

# Maritime Cultural Landscapes, Maritimity and Quasi Objects

David Berg Tuddenham

Published online: 8 May 2010  
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2010

**Abstract** Does the concept of maritime cultural landscapes bridge a division between land and sea, or does it maintain a gap that perhaps doesn't even exist? This paper discusses maritime and maritime cultural landscapes as phenomena in the light of Actor Network Theory, where *maritimity* is given attention as a derivation of the modern metaphysics as described by Bruno Latour. The paper makes use of a case study from Norwegian Cultural Heritage Management (CHM), where land and sea archaeologists meet each other in a joint venture project at the island of Smøla, Møre & Romsdal County.

**Keywords** Maritime archaeology · Maritime cultural landscapes · Maritimity · Actor network theory

## Introduction

Christer Westerdahl asks in a recent article *what is maritime? Is there anything exclusively maritime?* (2008:191). He points out that individuals as well as groups can be part of several cultures at the same time. *I believe it is obvious that, even if we deal with what we suppose is a single culture, it is in itself at least two, taken as a combination of two or more ways of subsistence* (ibid). Something such as exclusively maritime will therefore be hard to single out. Is there then any point defining maritime or coastal culture? Westerdahl stresses the cultural values associated with the maritime world of the past, which we cannot understand without a profound study of their roots;

*Those of us who study maritime culture have always been told by the mainstream that our field is marginal. That is only superficially true. The aim of the definitions is to resurrect the relationship of man with the sea as one of the bases for explaining cultural history in general. This is how essential the sea has been, whether humans have lived in direct contact with it or only had it as a permanent reference point. The human perspective, after all, always consists of both sea and land... The problem is, therefore, how to*

---

D. B. Tuddenham (✉)  
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway  
e-mail: david.tuddenham@vm.ntnu.no

*define the specifically maritime in relation to what is specifically land-oriented or, if you like, terrestrial. This is not at all self evident. But those who have an interest in matters maritime tend instinctively to treat subjects which may reveal essential things only in relation to a strictly maritime life. Unfortunately this may mean that their scope is excessively narrow (ibid).*

I believe Westerdahl points to something quite essential. Anything exclusively maritime is hard to define and is by no means self evident. Nevertheless that is in many senses the scope of maritime archaeology by stressing the importance of maritime life and the human relation to the sea and seafaring. Maritime and terrestrial becomes by definition categories that need distinguishing<sup>1</sup> where maritime archaeology necessarily is concerned about the human relationship to sea and seafaring. Its playground is the maritime cultural landscape. Its opposition becomes by semantics terrestrial archaeology, which also can be referred to as mainstream archaeology. Even though it is hard to define pure maritime, the very existence of an archaeology belonging to the maritime depends on something that actually can be termed maritime. If not, the sub discipline and its definition of its playground become meaningless.

In this article, I want to discuss the idea of maritime cultural landscapes, which can be said to be a dominant research area within North European maritime archaeology. As a concept, it has been exceedingly successful, and the term has been widely adopted after its introduction to archaeology in 1989 (Westerdahl 1989). But even if one of its ideals is to bridge the gap between maritime and terrestrial, as the quotation above refers to, there are some paradoxes inherent with the term that I want to explore further. Does the maritime cultural landscape as a concept bridge a division between land and sea, or does it maintain a gap that perhaps doesn't even exist?

### **Maritime Archaeology and its Landscapes: A Very Brief Research History**

In many senses, the concept of Maritime Cultural Landscapes was a reaction against particularism within archaeology under water, with its heavy focus on ship wrecks and ship remains (Westerdahl 1986:11). With the introduction of SCUBA equipment in the civilian market after the Second World War, the activity on ancient ship wrecks more or less “exploded”, with very different approaches toward sites. Frédéric Dumas, a companion to the better known French explorer Jacques-Yves Cousteau, made this comment on the ongoing activity in the Mediterranean after the release of modern day diving equipment:

*The forest of pines that borders the coast in the harbour provided shelter for the multicoloured tents of a vast international camping ground, from which hordes of pink, chubby little divers from Germany, Belgium and Switzerland set out in feverish pursuit of nautical souvenirs. They were especially fond of archaeological items, and the wrecks in the vicinity were the victims of regularly scheduled clandestine explorations (Dumas 1972:72–73).*

