Concrete places

When we think about cultural heritage, we think in temporal terms. Space seems an alien stuff when we handle the past, the domain of history.

Notwithstanding, this commonsensical experience is grounded on an old preconception, in its turn rooted in the representation of time established by the modernity. The idea that past is something we inherit stems from the modern divorce between the representation of space and that one of time. Such a breakup marked the beginning of modern age, taking place within the geographical domain, and it is related to the way Europe represented itself as a space of nations.

The aim of my lecture is to sketch such a transition, showing the role of geography in giving shape to the past, then to cultural heritage, by means of some cartographic examples drawn from my forthcoming book *Geografie d’Europa* (Neve, forthcoming). Of course, I owe you an apology for presenting such an abridged version of a more complex narration.

Places are full of time. They show, if we pay attention to them, the different «time layers» (*Zeitschichten*) – to use Koselleck’s metaphor – that let them making sense for us, as a concretization of people, activities, relations, matter, ideas, words, images, and so on: witness the history of landscapes.

The physical places we live in every day make sense for us because they are concrete. According to the definition given by French geographer Augustine Berque, places are concrete because «concretus, in Latin, it was the past participle of concrescere: to grow together. Actually [...] people, words, and things have grown up together; they have a shared story» (Berque, 2000, 18-19).
For such a reason places represent the collective, *social memory* of a group or community. As Karl Schlögel (2003) summed up, quoting the German geographer Friedrich Ratzel: «Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit» (In spaces we read the time).

But how do we really experience places?

The limited places of our everyday life – the streets of our town, workplaces, home, squares and monuments, and so on – are *naturalized* by cultural habits, routines, meanings acquired by education or social relations. Our feelings for places, our knowledge itself of them are a mat weaving both adopted pasts and personal experiences. They belong to the dialectics between individual and society Leroi-Gourhan keenly outlined almost fifty years ago:

Individuals at birth are faced with a body of traditions that belong to their ethnic group; a dialogue takes place, from childhood, between the individual and the social organism. Tradition is as biologically indispensable to the human species as genetic conditioning is to insect societies. Ethnic survival relies on routine; the dialogue taking place produces a balance between routine and progress, routine symbolizing the capital required for the group’s survival and progress the input of individual innovations toward a better survival (Leroi-Gourhan, 1965, Engl. transl. 228).

Historically, in this perspective, modern age marked the beginning of a new experience of places. As transport and communication systems gradually evolved, the relationship between places and knowledge changed.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the acquisition of knowledge (of all but some members of the upper and middle class) was still dependent upon where a person was born (and subsequently lived out her/his life) and upon the corresponding local availability of schools, booksellers and other means of dissemination of empirical knowledge. The nineteenth and twentieth centuries, in contrast, can be interpreted as a period of rapid homogenisation in the degree of spatial variation of availability of empirical knowledge (Thrift, 1996, 112-113).

This means that for a long time social situations and places were considered closely connected, and that imagination often was the one and only way to escape, as it were, the constraints of places’ dimensions.

The relationship between physical place and social situation still seems so natural that we continue to confuse physical places with the behaviors that go on in them (...) Before electronic media (...) places defined most social information-systems. A given place-situation was spatially and temporally removed from other place-situations. It took time to travel from situation to situation, and distance was a measure of social insulation and isolation (...) Communication and travel were once synonymous. Our country’s communication channels
were once roads, waterways, and railroads. Communication speed was limited to the speed of human travel (…) A place defined a distinct situation because its boundaries limited perception and interaction (Meyrowitz, 1985, 116).

However, when we face spaces we cannot experience directly – the region, the state, the nation, for example – that is, when we consider the spaces on the scale on which the notion of heritage, as a collective shared social dimension, only makes sense to the extent that is legitimized, in getting political relevance, it is the map that plays the leading role assigned to it by modernity. Actually, how could have geographical metaphors for nations come into use – such as the ‘boot-shaped’ Italy or France’s hexagon – without the employment of maps before first earth images from space were made available to the public?

If you feel uneasy in accepting the idea that mapping can be so invasive, you should remember how human memory really operate.

