

Kristin Ilves

**THE SEAMAN'S PERSPECTIVE
IN LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY**
Landing sites on the maritime cultural landscape

This paper examines mankind's connection with the sea, shore and coastal areas – that is, with the maritime cultural landscape. It is suggested that archaeologists dealing with maritime landscapes should get inspiration from the seaman's perspective in studying the impact of maritime elements within the culture under investigation. The features of navigation, piloting and safe landfall can be revealed only by approaching the landscape from the sea; the role of the water vessels is impossible to avoid. The question of the seasonal distinctions in landscape studies is also raised. Different places for landing, being the most popular and investigated antiquities in the maritime environment, are seldom defined in landscape archaeological research, and terms denoting different types of sites are often used as synonyms. Based on the inevitable dependence of landing sites upon watercrafts, these places are analysed in time and space.

Käsitletud on merenduslikku kultuurmaastikku ehk inimese suhet mere, kalda ja rannaladega. Merendusliku kultuurmaastiku uurimisel on rannamaastikuga tegelevatel arheoloogidel soovitatud leida inspiratsiooni meremehe perspektiivist, milles taevast, meri, merepõhi, mere- ja maamärgid on seotud navigeerimise, lootsimise ja ohutu maabumisega. Maastiku nimetatud merenduslike aspektide hindamine on võimalik üksnes mere poolt lähenedes, sealjuures on oluline veesõiduki roll. Püstitatakse kõnealuse perspektiivi probleematika seoses aastaegade muutustega. Erinevad randumispaidad on ühed huvitavaimad muistsed merenduslikul kultuurmaastikul, kuid arheoloogilises uurimistöös pole randumiskohti märkivaid termineid sageli defineeritud ja tihti on üksteisest erinevaid mõisteid kasutatud sünonüümidena. Toetudes randumispaidade vältimatule sõltuvusele veesõidukitest, on avatud nimetatud kohti tähistavate mõistete sisu ning analüüsitud neid ajas ja ruumis.

Kristin Ilves, Ajaloo Instituut (Department of Archaeology, Institute of History), Rüütli 6, 10130 Tallinn, Estonia; kristin.ilves@ai.ee

Introduction

The Estonian coastline on the Baltic Sea is 3780 km, of which the mainland coastline is 1240 km, and 2540 km consists of archipelagos. There are 1502 islands in Estonian waters, approximately 9% of the total land area,¹ i.e. 4133 km². It is

¹ Estonian land area is 45 227 km².

obvious that these numbers by themselves do not demonstrate the connection of the culture with the sea, yet they point to the strong connection between the natural landscape and the Baltic Sea. For this reason the question of man's relationship to the sea, which changes the natural environment near the sea into a maritime cultural landscape, will arise in the study of mankind's history in our coastal areas. Considering that the inhabitation of the Baltic islands, at that time not seen from the mainland, dates back to the Mesolithic period in some cases (Kriiska 2001), it is logical to assume that the sea was always more than just a body of water where the other shore could not be seen.

In this article I will concentrate on mankind's connection with the sea, the shore and coastal areas, that is, on the maritime cultural landscape. I will therefore look at the term, maritime cultural landscape, and present one possibility to explain and understand this term – approaching and looking at the landscape from the seaside, from a boat/ship, and getting inspiration from the seaman's perspective.

This subject is of importance considering that the base for mobility and thus for communication between people before airborne traffic and the Internet was definitely water and transportation over waters. Estonian research on maritime sites has so far been more concerned with perspectives from the land. This is usual even if an archaeologist is physically working “within former coastal waters” with the sites connected to the sea. The characteristics of water, e.g. salinity, currents, waves or underwater topography, and their impact on mankind's everyday life, especially on building the watercrafts, are seldom considered. But land and sea are interdependent on each other. My objective is to draw attention to this new perspective in landscape archaeology, which will notably broaden the discipline. At the same time, I will discuss the obvious obstacles that seasonal features, the formation of ice in particular, constitutes in using the seaside perspective. Also, I want to present some possible definitions for different landing sites – one of the more interesting land-based features of the maritime landscape. The terms describing these places – usually landing-place and harbour – are often used as synonyms in Estonian archaeology and, apart from the differences between these terms, they are seldom defined; but the term is an expression of the concept itself. The topic of discussion will be illustrated with examples from the biggest island in Estonia – Saaremaa – and in light of the project “Coastal Settlements on Prehistoric and Medieval Saaremaa”, financed by the Estonian Science Foundation (Grant No. 5432). Within the framework of the Project, the coastal settlement of the island and landing sites in particular will be viewed from both the sea and the land.

The maritime cultural landscape

People live and learn in the landscape. We give a meaning to the landscape through the impact of memories, legends and names, even smells, which are connected with different places in the landscape. However, fields, forests,

mountains, waters, coasts and shores are not just constructions we create, but they exist in time and space. Humans with physically existing landscapes are the ones who give to nature a form of culture. An interaction between nature and culture in a maritime surrounding can be expressed as the maritime cultural landscape.²

The maritime cultural landscape is connected with two main factors: firstly, the landscape has to be in relation to a coast – the maritime factor. Secondly, mankind's presence (by living in the landscape or by using physical/psychical ideas connected with the landscape) is important and constitutes the cultural factor. Therefore, a cultural landscape is an interaction between human being and landscape. Humans who consider one particular landscape as belonging to them, or who have some kind of relationship with the landscape, leave traces – “fingerprints” – there over time. These traces can be material, seen physically in the environment, but they can also be nonmaterial.

The interaction between maritime nature and culture has in cultural terms, as briefly mentioned above, different scales. The place of action overcomes an apparent division between nature and culture in addressing the physical environment. Even if the features of the landscape are wholly natural they can still be discussed in terms of how they are drawn upon and reproduced by people (Firth 1995). The classical example would be a person who enjoys a view of a sea without “using” the sea – in that case the sea has also a cultural relevance, which is often underestimated. Still, in the present article, such aspects will not be analysed despite their acknowledgement.

Only in the antiquarian point of view, being centred on objects, can the maritime cultural landscape be understood as the traces of human activity in the past or present that have remained both under and above the water. We can at the same time speak of material remains and, for example, about the information retained in the oral tradition i.e. the nonmaterial remains. Interpreting the term more analytically, it comprises the whole network of sailing routes, old as well as new, with ports along the coast, and its related constructions and remains of human activity, under water as well as above water (Westerdahl 1986, 7; 1989, 313). Nonmaterial aspects such as local tradition, shipbuilding traditions and place names, when taken into consideration, give additional meaning to material relics like shipwrecks, landing-places, different types of harbours, ballast-sites, sea- and landmarks.

