage*. Cheshire: Windgather Press, 2004.
- Handler R. and E. Gable. *The New History in an Old Museum: Creating the Past at Colonial Williamsburg*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.
- Hewison, R. *The Heritage Museum*, London: Methuen, 1987.
- Historic Scotland. *The Stirling Charter*. Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 2003.
- Howard, P. 'The Eco-museum: Innovation that Risks the Future'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 8, no. 1 (2002): 63–72.
- ICOMOS. *The Nara Document on Authenticity*. Available from <http://international.icomos.org/naradoc> (1994) (accessed November 2005).
- . *Burra Charter*. Available from www.icomos.org/australia/burra.html (1999) (accessed November 2005).
- Jameson, J. *The Reconstructed Past: Reconstructions in the Public Interpretation of Archaeology and History*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira, 2004.

- Jones, S., C. Richards et al. 'Artefacts, Monuments and Cultural Identity'. In *The Heart of Neolithic Orkney. World Heritage Site Agenda*. Edinburgh: Historic Scotland, 2005: 80–86.
- Laenen, M. 'The Integration of Museum and Theme Park: The Example of Bokrijk' in D. Uzzell, L. Blud, B. O'Callaghan and P. Davies *The Leverhulme Report: A Strategy for Interpretive and Educational Development*, Ironbridge: Ironbridge Gorge Museums Trust, 1988 .
- Leask A. and I. Yeoman. *Heritage Visitor Attractions. An Operations Management Perspective*. London: Cassell, 1999.
- MacLeod, S. 'Rethinking Museum Architecture. Towards a Site-specific History of Production and Use'. In *Reshaping Museum Space. Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, edited by S. MacLeod. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005: 9–25.
- Parks Canada. *Commercial Heritage Properties Incentive Fund*. Available from http://www.pc.gc.ca/culture/index_E.asp (accessed November 2005).
- Psarra, S. 'Spatial Culture, Way-finding and the Educational Message: The Impact of Layout on the Spatial, Social and Educational Experiences of Visitors to Museums and Galleries'. In *Reshaping Museum Space. Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*, edited by S. MacLeod. Abingdon: Routledge, 2005: 78–94.
- Rodaway, P. *Sensuous Geographies: Body Mind and Sense*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1994.
- Shanks, M. and C. Tilley. *Reconstructing Archaeology. Theory and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Skeates, R. *Debating the Archaeological Heritage*. London: Duckworth, 2000.
- Stone, P. and P. Paniel. *The Constructed Past: Experimental Archaeology, Education and the Public*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Trinder, B. 'A Philosophy for the Industrial Open-air Museum'. In *Conference Report, European Association of Open-Air Museums 1984*: 87–95.
- Tuan, Y.-F. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1977.
- Walsh, K. *The Representation of the Past: Museums and Heritage in a Post Modern World*, London: Routledge, 1992.
- Worsley, L. 'Changing Notions of Authenticity: Presenting a Castle over Four Centuries'. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 10, no. 2 (2004): 129–49.
- Young, T. 'Virtue and Irony in a US National Park'. In *Theme Park Landscapes: Antecedents and Variations*, edited by T. Young and R. Riley. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 2002: 1–10.
- Young, T. and R. Riley, eds. *Theme Park Landscapes: Antecedents and Variations*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Press, 2002.