Objects perceived are caught in the flux of time, so that consciousness is made of primary retentions – what consciousness retains from the ‘now’ – but such retentions depends on the horizon of expectations that memory and experience shape. We don’t retain all we could. So such retentions are indeed selections.

But, secondary retentions, which belongs to individual consciousness, are based, in turn, on tertiary retentions: the social memory, the cultural heritage if you prefer (Stiegler, 2004). And such a collective memory is materialized, concretized as, for example, territories, in which pathways, monuments, buildings, landscape’s features, all stand for past facts and deeds of previous generations we can accept or not as part of our culture.

So we have, as it were, two kinds of past: the past we lived – the biographical past – and the past not lived (Stiegler) – i.e., all we face since childhood as conveyed by the family, the school, friends, institutions, and so on. Unlike biographical past, we can adopt or not the past not lived, but there’s no doubt that it represents the way to access what we call cultural heritage.

Well, the map not only probably represents the best example of the twofold functioning of individual and collective memory, but also it is the main device selecting what the community chooses to retain, so indeed producing the territory.

Now, I’ll show you two examples. I beg your pardon if they are not drawn from contemporaneity, but, in this reconstruction, however brief it is, accounting for such processes would be too long anyway, so I prefer to introduce them in their coming-into-being form.
The first example shows, through a comparison, how pre-modern maps represented space and time, and how the first modern cartography’s bestseller established a new representation standard.

**Mapping the past**

Here we have the so called *Ebstorf map* (Fig. 1), from the Benedictine monastery where it was preserved, near Illzen in Lower Saxony. Drawn in 1234, it is the largest *mappamundi* – world-map – to have been recorded. Unfortunately, the original Ebstorf map became a casualty of the bombing in 1943 over Hanover, and this a copy based on the photographs taken for its restoration in 1888.

It sums up a medieval European-Christian cartographic tradition, with its circular shape recalling the communion wafer, the consecrated Host, and in the background the figure of Christ crucified ‘dressing’, in a sense, the world-picture; with his head at the top (East), his feet at the bottom (West) and his hands pointing North and South, an orientation that dominated medieval European cartography. Catholic spatial universalism is signaled by the presence of the ‘wonders’ (*mirabilia*) along the margin of African continent.

Now, I would like to draw your attention to the picture of the town of Carthage, a town missing since its destruction by the Romans in 146 BC. Representing a lost place on a medieval *mappamundi* is not a contradiction, as this kind of maps are not a picture of the contemporary world, as we are used to expect from our modern maps. Time and space are woven into the image, in which Christian worldview is the main framework.

The past remains a *place* amenable to geographical representation (...) The Ebstorf map expresses a cyclical vision of life through its deeply symbolic style, and its use of multiple point-of-view. Later, the Renaissance version of past, present and future will dovetail more snugly with an individual understanding of the reality of the body that moves from birth to death. The medieval meta-physical conception, while not refuting individual progression through space (indeed incorporating it), has a communal sense of culture gained from being witness at countless births and deaths, changes of season, and passages of the planets in the sky. Renewal and destruction are part of this world-without-end, and not yet the discrete book-ends a post-Renaissance individual will place before and after linear personal experience (Hillis, 1994).

With the first modern atlas – the *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* – by Ortelius (1570, this edition 1590), the representation of the present and the representation of the past separate, and, while recognizing the importance of the past, it is the present that gains the primacy: experience becomes more important than authority. And this is clearly shown by two great maps, the first one put in the first page of the section collecting historical maps, so
highlighting the different treatment reserved to the images of the past, located in a special section devoted to them.

In the *Aevi veteris, typus geographicus* (Fig. 2), Ortelius puts the earth as it was known by the ancients within the global frame outlined by the great planisphere displaying the extent of geographical knowledge in 1590 – the *Typus Orbis Terrarum* (Fig. 3) – but leaving blank all areas outside the ancient known earth: the simple comparison between the two planispheres was sufficient for the reader to grasp the gap between what ancients taught and moderns experimented (Besse, 2003).

Here, on the basis of a geometrical frame *common to both maps*, world’s present and past diverge, and time explicitly becomes a social memory, a past to be adopted.