The listed cultural elements in the maritime landscape are material and non-material and, according to Marek E. Jasinski (1993, 138), both of these categories have two possible meanings:

² The term “maritime cultural landscape” was first introduced in 1979–80 and further developed by Christer Westerdahl. His work in northern Sweden 1975–80, his description of the maritime cultural landscape in Norrland and the systematic approach used there (Westerdahl 1987; 1989) have influenced similar works elsewhere in the world (e.g. Crumlin-Pedersen *et al* 1996; Ulriksen 1998; Parker 1999; Dobat 2002).

- (a) material remains with a practical meaning – e.g. landing sites, ships, sea and landmarks, different constructions under and above water,
- (b) material remains with a symbolic meaning – e.g. art used in shipbuilding, iconography, chapels, churches,
- (c) nonmaterial remains with a practical meaning – e.g. practical skills and technologies connected with category (a),
- (d) nonmaterial remains with a symbolic meaning – as mythology, legends, traditions and adventures.

Beside the aforementioned, there are also remains, which belong to several groups at the same time and which are difficult to classify. The example of place-names and ship burials would be typical. But also meaning ascribed to large heaps of stones erected by people – cairns – can be cited here. There is a possible practical explanation of cairns having been primarily erected as navigation marks, but it is impossible to avoid the fact that they may have been erected as sepulchral monuments as well, thus carrying an additional symbolic meaning (Hägström 1998, 398–399). In all cases, in getting knowledge about the meaning of material and nonmaterial remains, the archaeologist's background and specialisation has a big influence on interpretations.

As long as the cultural elements with practical meaning are the objects of investigation, we have a good chance of studying and understanding man and society, in the hope that our functional interpretations are true. When the symbolic side of history is under discussion, the situation becomes more difficult. To interpret these elements, we should know the language of symbols with which we are not acquainted. The extremist post-processualist archaeologists Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley opine that material culture is a material language and they suggest it be read as we would read a text (1987, 210–211; Tilley 1989). Still, then we have to know the language that the text is written in, but we will never know how “true” our understanding is. Even if we pick up any number of words with a universal meaning, the reconstruction of the text will only be our personal understanding of the past (Jasinski 1993, 140). As the past tends to be written in a language we do not know, the learning of which is beyond our possibilities, or at least, extremely difficult, we will never **entirely** penetrate the semantic meaning of this language. Understanding the symbolic side of material culture is only an endeavour with speculative consequences, but still, one of the major tasks in archaeology.

Regarding the interpretation above, it is important to remember that the maritime cultural landscape constitutes a part of landscape in a wider sense,³ that these terms complement each other and their separation rests mostly on geographical aspects and they broaden the landscape archaeological research in general. Still, in the case of the maritime cultural landscape, the geographical aspect of the utilisation of space is in a key position. No sea – no maritime cultural landscape.

³ On the terrestrial counterpart of the maritime cultural landscape in archaeology see, for example, Lang 1999; 2001 and on more about the relationship between these two concepts, Ilves 2002.

This fact makes it particularly significant to study not only the cultural factors, but also the natural conditions, different coastal types in particular, as well as the sea – the waves and the currents, the shallow and deep waters, the underwater rocks and grounds. Accordingly, the total topographical vision of the coastal area should be added to the study of cultural remains; deep curves under the water have the same importance as the characteristics of the land nearby.

Seaman's perspective

A dwelling place situated by the shore can be approached and interpreted both from seaward and from land. The latter has always been in use and the spatial connection with waterfields is acknowledged both in the physical and economic sense (see, for example, Jaanits *et al* 1982; Vedru 2001; Kriiska 2002). However, in dealing with the actively used ancient or present day maritime cultural landscape, that is, a landscape where the inhabitants are engaged in maritime activities, it has to be reconstructed and/or seen from the sea as well. Waters also have, beside their spatial importance, their own meaning and characteristics that ought to be considered. The role of these features is crucial in the building of watercrafts, and choosing the landing site or dwelling place in general. In recommending the “from sea to land” perspective I am referring to the method suggested by the philosopher Jacob Meløe (1990, 73): one should situate oneself within the practice that the *object* belongs to, and then investigate the object and *its* contribution to that practice.

People have travelled on open waters from the beginning of seaborne activity. Actually, open sea is safer in good weather than coastal waters: one can always sail without worrying about shallowness or underwater obstacles. Navigation is possible without any special instruments as the sea has its own form and features. Even in deep waters, one can determine the boat's position using the sun or stars, the waves, drifting litter, clouds, seabirds, etc. That is why unexpected and uncontrollable landing is the biggest danger for seamen (excepting violent storms).

The Baltic Sea near Estonia is filled with islands and grounds. The depths of the water and the seabed are diverse and varying. The coastal area of the islands is mostly shallow and the seabed stony. In some cases, it is extremely difficult for those who do not know the special characteristics of the islands' coast to land in the shelf sea even with low draught boats. For example, waters near the whole southern coast of Saaremaa are relatively shallow and have many mounds of sand, which tend to change their position under influence from winds and waves (Orviku 1992, 19–20). But even a higher water level does not automatically mean better possibilities for waterborne transport. Currents may strongly affect the landing process. Fishing grounds in the past could only be discovered by observing and describing the waters in which fishermen move. It is impossible to find out these kinds of things by looking at them from the side of the land.

In the study of archaeological or historical cultural landscapes in the maritime environment, it is most important to see the landscape and settlement (more widely – the world) as the seamen and fishermen did in the past, approaching the shore from the sea or from the rivers. Ole Crumlin-Pedersen (cited from Parker 2001, 23) considers it to be the major objective of maritime archaeology. I had a similar perspective even before I read this opinion. Considering the information above, I believe that only seeing is unfortunately not enough, even if it would definitely be so much easier. In the case of a maritime cultural landscape everything cannot simply be seen; it is of importance to **know** this landscape. For evaluating the maritime aspects of historical landscape, archaeologists have to investigate the impact of maritime elements, such as the heavens, sea, seabed, sea and landmarks, which are connected with navigation, piloting and safe landfall. In this endeavour it can be useful to gain a “seaman’s perspective”, which allows new questions to be asked. Approaching the maritime landscape from land, which is of course another possibility in landscape studies, the perspective will be different, with other kinds of factors in focus, and it is impossible to learn to know the whole maritime landscape in this way.

