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ABSTRACT. Cultural landscape (Kulturlandschaft) is the keyword for Historical Geography in German speaking countries. Due to a specific history especially for the term Landschaft a broad spectrum of understandings can be perceived in spatial research. The article gives an overview of different comprehensions and concludes with assignments of specific understandings of Cultural Landscape relating to the current main fields of historic-geographical research being: 1. Historical Geography in a narrow sense aiming to reconstruct and explain former landscapes (Altlandschaften), 2. the Genetic Cultural Landscape Research seeking for the past in the present, 3. the Applied Historical Geography and 4. at last the Historical Cultural Geography. In the first three approaches a morphological understanding of Cultural landscape prevails, in the last case a constructivistic one predominates.
INTRODUCTION

The understanding of Cultural Landscape in a historical-geographical perspective depends on specific contexts, in which this terminus is used. So first of all it seems to be necessary to explain the main working fields of Historical Geographers in German speaking countries, which I will be doing first. The next step is to show the various approaches of (Cultural) Landscape in German spatial research enclosing an excursus to the history of the German word Landschaft to show the multiple reinterpretations of this term since it has been first mentioned in 830 AD. The paper will end with several conclusions.

Main working fields of Historical Geography:

Within the part of geography that deals with the spatial aspects of human existence (mostly called Human geography or Anthropogeography) three fields of research have been emerged, which link the temporal to the spatial dimension:

Historical geography in a narrow sense studies human activities and resulting spatial structures in historical perspective in order to deduce laws of temporal-spatial differentiation. This requires describing, differentiating and explaining the scale and quality of economic, social, political, demographic and natural processes. It also includes the reconstruction of past landscapes (in German: Altlandschaften);

Genetic Cultural Landscape Research seeks to explain present spatial structures and processes in terms of natural processes. It also includes the reconstruction of past landscapes (in German: Altlandschaften);

Historical geography in a narrow sense studies human activities and resulting spatial structures in historical perspective in order to deduce laws of temporal-spatial differentiation. This requires describing, differentiating and explaining the scale and quality of economic, social, political, demographic and natural processes. It also includes the reconstruction of past landscapes (in German: Altlandschaften);

Applied historical geography aims to implement the results of the branches mentioned above in regional planning and environmental education. If sustainable development takes centre stage, it is called cultural landscape conservation (in German: Kulturlandschaftspflege). It includes the cooperation on all levels of planning, from the local to the global level.

In the last few years a sort of Historical Cultural Geography is emerging in Germany in order to connect to certain developments in the English speaking community of Historical Geography, which can be headed new cultural geography, critical geography and critical geopolitics. The key concept of all these approaches is Cultural Landscape. This terminus connects two very imprecisely defined concepts in European policy and intellectual history, even the words ‘landscape’ and ‘culture’ taken by itself do have a variety of meanings. In the following remarks I will only focus on the term ‘landscape’ without discerning the interpretation of the word ‘culture’ as well as it would go beyond the scope of this discussion.

UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE TERMINUS ‘LANDSCAPE’ IN GERMANY’S SPATIAL RESEARCH [1]

Landscape is one of the most principal, widely used and, hence, very imprecisely defined concepts in European policy and intellectual history of the last century. Consequently there is a wide variety of connotations of landscape which may, by all means, be useful: for instance, to integrate different perspectives and ideas as a prerequisite for the implementation of interdisciplinary research projects; or to stimulate discussions about the qualities of space in the context of spatial planning processes with predominantly sectoral perspectives.

However, in the latter case, the term Cultural Landscape (in German: Kulturlandschaft) is rather used to confine to the difference of the landscape terminology in nature conservation. Please refer to ‘Cultural Landscape’ as it is defined in the German Regional Planning Act (in German: Raumordnungsgesetz). It is
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virtually synonymous with the definition of landscape in the European Landscape Convention of the European Council of the year 2000. The Convention is the pivotal document for European landscape policy. In article 1 it is said that “Landscape means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”.

However, the wide variety of connotations of landscape is also a source of misunderstandings. It is illusionary to hope for one universal and consistent concept of landscape. In 2012 Leibenath and Gailing [2] offer a guiding framework to organise the plurality of concepts and to allow scientists and practitioners a certain kind of self-positioning (see Figure 1). The authors elucidate the framework comprehensively using literature references and concise quotations. Based on that, in the following, only key aspects of the conception of landscape are highlighted.