In order to more fully understand the power of modern maps it should be remembered – as Franco Farinelli (2009a, 2009b) demonstrated long since – that just because modern maps adopted as its basis the space defined by the rules of Euclidean geometry (along with its qualities of homogeneity, isotropy, and continuity), their way to translate reality works as follows:
The rich complexity of the world is reduced to what can be measured and displayed inside the grid of coordinates, dividing into different spaces of representation the present, the past, the physical features of a land, the political boundaries of a territory: a subdivision that wouldn’t have made sense in maps drawn before modern times.

The second example dates to modern age’s threshold, and it points out how a community can legitimize a new social and political order using cultural heritage through an iconographic programme in which mapping plays a prominent role.

This time we are in Siena (Fig. 4). The year 1345. Five years after the completion of his renowned frescoes’ cycle, called the «Good Government», located at the second floor of the Palazzo Pubblico (Palace of Government) in Siena on the walls of the Room of Nine (the Sala dei Nove), the nine governors of the republic, Ambrogio Lorenzetti makes and installs on a wall of the adjoining room, the Sala del Gran Consiglio, before the Maestà (Majesty) of Simone Martini (1312) (Fig. 5), a mappamundi, a world-map (Fig. 6).
What is the sense of such a cartographical artefact put in explicit relation to the iconographic cycle celebrating the virtues of republican regime?

After the Peace of Constance (1183), following the relative independence gained both from the Empire and the Church, the city-republics of the Centre and Northern Italy engaged themselves into the hugest building and public art programmes since antiquity.

The urban revolution fixed steadily the relation between place and identity, so identifying citizenship with the belonging to the urban space.

In 12th century (…) populations are settled as much from a secular point of view (seigniories) as from a spiritual one (parishes). In both cases, it must be noticed that territorial relationship is mediate: they are the bonds of dependency on a protector (the secular seignior or the patron saint) that determine the belonging to a place (logna-Prat, 2001, 53).

In 14th century, by the time Siena was a city-republic, political status and citizenship were defined by residence and house ownership.

In Piazza del Campo, the main square (Fig. 4), the Palazzo Pubblico hosted since 1310 the Government of the Republic, ruled by the Concistoro, a «council made of councils», in which the Nine (i Nove) were the governors and defenders of republic, elected mostly among the member of merchant class.

As Randolph Starn puts it:

The republic of interests and the republic of principles – for the first time since antiquity the city-republics of Italy confronted the double binds of republican ideology. On the one hand, the republican commune was a “mere alliance”, a restrictive one at that; on the other hand, far from merely standing for a sum of private differences, it was supposed to stand above them (…) To contend with these conflicting demands was the great task of the new republican culture (…) communal institutions raised questions about their own legitimacy outside the “natural” [i.e., the Emperor and the Pope] hierarchical order of things (…) Thus the republican experiment called for the articulation and the suppression of doubts over its legitimacy, the demonstration of fearful consequences for inadequate civic discipline, the assertion and the control of particular interests that a republican regime could neither easily accommodate nor do without (Starn in Starn and Partridge, 1992, 13 and 21).

So, the iconographic programme of the «Good Government» (Figs. 7-11) seems to follow Michael Walzer’s definition: «the state is invisible; it must be personified before it can be seen, symbolized before it can be loved, imagined before it can be conceived» (Walzer, 1967, 194). In fact, the frescoes’ cycle uses the iconographic style that citizens were used to see in the representation of traditional powers: for example, Lorenzetti personifies the
representation of the «Bad Government» – i.e., the rule of monocracy as opposed to republic – with the medieval icon of the Devil, a figure everybody could identify (Fig. 9).

On the wall just at the back of the site on which there was the world map, lies the great panorama of the «Effects of the Good Government» (Figs. 12-13).

The striking fact about the great panorama is that it incorporates very different perspectives just as it integrates distinct social groups and activities. Here, if anywhere, we have a model of, and for, the genial accommodation of diversity envisaged by republican ideology (Starn, cit., 50).