Unfortunately, the task to see the landscape from the perspective of the seaman is rather problematic in the context of the past. The landscape is continuously changing. On the open sea, but on the shore in particular, it is very difficult to reconstruct the past circumstances as the seaman experienced these at that time. Although climate and weather conditions could have been almost the same in the past as nowadays (Aston 1985, 19), other elements of the maritime environment, especially the sea level, have changed. For example, in Saaremaa the water level of many rivers has dramatically decreased or the rivers have totally vanished, an unknown number of harbours have been filled with mud and sediment. The role of the land upheaval is notable; it is probably the most important factor in the maritime landscape of Estonia. Within these long-term processes, storms, the spreading of the riverside areas, and most of all, interference by humans, also play a vital part. At the same time, natural processes, such as erosion, can considerably change the maritime landscape – even destroying entire harbours.

From the very beginning of seaborne activity until the present day, it has always been wind, and processes connected to wind, that have been in the centre of all meteorological events. For thousands of years wind and sea have been the crucial factors, which made it possible to communicate between lands and nations – during the Viking Age and at the beginning of the Middle Ages Saaremaa had a leading position in the overseas contacts in the region. Being the westernmost island in Estonia, Saaremaa and its western and southern territories in particular belong to an area of extreme winds, and among which the dangerous SW winds clearly dominate⁴ (Ohu 1926). At the same time, these territories are very foggy.

⁴ SW winds and storms, which usually take place in the cold season of the year, from September to January, are considered to be the most dangerous because they move against the main streams of the Baltic Sea; often a sea level rise accompanies SW storms (Soomere 2001, 209).

Furthermore, a bigger refraction of the beams of light is characteristic to the area, causing difficulties in visual estimation of distance. Thus, seafaring in the waters near Saaremaa always demanded great experience and skills. Accordingly, an archaeologist using “the seaman’s perspective” and dealing with the maritime cultural landscape of Saaremaa or the cultural landscape of this area in general, should have additional knowledge in geology, geography, meteorology and, of course, shipping and navigation. To find out the potential transition points in the maritime cultural landscape of Saaremaa – the places for landing, topographically well-protected sites, within the archaeologically interesting areas with easy access from both land and sea, should be taken into account. The different geological processes of coastal areas – the coast formations⁵ and changes⁶ – must be also considered.

Regardless of the changes in environment and climate, present day environments can still be useful as an analogy for the past. At least certain similarities prevail, particularly in the case of maritime landscapes. Incorporation of different models such as Geographical Information Systems (GIS) into this type of study would be useful. In my opinion, concerning the spiritual needs and requirements of human societies in the maritime cultural landscape, the study of these aspects always remains speculative. Even if there exists an experience of nature, aesthetic pleasure or historical experience, and the attempt to bring oneself closer to these things is fully justified, I prefer to focus on how mankind lived in the maritime landscape, rather than on the manner in which it was experienced. Whether functional or aesthetic aspects of the landscape were decisive in people’s choices, both of these decision categories is mirrored most of all in the water vessels – the boat’s hull is designed to fit the weather and the waters in which it moves.

To see the landscape as the seaman and/or fisherman does, it is important to have a boat. The life of societies, which to a high degree are dependent on maritime culture, revolves mainly around the boat and its equipment, and not, in the same sense, for example around the fish. Catching fish is connected with luck, combined in some way with skill⁷, building a boat, repairing a boat, keeping it in good shape and handling it in all sorts of weather, that takes skill (Meløe 1990, 69). It is quite natural that you hope and pray to catch a fish and it may be a successful tactic, but it is impossible to build, repair and handle a boat only with the help of magic. Thus, the study of shipwrecks, but most of all, the procedures of working

⁵ The coast of Saaremaa can be in general divided into two different categories, which can be characterised as follows – in southern Saaremaa there are sediments which play a decisive role, and coasts actively change due to the waves that move the sediments; in northern Saaremaa, cliffs, limestone pits and quarries are typical because of the limestone, which has become denuded; this process also results in shore banks (Orviku 1992, 19–23).

⁶ The main coast changing factors are 1) deficiency of ice near the coast and unfrozen sediments, 2) the continuing rise of the water level in the world, which cannot be compensated by land upheaval, 3) extreme wind events, 4) interference from humans (Orviku 1992, 29–34).

⁷ It is a matter of (probably intensive) debate on how much skill and how much luck actually go into catching fish.

ships and transferring cargoes can be one base for reconstructing the seaman's perspective.

Thanks to the boat, the seaman and/or fisherman learns the landscape to which he has wedded his life (Meløe 1990, 69). It is from a boat the seaman learns to know the weather and waterfields. Of course, the legends and stories told by others, active seafaring people, have their own impact in understanding the landscape. But whether we speak about the experiences one learns or about the stories of the others, the basic scheme is still the same – the maritime cultural landscape reveals itself from a boat and the boat is the place from which the world is seen.

The winter landscape

The discussion above will have a “slightly” different meaning in the case of winter, when the sea and the coastal waters in particular are covered with ice. If the temperature of the Baltic Sea water falls only a little under 0°C, ice starts to form. There have been occasions when the whole Baltic Sea has been frozen and crusted with ice – it was possible to even ride a horse from Estonia to Sweden in 1459, and in 1893 any kind of shipping was impossible for two months (Mey 1927, 7–8). Orientation under these conditions was probably still similar to navigation on an open sea, but directed more to the heavens – the sun, stars, clouds and winds are year-round features. Examples of crossing the entire Baltic Sea on ice are still rare. Considering the wind conditions in our region, which are the main factors in the formation of ice, the open sea is usually navigable.

There is no doubt that the landscape changes dramatically during winter and so do the perspectives. Fishing and hunting continues despite the ice, but it is feasible without the special vessels for transportation over the waters. The meaning of *maritime* diminishes and the fact that the maritime cultural landscape is a part of landscape in a wider sense becomes more obvious.