Number 1 in Figure 1 describes a landscape conception that is sometimes applied to landscape ecology and physical geography. In this respect a distinction should be made between landscape as an ecosystem and landscape as a space in terms of a container or box that encompasses everything 'inside' or rather anything 'that is there'. Regarding the latter landscape epitomises a composition of all existing objects in an area or a limited section of the earth’s surface.

Number 2 encompasses all landscape conceptions that are connected to human-environment-relationships. Most likely this is the majority of landscape concepts. In this regard the term culture is associated with agriculture in historical or landscape research and in preservation approaches (derived from the Latin word “colere” meaning “cultivate, sustainable use of resources, adore”). However, other sociological and cultural sciences associate the term culture with more open and, to some extent, opposing concepts, thus being hybrid definitions of the term, if the human dimension of the term landscape is to be emphasised, which holds true in this case. Therefore, in figure 1 and in the following text the term 'culture' is used as a compound to the word 'landscape' but put in brackets. Depending on the understanding of the human-environment-relationship different aspects are emphasised. As a result the sub-concepts 2.1 to 2.4 in figure 1 have emerged:

2.1 focuses on physical aspects of the human-environment-relationship. Most generally this concept describes any section of the earth’s surface that is influenced by man as well as by the interaction between natural and anthropogenic factors. This understanding is expressed in the definition of (cultural) landscape in the UNESCO world heritage convention from 1991 in article 1 as “combined works of nature and of man”.

The sub-concept 2.2 emphasises mental, subject-related aspects. The German conceptual history of the word 'Landschaft' reveals that during the modern era the term indicates a visual section of the earth in the sense of an image. Some authors define landscape accordingly by saying that landscape is an aesthetic category and a vivid and ideal state in which one can read into it beyond actual physical perception.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essentialistic and ontological concepts (based on direct observations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “Landscape” as an actual, physical area or ecosystem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. »(cultural) landscape« in the context of man-environment relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Emphasising physical aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. »(cultural) landscape« as a figurative/metaphoric term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexive-constructivist concepts (based on indirect observations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. »(cultural) landscape« as arena of communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Orientation framework of (cultural) landscape concepts in Germany [2]
Number 2.3 is the most complex concept. The sub-concept expresses that (cultural) landscape can be interpreted as physical expression of social conditions and interactions but, at the same time, as the foundation of social structuring and interactions. It is a conceptualisation of (cultural) landscape as artefact and medium of social practice and, for this reason, also as a historical artefact.

Cultural Landscape is described as a symbol in 2.4. Evidence can be found in literature that both terminologies, the physically defined (cultural) landscapes and the terms 'landscape' alternatively 'cultural landscape' are recognised as symbols.

The metaphorical use of the terms 'landscape' or 'cultural landscape' is prevalent in number 3. But this (cultural) landscape metaphor is, by no means, limited to spatial or space based issues. One can differentiate between landscape as a metonymical label of socially interacting networks and landscape as a metaphor for the entirety of phenomena belonging to some sort of phenomena sphere, for example landscape of sentiments or landscape of political parties.

The understanding of the (cultural) landscape concept in number 4 is no longer based on direct observation but is rather embedded in a deontological and anti-essentialistic context. How do people deal with terms like 'landscape' and 'cultural landscape'; how are these terms being used; what do persons refer to when using them; how is social realness and truth constructed by language and how is perception and assessment regulated by linguistic means. This is the (Cultural) landscape concept of discourse analysis. One has applied the concept if the construction of (Cultural) landscape ontologies is reflected. Therefore it is called a reflexive-constructivistic concept of cultural landscape.

The previous section has revealed that a certain opinion has become accepted in cultural sciences during the last decades meaning that 'landscape' has been more than a mere 'constellation of natural facts', but rather a piece of earth with a relationship to man and, hence, a reflexive entity. But if landscape is perceived as socially constructed rather than physically given, it must be asked, which different terms and definitions have emerged against the background of different cultural imprints. The socially constructed character of the term “landscape” is shown in the following short history of the German word 'Landschaft'.