Please note the realistic style: citizens viewing the scene identify the real town to identify themselves with it. Lorenzetti’s idiomatic compositional features symbolize Siena’s political project through the realism itself. First of all, country shows its curved and undulating lines tending to horizontality (Figs. 14-15), a contrast to town’s straight lines tending to verticality (Fig. 16): «the town was what men erected, by means of reason and technique, above the ground» (…) Into the country, on the contrary, the human work of fields’ cultivation followed the natural undulation of landscape. The town was a geometrically ordered space, country was extension, nature» (Argan, 1984, 124). The town’s walls themselves, splitting the scene of the panorama, are not an enclosure, sealing off urban places, but a threshold, a hinge connecting town and country. The necessity to build on Siena’s hilly ground often caused the walls to be built very close to monuments and buildings (Fig. 16):

Equidistance between town and country, transparency and adhesion to the built environment: the walls are the pivot of the figurative message joining town’s image to the propaganda of Good Government, of Peace and Justice (Rinaldi, 1989, 810).

Moreover, the choice to use realism in order to convey the values of civic life is reinforced by other expedients, such as the presence of town’s heraldic colours on buildings’ details, a common figurative solution in Sienese painting initiated by Pietro Lorenzetti, Ambrogio’s brother (Rinaldi, cit., 779), or the use of «reversed (or inverted) perspective», which allows «individual buildings splay out, everywhere turn their facades towards us», so increasing the degree of recognizability of urban features by citizens.

Curiously enough, the latter compositional solution shows some interesting analogies with another townscape, dated more than a century and half later: i.e., the great achievement of Jacopo de’ Barbari: the Bird’s eye view of Venice (Figs. 18 and 19). The relatively small late medieval Tuscan city republic and the largest Italian republic of 16th century were both ruled by leading merchant families (although Venice had a narrower oligarchy, with rules concerning access to offices far less open and equitable than Siena’s), and for both town’s image is
The means of harmonizing a multiplicity of viewpoints. It lends mere mobility a sense of perspective. It transforms comings and goings into a distinctively-shaped city. Turning geography into history, it re-enacts a spatial history (Carter, 1996, 120).

Finally, note the marginal position of the main church (the Duomo) at the left upper side of the panorama, reflecting the peripheral location and role of the Church in comparison with the civic life: in fact, in the main square, Piazza del Campo, there are neither churches nor ecclesiastical buildings, but the Palace of the Government and the prominent families’ buildings alone (Figs. 4 and 20). The Palace of the Government itself contains the great panorama and it is contained in it, as in the panorama, thanks to the reversed perspective, the Palace is placed at the vantage point (Rinaldi, cit., ibidem), so enacting a play of multiple identification of and identification with.

The world map has long since disappeared, but not without leaving traces of its presence (Fig. 21). It seems it was a rotating wheel. A series of great concentric marks into the surface of the wall on which it hung would signal that the world map was a rotating disk located on the wall below the equestrian figure (Kupfer, 1996).

Given the size of Lorenzetti’s map (4.83 m in diameter), it would probably have been a cloth-made map stretched over an open wooden framework necessary to make easier the movement of the artefact rotating on a single pivot.

From the sources we know that the map was centred on Siena: a rotating map with Siena as its pivot.

Eventually, what is the meaning of such an artefact, standing in a straight line as a medium between the gaze of the Virgin of Majesty (the tradition, the past, the cultural heritage) and the panorama of the city (the future of the republic)?

It was probably intended to mean that the world can turn, but Siena will hold still, under the gaze of its patron saint (the Majesty) – the first political icon in Italian communal history – thanks to the skill of republic in harmonizing all different interests, beliefs, hopes, of citizens, represented in the great panorama located on the other side of the wall (Fig. 6).

Lorenzetti’s iconographic recipe is: an icon from the past (the Majesty), symbols drawn from the medieval repository of images everybody could recognize (the Devil as an autocrat), the realistic style of representation of urban features to make identification of citizens with town possible. They are all mobilized in order to establish a link between the past and the future, to legitimize the new order through old symbols. The rotating world-map centred on Siena links the steps and gaze of the observer from the Majesty (a religious and political icon belonging to local cultural heritage) to the great panorama (the political utopia of the town’s
life as an harmonious arrangement of diversities), so putting into relation what protects the citizens (the patron saint) with what citizens should protect (the republic).