During winter, I count the seawater as an element disappearing (temporarily) from the coastal settlers' so-called landscape consciousness and the latter is projected into the waterline/waterfront (water as space). This is generally the case for Estonians, in the opinion of Hannes Palang and Mart Külvik (1999, 373). Still, when people are engaged in maritime activities, and the maritime cultural experience and tradition have been accumulated from generation to generation, water as an element is equally important to water as space. It is the natural geography of different zones and the characteristics of the water to which the boats/ships are intimately adapted.

It should be emphasised that the definition of, for example, an object or landscape is only a theoretical tool that can be changed in the course of an investigation. The maritime cultural landscape is not so dependent on geographical, geological or meteorological conditions during wintertime. Actually, it hardly differs at all from the cultural landscape on the land as it is in winter. Large areas covered

with snow, like ice and snow crusted waterfields, can be found a long way inland, even in Estonia. At the same time it is unnecessary to compare these two landscapes visually as already the leaf fall in forests and snow cover will create totally different conditions for land travel such as a frozen sea offers for sea voyages. Thus, transportation conditions are very different and have a seasonal character both on sea and land (see also Bērziņš 2000). The terms of maritime cultural landscape and terrestrial cultural landscape fuse, and the studies of winter landscapes in general would be a totally new option.

Watercrafts and landing sites

As expressed above, coastal territories can be explored and known only with the help of a boat and knowledge on the features of the local sea. From the beginning of the history of seafaring, there have been many different kinds of vessels for transportation over the waters. The first archaeologically known “real” boats in the Baltic Sea region were dugouts and animal skin boats, and from these developed the largest and most complex “machines” built by mankind in pre-industrialised European society – plank boats, and finally, great ships⁸ (Crumlin-Pedersen 1999, 11). Unfortunately, we do not know much about these early plank boats, but the knowledge we have allows the guess that these vessels demanded no special sites for landing, as their construction was suitable for landing on almost every coast.⁹

During the decades of maritime archaeology, the number of archaeologically recorded watercrafts has grown (McGrail 2001). In the Baltic Sea region, these date mostly from the 9th to the 14th centuries, and with a few finds of wrecks from the 7th and 8th centuries they allow statements to be made about ship-building traditions and variations within the period. For the present discussion, it is important to point out that, beside personnel carriers, cargo carriers first appear in the 9th century and then rise dramatically in number. Earlier ships – personnel carriers in their primary function – are all basically similar in type and construction, but the wreck Ralswiek 4 from the 9th century is the first indicator of specialized cargo ships in the Baltic Sea. A single find of a cargo carrier should nevertheless not be taken as the proof of specialisation; still, different ship finds from the 10th century and onwards (for example, Klåstad, Åskekärr, Ralswiek 1, Hedeby 2) suggest that some ships were from then on designed especially for cargo carrying. Since the 11th century there is already a well-developed cargo transportation system, based on three classes of ships – small, medium and large (for more detail, see Crumlin-Pedersen 1991; 1999).

⁸ Boats are vessels with the hull no longer than 12 meters; the term ship is used for vessels with a hull longer than 12 meters.

⁹ The impact of sea and weather, as discussed above, differs from place to place and had its own role to play.

At the same time, the development of shipbuilding demands changes in the places for landing – the building, using and abandonment of landing sites depend on water vessels. Landing is the most important task for every sea voyage. It is a process where a ship/boat approaches the coast/shore from the sea (or lake/river) to the depth that is safe for the vessel. In the case of smaller boats it comprises also the disembarking. Any types of landing sites are thus important transition points in crossing the line between water and land: and these are now gaining an important position in archaeological landscape research. Dan Carlsson's investigation of these places on Iron Age Gotland, and the vast number of landing sites he detected (Carlsson 1987; 1991), became the first step in the search of sites for landing. His work and methods¹⁰ are often considered as a source of inspiration, also in case of the Estonian research on landing sites.

The investigations of late Iron Age Saaremaa by Marika Mägi in the mid-1990s showed clear connections between settlement units and possible landing sites (Mägi 1998; 1999; 2000). Based on these results and in the pattern of the landing sites' investigation in the Baltic Sea region, the project – “Coastal Settlements on Prehistoric and Medieval Saaremaa” – started in Estonia in 2003. The research concentrates on settlement units along the coast of Saaremaa, analysing their establishment, development, and their connection with maritime activities from the Bronze Age until early medieval times. It is a pilot project that is, for the first time in Estonia, focusing on the symbiotic relationship between terrestrial/agricultural and maritime cultural landscapes (see Mägi's article in the same issue for more details). The position of the landing sites in the transition zone between land and sea offers the best possibilities for the analyses.

There are many denotations for landing sites – from natural harbour, anchorage and landing-place to harbour, port and haven.¹¹ Despite the different meanings of some of these terms, they all (but especially the names of landing-place and harbour) are frequently used as synonyms, or functionally the most neutral name – landing site – is used. Often the term of harbour is preferred. Reasons behind this situation are the already ingrained oral tradition, the place-names in active use, and the former scientific writing tradition in Estonia, which was driven by archaeologists not deeply interested in maritime sites. And, of course, if we define a harbour simply as a place of departure and arrival for watercrafts we do not need any other term, as every place in the coast/shore, where a landing process is practicable, is a harbour. Still, I believe that in academic research a distinction

¹⁰ In order to localise landing places, Carlsson used a method based on several indicators for maritime activities. Three criteria were the most decisive: 1) favourable topographical situations with regard to the landing of ships and activities on land; 2) graves or grave fields close to the coast; 3) a special situation in the cultural landscape as revealed on historical maps, which differs from normal conditions (for example, cultivated fields near the coast in absence of a farm or old roads meeting on the coast). Characteristic place-names marking a locality as formerly related to trade activity or witness the function of a site as a landing-place, as well as the existence of medieval structures like strongholds or Romanesque churches on the coast, were used as secondary indicators (Carlsson 1991).

¹¹ This is not meant as a complete list of terms.

would be more correct, especially concerning the growing interest in these places – usage of the term “harbour” would equalise all the landing sites and their types through all the ages with one another, which is not proper. I will present here one possible and quite simplified way of defining landing sites without demanding that it be seen as an absolute truth. The following discussion is based on the above analysis on the seaman's perspective in landscape archaeology and on the importance of the development of watercrafts for landing sites.

The name used throughout this article – *landing site* or *place for landing* – is the starting point for the following discussion. The reason for such frequent usage is the neutral and wide character of this term as a marker for the passages between water and land. It implies **every** place on the coast, on riverside areas, and lakes, with constructions or not, where the landing process is or was possible. This term extends from the (pre)historical age until the present day.