In this early phase, archaeology had to compete with treasure hunters, and most of the archaeologically motivated expeditions could be regarded as merely rescue operations to protect sites from looting. And its methodological base was poorly developed. Until the excavations of the Yassi Ada and Cape Gelidonya ships in the early 1960s, under the leadership of Bass (1966, 1967), the methodological level was quite experimental and by

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Jasinski (1995a) in his attempts to define different categories and levels of maritime archaeological data.

no means comparable with an excavation on shore. With the methodological breakthrough represented by Yassi Ada and Cape Gelidonya, archaeology under water faced a new era, where the methodological standards proved to be at the same levels as a site on shore. Though, a division was created between terrestrial and marine (later maritime) archaeology, where the latter was tended to be viewed as less serious than archaeology on shore (Bass 1983; McGrail 1984; Carpenter 1991; Jasinski 1993, 1995b, 1999; Westerdahl 1986, 2008).

One early critique against archaeology under water was its lack of a theoretical foundation, mainly occupied with particularistic investigations on shipwrecks. In 1978, Keith Muckelroy published *Maritime Archaeology*, a processual approach toward the activity on the sea floor. In the introductory, he states that *another outstanding feature, as things stand in the late 1970s, is a remarkable lack of development or systematisation, when compared with most other archaeological sub-disciplines* (1978:10). Later on in his publication, he notes that *without a corresponding level of generalisation, maritime archaeology would be merely antiquarianism, a fascinating and relatively harmless leisure activity, but no serious and rewarding academic discipline, demanding of considerable expertise, sophisticated equipment, and support from public funds* (ibid:226).

With Muckelroy's processual contribution, the archaeological sub-discipline Maritime Archaeology was born, giving for the first time a definition of the maritime research field within archaeology (Jasinski 1995b:108). Muckelroy's definition of maritime archaeology was *the scientific study of the material remains of man and his activity on the sea* (ibid:4). The concept of maritime archaeology as a sub-discipline soon became a success (see also Adams 2002:228–230; Harpster 2009:67–82), but the definition was quickly brought up for discussion. One of the first observations made was the obvious fact that the definition doesn't take into account remains on shore or in lakes and rivers that can contribute to the understanding of maritime life—which was commonly understood to be ships and shipboard community (see McGrail 1984; Adams 2002:228). Another important critique came from researchers who found the focus on ships and shipboard community as rather narrow, with the proposal of maritime cultural landscapes as a tool to achieve a more holistic approach within the discipline (Crumlin-Pedersen 1978; Westerdahl 1986, 1989, 1992). An important question that led to the concept of the maritime cultural landscape was; what is maritime culture? Where can we find traces of maritime culture? Ships and boats are an obvious part of maritime culture, but they are only part of a larger cultural complex. And the fact that most shipwrecks are deposited on the seafloor can not be of significant importance for an academic discipline that aims to understand maritime ways of life. They simply belong to a cultural landscape- a maritime cultural landscape (Westerdahl, personal communication).

In its earliest definition, the maritime cultural landscape referred to a relict archaeological landscape, in search of maritime cultural areas. The first attempt toward a definition of the maritime cultural landscape was *the network of sea routes and harbours, indicated both above and under water* (Westerdahl 1978:19; Westerdahl, Personal communication). A later definition is that *the maritime cultural landscape would be the whole network of sailing routes, with ports, havens and harbours along the coast, and its related constructions and other remains of human activity, underwater as well as terrestrial* (Westerdahl 2008:212). Westerdahl further points out that cognitive aspects of landscape are also necessary to an understanding of the Landscape in Man. *One could express it this way: physical landscape + cognitive landscape = cultural landscape* (ibid:213).

For maritime archaeology, the concept of maritime cultural landscapes had a profound impact. As Marek Jasinski points out; *This concept proved very important for the*

development of, at any rate, a significant part of maritime archaeology because it shows how large a range of data archaeologists can exploit in their studies of human relation to the sea (1999:9). With the concept of maritime cultural landscape, maritime archaeology moved toward a more holistic understanding of the relation between sea and land—it is not merely a practice on the seabed. It is according to Jasinski “a sub discipline of archaeology (that) covers the entire research field of marine archaeology, other spheres of past material culture related to the sea and, in addition, the cognitive aspects of human attachment to the sea (Jasinski 1994 in Jasinski 1999:10). The maritime cultural landscape as a concept is very much in use within e.g. Norwegian Cultural Heritage Management (CHM) under water, as an analytical term to address physical and cognitive aspects belonging to what can be said is maritime (see also Firth 1995:5—Management environment).