**Non-contemporaneity**

Summing up: modern age produced a divorce between the representation of space and the representation of time. Such a separation appeared in modern mapping’s cartographic dress, in which, on the same geometrical basis, in accordance with the tacit principle assigning a determinate temporal frame to each map, maps of past territories and maps of present ones are drawn. While medieval *mappaemundi*, according to the plot of Salvation established by the Scriptures, included past, present, and future; modern maps, in giving the past a separate space of representation, made the cleavage between past and present visible, perceptible, so allowing to put in temporal terms that *Ungleichzeitigkeit* (Non-contemporaneity) described by Ernst Bloch:

Not all people exist in the same Now. They do so only externally, through the fact that they can be seen today. But they are thereby not yet living at the same time with the others (Bloch, 1935, Engl. trans., 97).

But non-contemporaneity typifies all societies:

The non-synchronicity of its elements is the constitutive characteristic of social reality. Any social interaction is based on the coordination of action over time. The double contingency of social interaction is resolved through the sequencing of interaction. What holds for social interaction as the elementary form of the social, holds for any social form. Thus the social world is by its very nature non-synchronous. To synchronize the social, it has to be ‘represented’ as a synchronous world (Eder, 2004, 89-90).

As Reinhardt Koselleck pointed up, it was modern age that, starting from the mere observation of geographical differences, produced a spatial hierarchy by way of past’s mapping.

The geographical opening up of the globe brought to light various but coexisting cultural levels which were, through the process of synchronous comparison, then ordered diachronically. Looking from civilized Europe to a barbaric America was a glance backward (...) From the eighteenth century on, therefore, it was possible to formulate the postulate of acceleration; or conversely from the point of view of those left behind, the postulate of drawing level or overtaking. This fundamental experience of progress, embodied in a singular concept around 1800, is rooted in the knowledge of noncontemporaneities which exist at a chronologically uniform time. From the seventeenth century on, historical experience was increasingly ordered by the hierarchy produced through a consideration of
the best existing constitution or the state of scientific, technical, or economic development (Koselleck, 1979, Engl. transl., 238).

Borrowing the meaningful opening line from L.P. Hartley's *The Go-Between*, it can be claimed that modern cartography made the past «a foreign country». As David Lowenthal stressed, from the late 18th century on:

Europeans begin to conceive the past as (...) a congeries of foreign lands endowed with unique histories and personalities. This new past gradually ceased to provide comparative lessons, but came to be cherished as a heritage that validated and exalted the present. And the new role heightened concern to save relics and restore monuments as emblems of communal identity, continuity, and aspiration (Lowenthal, 1985, XVI).

Modern cartography explicitly made time a matter of social memory, a past to be adopted, in order to legitimize new forms of political communities searching for new secular bonds to share – like in medieval Siena.

When the issue at stake would become the building of nation states, not only national and historical atlases (Black, 1997) would be recalled to their duty, but also literary forms, such as the novel.

Geography as the foundation of narrative form; the internal border as the on/off switch of the historical novel. And it makes sense, because the internal border is the space where the non-contemporaneity of European countries (and especially of those where trade and industry have advanced more quickly, like France and Great Britain) becomes inescapably visible: a distance of just a few miles, and people belong to different epochs. Internal borders define modern states as composite structures, then, made of many temporal layers: as historical states – that need historical novels. But need them to do what? To represent internal unevenness, no doubt; and then, to abolish it. Historical novels are not just stories ‘of’ the border, but of its erasure, and of the incorporation of the internal periphery into the larger unit of the state (Moretti, 1998, 38-40).

Non-contemporaneity of European countries – well perceptible when «distance was a measure of social insulation and isolation» (Meyrowitz) – didn’t cease to be contemporaneous even in the ‘new Europe’ of EU.