I consider *natural harbour* to be the first term to use if we move from the simple landing sites to more complex ones. To distinguish this term further from the term “harbour”, I suggest the term of *anchorage* is also not wrong. This term prevails throughout history and appears in the case of almost every body of water. It denotes a place on a coast or shore with a suitable topography and a bottom for the landing process or finding a shelter, where humans usually do not interfere with the appearance or the features of the site. Anchorages are and were everywhere on coasts, and they just have to be recognised. Without sailing a vessel this would be impossible, and a good anchorage can only be found from the side of the water; it takes a seaman's skill to recognise such a place (Meløe 1990, 72). Of course, every anchorage is not suitable for all vessels – different boat/ship types can use different natural harbours. As anchorages are and were more places for refuge and were seldom interdependent on terrestrial sites, archaeological evidence for natural harbours is almost impossible to find, except with the great exception of discovering a shipwreck.

A *landing-place* acts as a natural harbour, where a suitable topography is a presumption for its existence. It does not need to, but usually does, include some kind of construction, and is the place where boats can be drawn ashore. Structures are important for landing in a way that does not presuppose building a new vessel for again going to sea. Landing-places will therefore be projected by the practice of using smaller boats. The difference between a landing-place and an anchorage is, that while a natural harbour is often used only occasionally, in case of need, landing-places are used frequently and they are definitely connected with terrestrial life.

As there are many places on the coast matching the definition of a landing-place, of a different size and character, additional terms are needed. Therefore, the term *specialised landing-place* can be used for bigger sites that function as regional or local markets¹² while smaller, more natural places would be named simply landing-places.

¹² Mägi uses *harbour site* instead of the term *specialised landing-place*.

Anchorage and even landing-places have existed in nature all the time, just waiting to be found. The sites that we could call *harbours* appeared in the Baltic Sea region only when the development of ships achieved a size which made it impossible to land without suitable constructions. Thus, harbours on the coasts of the Baltic Sea became a reality since the 10th–11th centuries, in some cases the 9th century, when boats and ships became increasingly bigger with each century and they were too large for their crews to draw ashore. A harbour is understood as a place on the shore, which is prepared to anchor up a boat/ship for shelter in most sorts of weather, that is, with a bottom of a material that will hold an anchor, and special, permanent constructions for landing a vessel. The interference of humans is needed for the proper functioning of the harbour – the port service possibilities are one of the most important factors in defining the harbour. The ports have hinterlands, which are different in size for different types of harbours.

The definitions given above are simple and logical by themselves when one takes watercrafts as a starting-point. The functional classification is in accordance with the development of shipbuilding as it is studied through the archaeologically investigated finds of wrecks. As mentioned earlier, landing sites are meant for ships, not the opposite. Still, uniting this theoretical, ship-centred construction with land-based archaeology, a problem occurs with archaeological material from the Baltic Sea region, which implies big coastal trading-centres with a notable hinterland already since the 7th–8th centuries (e.g. Hedeby, Fröjel, Paviken). Even though the archaeologically documented ships give no proof for the existence of specialised and totally different ship types of that period that would need special constructions for landing,¹³ it is difficult to define these aforementioned trading places as (specialised) landing-places. To resolve this situation, I would propose a term *proto-harbour*, which would primarily carry the meaning of an early harbour. In most cases, these were the places that developed into specialised harbours in the following centuries.

Conclusion

The term, maritime cultural landscape – expressing the material and non-material traces of human activity in the past or present that remain both under and above the water – opens up in itself a totally different perspective in landscape archaeology. The context of coasts and islands is both maritime and terrestrial; cultural remains in these places, with practical and/or symbolic meaning (landing-places, harbours, sea and landmarks, coastal settlement, shipwrecks, but also shipbuilding traditions, place-names and oral tradition) belong to both spheres. The approach from the land in explaining these elements already characterises the investigation of coastal landscapes. The meaning of the water's spatial importance

¹³ Still, it has to be pointed out that the evidence in the archaeological record from the 7th–8th centuries is weak. Half of the ships found from this period come from graves of a high standard and these finds are probably not relevant to all (Crumlin-Pedersen 1999, 15).

is also often taken into consideration. However, water is not just a space without its own features; its characteristics are of importance in studying and understanding mankind's water-bound activities. Water's role in the building of watercrafts is especially notable, as vessels are built to fit the weather and the waters in which they move. In investigating the impact of maritime elements within the coastal areas, it would be useful for archaeologists to get inspiration from the seaman's perspective, where everything revolves around navigation, piloting and safe landfall. For reconstructing this perspective, the models based on procedures of working ships and transferring cargoes are one possibility, and the integration of GIS into this kind of study would give a methodological basis.

The study of the maritime cultural landscape from the perspective of the sea provides an increased opportunity to understand the boundaries of the cultural landscape that are dependent on natural conditions. It is also possible to explain the usage of different kinds of water vessels and landing sites. Approaching from the land mainly simplifies the explanation of the functional and social connection of the ancient monuments in the maritime landscape with the land. The study of the maritime cultural landscape both from sea and land is important, as these two features are dependent on each other. In winter, the perspectives change on the maritime landscape and become similar to those of the terrestrial landscape. The study of seasonality in maritime, but also terrestrial activities will hopefully be the subject for further research.

Often, the recognition of the suitable place for landing on the coast is possible only from the boat/ship. All different landing sites are dependent on the watercrafts. This matter is the most important factor in defining the different landing sites, according to the author. A landing-place acts as an anchorage, which does not need to, but usually does, include some kind of construction, and/or place where the boats are drawn ashore. The term of specialised landing-place is needed for larger regional or local sites. Both landing-places and anchorages existed from the beginning of seaborne activity and they occur also in the present day; the recognition of these is possible merely from the perspective of the sea. The sites that can be called harbours arose in the Baltic Sea region only when the development of ships achieved a size that made it impossible to land without suitable constructions. Thus, harbours on the coast of the Baltic Sea became a reality only from the 9th, but especially from the 10th–11th centuries, when specialised shipping with small, medium and large vessels developed. For the few early trading centres from the 7th–8th centuries, the term proto-harbour denoting the places for landing would be suitable.