EXCURSUS: SHORT HISTORY OF THE TERM 'LANDSCHAFT'

Several studies confirm the association of landscape with non-urban areas or even with nature in common parlance. This is due to a complex, historic-cultural process spanning more than 1200 years and starting in 830 AD with the first evidence in archives of the word lantschaft. Essentially, there are three interwoven aspects:

• The Old High German word lantschaft that is introduced in 830 AD for the first time describes a politically defined area in terms of territory and region. Besides, large-scale settlements and tribal communities without areas of unspoiled nature are documented with it. The Middle High German word lantschaft “diu diet” denotes the population of a nation that is occasionally referred to as natives; but above all, the word denotes the entirety of people within a territory that are capable of political action. In relation to the constitutional institution of 'landscape' one refers to groups that are involved in political decision-making processes;

• The development to a ‘visual excerpt of nature’, a terminus technicus in painting since the Middle Ages, is a second source of the contemporary meaning of landscape as a picture. Subsequently, a trend can be observed towards an equalisation of the term with a definable and small-scale spatial area without political implications;

• Until the 18th century the word landscape is only used in specific contexts; after that it became an inherent part of everyday language. Particularly the educated classes used the word on a high stylistic level based on the early modern technical language of the painters. From this time forth, it intertwined with facets of the aesthetic world-view of the well-educated middle class (Bildungsbürgertum) in the 18th and 19th century. Nowadays it is associated with partially discredited conceptions of the early 20th century (for example, of the homeland protection movement (Heimatschutzbewegung)). In this respect the meaning of the term particularly resonated with conceptions of an anticipation of a humanised inner and outer nature and of a successful mediation of society and territory, at least, with an anti-urban attitude.

Possibly, as early as around 1900 physiognomic aspects and facets of regionalisation melded. As a consequence two traditions of thought on how to use the word landscape can be derived: the first one is
about a 'naive ideology' and 'landscape focused nature paintings' emphasising descriptive aspects and a 'beautiful and rural' physiognomy. The second is consistent with the tradition of regionalisation which means a way of thinking that is connected to zonating and subdividing the earth in terrestrial regions. The first tradition of thought led to a conception of landscape as a non-urban, open and not built-up area used in colloquial language. Geography as a scientific discipline incorporated the second aspect without eliminating the first, and, to some extent, even without being aware of it. The differentiation of land and landscape which is usually carried out in this discipline implies that the geographic conception of landscape also refers to the aesthetic sphere of its origin. This is conciliated by Alexander Humboldt. Thus, this conception is composed in the analysis of landscape as an 'aesthetic notion of nature'. Interpreting landscape as a biased term with many connotations in the context of scientific logic would lead to the conclusion that it is impossible to derive a universal definition of the term. Therefore it could only be used colloquial. But instead, the vagueness facilitates enormous opportunities for a variety of connotations, especially, if it is used in standard and high-level language.

This short outline of the history of Landschaft shows, that the term Landschaft has been manifold reinterpreted being the reason why it is open for a broad spectrum of possible definitions and explorations.

CONCLUSIONS: CULTURAL LANDSCAPE IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY
Looking at the sketched background discussions the definition of landscape was exceedingly intense especially within the geographic disciplines because the landscape concept was regarded as determinative until the 1960s. Beforehand most geographers believed that landscape was the constitutive object of their discipline. During the scientific turn of the discipline in the 1970s, the term landscape lost its significance. In fact, the term was entirely rejected except in the branches 'historical geography' and nature-related 'physical geography'. In this respect the historical geographer is akin to the physical geographer.

1. If historical geographers are working in reconstructing former landscapes, as mentioned in chapter 1, a continuous accent on the morphogenetic approach is found, closely related to the definitions given in number 1 till 2 in Fig. 1. That understanding is closely related to the kind of meaning used in settlement archaeology, settlement history, and – as mentioned by some physical geographers – furthermore to some environmental disciplines with a historical approach, for example forest and vegetation history. In this context Historical Geography seems to be a discipline between humanities and sciences, because it gains its knowledge from three different types of sources: from written documents and cartographic sources, from the landscape itself and from data obtained by scientific methods. With respect to the Genetic Cultural Landscape Research these understandings of Cultural landscape are common, too, linking it to Applied historical geography. Visible elements and structures of the cultural landscapes are mapped, explained, evaluated and put into inventories. The specific definition of cultural landscape depends on the regulations and targets of the planning process. In most cases it is also a morphogenetic approach.

2. If historical geographers feel obliged to Historical Cultural Geography they follow more or less the constructivist’s kind of understandings of landscape as defined in number 4 in figure 1. Currently one rarely finds this approach in the circle of German speaking Historical Geographers.
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