As Klaus Eder pointed out, the issue of different evolution speeds of European regions is the underlying theme of «the famous formula of a Europe à plusieurs vitesses», or of the ticklish question of ‘Enlargement process’:

First some selected parameters of rates of change have to be reached before being considered as a potential member of the Community. Defining flexible ‘corridors’ of entrance into the Union allows the integration of other countries. This is the timing of synchronization (Eder, cit., 101).
And if you are thinking that such issues are today managed in a way being alien to the logic I attempted to emphasize in examples remote from modern times, it is curiously enough to notice in a famous theory about European continental structure, Stein Rokkan’s theory of «cleavages» (Rokkan, 1999), a design Jean Bodin would have probably shared:

[European] space is divided up in sub-spaces and differentiated along specific social axes: The North–South axis and the West–East axis which are the axes of progress and backwardness. Thus the Northwest of Europe becomes the locus of progressiveness, the Southeast the locus of backwardness. It is obvious that this social differentiation of the geographical space of Europe has not only a spatial dimension. It also implies a time dimension: The Northwest is faster, and the Southeast is slower. At the same time, the point which defines the threshold is also moving: it has moved from the Southeast to the Northwest, and in doing so, has turned on its head what is to be considered ‘looking backwards’ and ‘looking forwards’. The turning point is in the seventeenth century, when Europe’s gravitating center started moving toward the Northwest. The result is that the Old Europe of the South, peopled by ‘civilized’ people, was surpassed economically and culturally by the New Europe of the North, peopled by more or less ‘uncivilized’ or ‘just recently civilized’ people, the Anglo-Saxons (Eder, cit., 91).

At the end, I think the management of cultural differences, of different heritages, cannot avoid the complex tangle of time-space representations we adopt. The risk is to excessively simplify the criteria on which any attempt to develop a ‘new Europe’ is grounded.

Julia Kristeva urged us that «the foreigner is within me, hence we are all foreigners. If I am a foreigner, there are no foreigners»¹, but too often today political depiction of cultural differences is more akin to the stereotypes 18th century produced (Fig. 22). Is this the best we can do?
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\(^1\) With this term Thrift means the socially structured knowledge on which grounds social experience.

\(^{ii}\) The first works by Farinelli about the mapping model of Western culture date back to the end of 70’s.

\(^{iii}\) See the detail in Fig. 17.

\(^{iv}\) The black and white’s Balzana, the old Roman insignia used as the Coat of Arms of Siena.

\(^{v}\) A practice in perspective drawing where as distance increases objects are drawn larger, unlike the classical linear perspective where – as the lines converge toward the horizon – farther objects are drawn smaller than nearer ones. The vanishing points are placed outside the painting so producing the illusion that they are in the vantage point, where linear perspective places the observer.

\(^{vi}\) Latest sources reporting evidences of its presence date to 18th century.

\(^{vii}\) On this subject, see the keen analyses of Iacono (2006).

\(^{viii}\) Explicitly, because modernity revealed the customary nature of what was previously considered as a sacred gift.

\(^{ix}\) Regions and not countries, because the speed’s issue, in the context of European integration, concerns each national space as well.
«Car combien qu’il n’y a point de lieu stable où l’on puisse remarquer l’Orient de l’Occident, comme il se fait du Midy au Septentrion : si est-ce que tous les anciens ont tenu, que les peuples Orientaux sont plus doux, plus courtois, plus traitables, et plus ingénieux que ceux d’Occident, et moins belliqueux [...] Les Espagnols ont remarqué que les peuples de la Sina, les plus Orientaux, qui soient, sont bien les plus ingénieux hommes et les plus courtois du monde ; et ceux du Bresil les plus Occidentaux, sont les plus barbares et cruels. Brief, si on prend garde de près aux historiens, on trouvera que le peuple d’Occident tient beaucoup du naturel de Septentrion ; et le peuple Oriental du naturel de Midy, en même latitude [...] Toutesfois la difference des mœurs, et du naturel des peuples, est bien plus notable entre le Septentrion et le Midy, qu’elle n’est entre l’Orient et le Ponent» (J. Bodin, *Les Six livres de la République*, à Lyon, chez Jacques Du Puys de l’impr. de Jean de Tournes, 1579, Cinquième Livre, Chapitre I, pp. 481-2).
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