References

- Aston, M.** 1985. *Interpreting the Landscape. Landscape Archaeology and Local History.* London.
- Bērziņš, V.** 2000. The conditions for travel and transport in the Stone Age. – *De Temporibus Antiquissimis Ad Honorem Lembit Jaanits.* (MT, 8.) Tallinn, 27–48.
- Carlsson, D.** 1987. Äldre hamnar – ett hotat kulturarv? – *Fornvännen*, 82, 6–17.

- Carlsson, D.** 1991. Harbours and trading places on Gotland AD 600–1000. – Aspects of Maritime Scandinavia AD 200–1200. Proceedings of the Nordic Seminar on Maritime Aspects of Archaeology, Roskilde, 13th–15th March, 1989. Roskilde, 145–158.
- Crumlin-Pedersen, O.** 1991. Ship Types and Sizes AD 800–1400. – Aspects of Maritime Scandinavia AD 200–1200. Proceedings of the Nordic Seminar on Maritime Aspects of Archaeology, Roskilde, 13th–15th March, 1989. Roskilde, 72–82.
- Crumlin-Pedersen, O.** 1999. Ships as indicators of trade in Northern Europe 600–1200. – Maritime Topography and the Medieval Town. Papers from the 5th International Conference on Waterfront Archaeology in Copenhagen, 14th–16th May 1998. Copenhagen, 11–20.
- Crumlin-Pedersen, O., Porsmose, E. & Thrane, H.** 1996. Atlas over Fyns kyst i jernalder, vikingetid og middelalder. Odense.
- Dobat, A. S.** 2002. Der Seeweg nach Haithabu. Die maritime Kulturlandschaft der Schlei. – Beretning fra enogtyvende tværfaglige vikingesymposium. Aarhus, 25–43.
- Firth, A.** 1995. Three facets of maritime archaeology: society, landscape and critique. – <http://www.arch.soton.ac.uk/Research/Firth/> [29.08.2001].
- Hägström, L. H.** 1998. The ritual landscape of existing monuments. The cairns of Morlanda parish, a case study in western Sweden. – The Kaleidoscopic Past. Proceedings of the 5th Nordic TAG Conference. Göteborg, 2–5 April 1997. Göteborg, 395–403.
- Ilves, K.** 2002. Merenduslik kultuurmaastik ja Maasi laev kui selle element. – EAA, 6, 2, 134–149.
- Jaaniits, L., Laul, S., Lõugas, V. & Tõnisson, E.** 1982. Eesti esiajalugu. Tallinn.
- Jasinski, M. E.** 1993. Maritimt kulturlandskap – arkeologisk perspektiv. – Viking. Tidsskrift for norrøn arkeologi, LVI, 129–140.
- Kriiska, A.** 2001. Stone Age Settlement and Economic Processes in the Estonian Coastal Area and Islands (<http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/hum/kultt/vk/kriiska>).
- Kriiska, A.** 2002. Lääne-Eesti saarte asustamine ja püsilanikkonna kujunemine. – Keskus – tagamaa – ääreala. Uurimusi asustushierarhia ja võimukeskuste kujunemisest Eestis. (MT, 11.) Tallinn; Tartu, 29–60.
- Lang, V.** 1999. Kultuurmaastikku luues. Essee maastiku religioosest ja sümboliseeritud korraldusest. – EAA, 3, 1, 63–85.
- Lang, V.** 2001. Maastik ja kultuurmaastik arheoloogias. – Maastik: loodus ja kultuur. Maastiku käsitlusi Eestis. Tartu, 78–83.
- McGrail, S.** 2001. Boats of the World. From the Stone Age to Medieval Times. Oxford.
- Meløe, J.** 1990. The two landscapes of Northern Norway. – Acta Borealia, 1, 68–80.
- Mey, J.** 1927. Eesti loots. Meresõidu ja lootsiasjanduse käsiraamat. Hüdrograafiline kirjeldus Eesti rannikust ja merest. Tallinn.
- Mägi, M.** 1998. Districts and centres on Saaremaa 1100–1400. – Culture Clash or Compromise? The europeanisation of the Baltic Sea Area 1100–1400 AD. (Acta Visbyensia, XI.) Visby, 147–157.
- Mägi, M.** 1999. Farmsteads and villages on Saaremaa from the late prehistoric to the medieval periods. Study of historical maps and archaeological evidence in Põide district 1100–1400 AD. – Europeans or Not? Local level Strategies on the Baltic Rim 1100–1400 AD. (CCC papers, 1.) Oskarshamn, 197–212.
- Mägi, M.** 2000. Weapons find and an ancient harbour site at Viltina Käo-Matsi. – AVE, 1999, 92–99.
- Ohu, A.** 1926. Tormid Läänemerel. Statistilis-sünoptiline käsituskatse. Tartu.
- Orviku, K.** 1992. Characterisation and Evolution of Estonian Seashores. Doctoral thesis at the University of Tartu. Manuscript in the Library of the Tartu University.
- Palang, H. & Külvik, M.** 1999. Maastik – osa meist endist. – Eesti Loodus, 9, 372–374.
- Parker, A. J.** 1999. A maritime cultural landscape: the port of Bristol in the Middle Ages. – The International Journal of Nautical Archaeology, 28, 4, 323–342.
- Parker, A. J.** 2001. Maritime landscapes. – Landscapes, 2, 1, 22–41.
- Shanks, M. & Tilley, C.** 1987. Social Theory and Archaeology. Albuquerque.
- Soomere, T.** 2001. Extreme wind speeds and spatially uniform wind events in the Baltic proper. – Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia Toimetised. Tehnikateadused, 7, 3, 195–211.

- Tilley, C.** 1989. Interpreting material culture. – The Meanings of Things. Material Culture and Symbolic Expression. London, 185–194.
- Ulriksen, J.** 1998. Anløbspladser. Besejling og bebyggelse i Danmark mellem 200 og 1100 e.Kr. En studie af søfartens pladser på baggrund af undersøgelser i Roskilde Fjord. Roskilde.
- Vedru, G.** 2001. Põhja-Eesti muinasaegselt rannikukasutusest. – EAA, 5, 2, 110–127.
- Westerdahl, C.** 1986. Die maritime Kulturlandschaft. Schiffe, Schifffahrtswege, Häfen – Überlegungen zu einem Forschungsansatz. – Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv, 9, 7–58.
- Westerdahl, C.** 1987. Norrlandsleden II. Beskrivning av det maritima kulturlandskapet. Härnösand.
- Westerdahl, C.** 1989. Norrlandsleden I. Källor till det maritima kulturlandskapet. Härnösand.

Kristin Ilves

MEREMEHE PERSPEKTIIV MAASTIKUARHEOLOOGIAS **Randumispaigad merenduslikul kultuurmaastikul**

Resümee

Inimeste liikuvuse ja seega kommunikatsiooni aluseks olid enne tänapäevale tavapärasest lennuliiklust ning Interneti vahendusel toimuvat suhtlemist vesi ja veeliiklus. Arusaadavalt on mere ja merenduslikul maastikul paiknevate muististe tähtsus seega märkimisväärne ning inimasustuse ruumilised ja majanduslikud seosed vetega on olnud arheoloogilise uurimise objektiks juba aastakümneid. Kuid meri ei ole üksnes ajas ja ruumis eksisteeriv lõputu veteväli, sel on iseloomulikud omadused: soolsus, hoovused, lained, veealune topograafia jne. Nende mõju inimese igapäevaelule ning tähtsus veesõidukite ehitamisel või randumispaikade valimisel on senises uurimistöös paraku tagaplaanile jäänud. Käesolev artikkel keskendub inimese suhtele mere, kalda ja rannaladega ehk merenduslikule kultuurmaastikule. Selline, n-õ merelt maale lähenemisviis on Eesti arheoloogias uus – rannikumaastiku ja -kultuuri uurimisel on teadlastel soovitatud leida inspiratsiooni meremehe perspektiivist. Nimetatud meetodi kasutuselevõtt laiendaks tunduvalt maastikuarheoloogilisi uurimistöid, integreerides sellesse ka merendusliku arheoloogia. Samuti on arutletud kõnealuse lähenemisviisi kasutamise juures ilmnevate takistuste üle, mis kaasnevad aastaegade muutustega, näiteks lumi- ja jääkatte moodustumine, ning talvemaastike uurimise küsimuse üle üldiselt.

Artikli teises pooles on võetud lähema vaatluse alla ühed huvitavaimad muistised merenduslikul kultuurmaastikul – vee ja maa piiril paiknevad randumispaigad. Kuigi maastikul leidub erinevat tüüpi randumispaiku, on arheoloogilises uurimistöös jäänud neid tähistavad mõisted tihti defineerimata ja sageli on eritähenduslikud terminid kasutusel sünonüümidenä. Sellise olukorra põhjused peituvad eelkõige arheoloogilises kirjanduses juba väga juurdunud terminikasutuses, oma roll on kindlasti ka kinnistunud suulisel traditsioonil ja kasutatavatel kohanimedel. Autor defineerib siinkohal randumispaiku tähistavad terminid lähtuvalt veesõidukite tähtsusest ja arengust. Terminoloogia arutelu baseerub suuresti merelt maale lähenemisviisil.

Kogu merega seotud kultuuripärandit hõlmav merendusliku kultuurmaastiku mõiste avab maastikuarheoloogias teistsuguse uurimisperspektiivi – rannikute ja saarte kontekst on nii merenduslik kui ka maismaaline; sealsed praktilist ja/või märgilist tähendust kandvad materiaalsed ning mittemateriaalsed kultuurielemendid – sadamad, maabumispaidad, mere- ja maamärgid, rannaasustus, laevavrakid, mereteed, aga ka laevaehitustraditsioonid, kohanimed ja suuline pärimus – kuuluvad mõlemasse valdkonda. Ka meresidus elukohavalik on tähendanud samaaegset lähtumist nii “merelt” kui ka “maalt”. Filosoof Jacob Meløe arvab (Meløe 1990, 73), et uurimistöös tuleb end asetada sellesse tegevusvälja, milles uuritav objekt asub, ja alles siis käsitleda nii seda objekti kui ka selle osakaalu tegevuses. Uurides merenduslikul maastikul paiknevaid muistiseid ja üritades seega hinnata maastiku merenduslikke aspekte, peaks arheoloog artikli autori arvates leidma inspiratsiooni n-ö meremehe perspektiivist, milles taevast, meri, merepõhi, mere- ja maamärgid on seotud navigeerimise, lootsimise ja ohutu maabumisega.

Avamerel on inimene sõitnud alates meresõidu alguspäevadest. Tegemist on hoopis ohutuma alaga kui kaldalähedased piirkonnad, sest pole vaja muret tunda madala vee või veealuste takistuste pärast, mis rannikuvetes muudavad liiklemise sageli isegi madala süvisega alustele ohtlikuks. Orienteerumise juures tulevad abiks nii mere enda vorm ja tunnused kui ka päike, tähed, pilved, merelinnud jne. Peale väga vägivaldsete tormide on meresõitjale tegelikult alati olnud suurimaks ohuks ootamatu ja kontrollimatu maabumine ehk liiklemine rannikuvetes. Ometi on just randumine iga merereisi kõige olulisem eesmärk ja randumispaidad on tähtsad üleminekul vetelt maismaale. Lähenedes maastikule üksnes kuivalt maalt, ei saa me täielikult mõista inimesele mere poolt seatud kohanemise piire, selleks on vaja tunda maastikku nii, nagu see saab avaneda üksnes merelt. Arvestada tuleks lainete, hoovuste, madala ja sügava vee, veealuste kivide ja madalike, aga samuti ilmastikutingimustega, eriti tuulte ja ududega, mis kõik on mõjutanud elu rannikupiirkondades. Seetõttu tuleb ka arheoloogilise või ajaloolise maastiku uurimisel, hoolimata looduse ja kliima muutustest, kasutada abistava analoogiana tänapäevaseid keskkondi ning selgitada välja uuritava ala geograafilised, geoloogilised ja meteoroloogilised tingimused; sealjuures on geograafiliste infosüsteemide programmi (GIS) kasutuselevõtt metodoloogilises plaanis üheks heaks eelduseks. Et aga näha maastikku, nagu seda näeb/nägi meremees, ning arvestades nimetatud lähenemisviisiga, on oluline veesõiduki olemasolu, sest just pardal õpib meremees tundma ilma ja vetevälja ning ilmneb seos nägemise ja tegemise vahel. See lisab aktiivselt merega seotud tegevustesse kaasatud kultuuride uurimise juurde ühe kõige tähtsama objektina veesõiduki. Meremehe perspektiivi rekonstrueerimine võib baseeruda sellel, kuidas tegutsesid laevad ja toimus kaubavahetus.

Rannikumere jäätumisega muutub merenduslik kultuurmaastik järsult. Eesti rannikualadel “kaob” vesi elanike maastikuteadvusest kolmeks kuuks ja veesõidukite järele puudub igapäevane vajadus. Kuid samamoodi muutub maastik

talve tulekul ka kaugel sisemaal – perspektiivid teisenevad mõlemas ümbruskonnas. Inimene talvemaastikus ja samuti talvemaastik inimeses on hoopis tundmatu valdkond, mille uurimine rikastaks kindlasti erinevaid maastikukäsitlusi.

Üksnes veesõiduki olemasolul ja uuritava piirkonna merele iseloomulike omaduste tundmisel on lootust mõista inimest ja tema ajalugu rannikualadel. Meresõidu alguspäevadest alates võib üles loetleda väga palju erinevaid vetel liiklemiseks ette nähtud aluseid. Esimesed arheoloogiliselt teada olevad veesõidukid Läänemere regioonis olid ühepuu- ja nahkpaadid, millest arenesid plankpaadid ja peagi ka suured laevad. Kuigi varastest paatidest on andmed veel üsna kesised, lubab olemasolev info oletada, et tänu oma konstruktsioonile ei vajanud need alused randumiseks spetsiaalseid kohti; samas tuleb kindlasti rõhutada, et vete ja ilma mõju erines piirkonniti ning sel faktoril on randumise juures siiski oma kindel roll. Hilisemast ajast pärinevate arheoloogiliste laevaleidude hulk on aga märgatavalt esinduslikum ning laevaehituse traditsioonide ja erinevuste kohta tehtavatel oletustel on seega kindlam alus. Nii võibki juba alates 9. sajandist, eelkõige aga alates 10. sajandist, kõnelda spetsialiseerunud laevandusest Läänemere ruumis, kuhu ilmusid esimesed selgelt kaupade transportimiseks ehitatud alused. 11. sajandi laevaleiud viitavad juba kaubanduses väga hästi arenenud transpordisüsteemile, mis põhines kolmel laevade suurusklassil: väikesed, keskmised ja suured laevad.

Laevanduse areng peegeldab ka muutusi randumiskohtades, sest need olid ehitatud veesõidukite tarbeks. Nimetatud asjaolu koos väitega, et kohti randumiseks ei saa üksnes maismaast lähtudes valida, annab suurepärase aluse erinevate randumispaikade defineerimiseks ja määratlemiseks nii ruumilises kui ka ajalises kontekstis.

Käesolevas artiklis esineb küllalt sageli nimetus *randumispaik* (*landing site, place for landing*). Terminil laialdase kasutamise põhjus on selle vetelt maale üleminekukohti tähistava mõiste kõige neutraalsem ja ulatuslikum tähendusväli ning ajaline mõõde. Randumispaiga nimetus hõlmab **kõiki** randumist võimaldavaid või võimaldanud, nii konstruktsioonidega kui ka ilma nendeta, kohti rannikul, suudmealadel, jõe- ja järvekallastel. Seega mahuvad selle mõiste alla ka kõik allpool käsitletavad terminid – loodussadam/ankrupaik, maabumiskoht, sadam ja protosadam, nende erinevad tüübid, aga samuti käsitlemata jäänud kohad, kus randumine on või oli võimalik.

Loodussadam (*natural harbour*) on üks lihtsamaid randumispaiku. Terminoloogiliselt sadama nimetusega enam vahet tehes sobib sünonüümina ka *ankrupaiga* (*anchorage*) termin. See on randumiseks või varjupaiga leidmiseks sobiva topograafiaga koht rannikul, kus inimene paiga välimusse ja omadustesse ei sekku. Tavaliselt asuvad need kohad inimasustusest eemal. Olemas on/olid need kõikjal rannikul ning need tuleb/tuli üksnes ära tunda – viimane on võimatu vete poolt ja veesõidukiga lähenemata, sest iga ankrupaik pole igale laevale sobiv. Arheoloogiliselt on ankrupaiku seetõttu peaaegu võimatu avastada; vraki leidmine on siiski seda reeglit välistavaks erandiks.

Maabumiskoht (landing-place) on sarnaselt loodussadamale/ankrupaigale paatide randumiseks sobiva topograafiaga koht rannikul, mis inimese kohandavat sekkumist ei nõua, kuigi selles esineb tavaliselt erinevaid konstruktsioone. Viimased on olulised randumiseks viisil, mis taas merele sõitmiseks ei eelda uue veesõiduki ehitamist. Seega on maabumiskohad tähtsad eelkõige väikeste paatidega liiklemisel, ning kuigi ka maabumispaiga äratundmisel on merelt maale vaade oluline, eristab neid loodussadamast püsikasutus ja kindel seotus inimasustusega. Kuivõrd maabumiskohad erinevad nii suuruse kui eesmärkide poolest, on suuremate, regionaalse või kohaliku tähtsusega kohtade puhul korrektsem kasutada *eriotstarbelise maabumiskoha (specialised landing-place)* nimetust.

Sadama (harbour) kontseptsioon Läänemere ruumi kultuurmaastikul kerkis esile alles laevanduse arenguga üha suuremate aluste ehitamise suunas ning selliste veesõidukite kasutusele võtmisega, mis olid niivõrd suured, et sobivate rajatiste puudumisel polnud randumine enam võimalik, seega alates alles 9.–10. sajandist. Tegemist on spetsiaalsete (püsi)konstruktsioonidega kohaga rannikul, mis on rajatud laevadele randumiseks iga ilmaga ja on ankrut paigal hoidva põhjamaterjaliga. Sadamad eeldavad ka inimese pidevat sekkumist, n-ö sadamateenuseid laias tähenduses. Nende tagamaa sõltub sadama eesmärkidest. Kuivõrd Läänemere regioonis on aga arheoloogiliselt tuntud rida varaseid, eelkõige alates 7.–8. sajandist tekkinud suuri kaubitsemiskeskusi juba märkimisväärse tagamaaga, sobib autori arvates randumispaiku sealsetes kohtades tähistama termin *protosadam (proto-harbour)* varase sadama tähenduses. Nii maabumiskoha kui ka eriotstarbelise maabumiskoha nimetus võrdsustaks need vähetähtsate paikadega rannikul, sadama nimetus pole aga funktsionaalselt korrektne.