### Maritimity, Actor Network Theory and Quasi Objects

Few people would deny the existence of maritime, and my intentions are by no means to prove otherwise. But I do want to ask—what is maritime and its landscape as a phenomenon? This question is a lot more than defining what belongs to the category maritime and how to identify maritime cultural landscapes, it is about the very nature of the category and the effects it has upon us. What kind of a landscape is a maritime cultural landscape? Is it something to be found out there, consisting of more or less pure maritime objects?

The theoretical discussion within maritime archaeology has to a large extent been concentrated on self definitions; if we are maritime, marine, aquatic, sub aquatic archaeologists or simply just archaeologists, which borders we defend and have to overcome. What is the nature of our discipline and objects (e.g. Adams 2002; Bass 1966; Carpenter 1991; Firth 1995; Flatman 2003; Gundersen 2000, 2007; Løseth 2006; Muckelroy 1978; McGrail 1984; Nymoer 1997; Westerdahl 1989, 1992, 1995, 2007, 2008; Jasinski 1993, 1995a, b, 1999; Kvalø 2000). An extensive amount of adjectives have been presented through research history for describing the activity on the sea floor, and some have based large parts of their academic career on shaping and intensify those definitions.

In many senses, I am adding more stones to this ballast heap with my article by discussing and shaping a fairly uncommon noun in use at least within Scandinavian archaeology: *maritimity*. Albeit I do hope that it will help as an analytical tool to understand maritime as a phenomenon, and therefore has a justification. My intention with *maritimity* as a concept is to explore some differences to be found between Norwegian CHM under and above water. The concept also might be useful outside Norwegian CHM, to better understand and discuss the relation between maritime and terrestrial, or land and sea as we see it in archaeological research and CHM.

*Maritimity* as I define and use it is the result of identification and sorting between terrestrial and maritime affairs. The question *what is maritime* as Westerdahl asked is a quite complex one, and *maritimity* as I use it doesn't contribute in any sense to help further with a more precise definition. But it does discuss the relationship between sea and land, a central issue when it comes to maritime archaeology and maritime cultural landscapes. Though, it is the sorting process between Land and Sea which is kept in focus, not whether a phenomenon is to be labelled maritime or terrestrial. *Maritimity* is then to be understood as a category of understanding, not something with empirical qualities. Here I define *maritimity* as the process of purification that takes place in the network, in between the poles of Land and Sea. In this sense, *maritimity* is equivalent to the modern metaphysic as

described by Bruno Latour (1993), with the same actants and process at work. The purification consists of several processes, which gives maritimity many facets. Some of them I want to explore in this article. Latour's understanding of the modern metaphysics is more thoroughly explained below.

One of the portable arguments within the concept of maritime cultural landscapes is to bridge boundaries between Land and Sea, as the research history points out as a gap to overcome. *The human perspective, after all, always consists of both land and sea.* (Westerdahl 2008:191). My assertion is nevertheless that those who have the strongest critical focus on the division between land and sea (or maritime and terrestrial) also seems to be at risk of maintaining the gap most efficiently. How I can come to such a conclusion is to be found within a specific theoretical point of departure.

Bruno Latour claims in “Science in Action” (1987) that in the study of science and technology when following the constitution of knowledge, one should enter through the back door of Science in the Making, not through the more grandiose entrance of Ready Made Science (ibid:4). Those two aspects of science are as different as a two-faced Janus, where the presented statements from ready Made Science are to be regarded as black boxes—devices of which one needs to know nothing but its input and output. At this stage, knowledge is cold and stable. An example of a black box could be the scientific method  $^{14}\text{C}$ , introduced by Willard F. Libby in 1946 (Hedeager and Kristiansen 1985:47; Trigger 1989:304). Hardly anyone would argue against this method and its relevance, it simply has become a black box and a valid argument in any dispute. But how did Libby manage to establish his method as a scientific black box when the knowledge still was warm and unstable? According to Latour, the unstable phase of Science in the Making is the most interesting stage in the study of science and its impact on society. The researcher simply has to be there before the black box gets closed (Latour 1987 cpt.1; Brattli 2006:40).

Science as a phenomena aims to establish secure knowledge or black boxes as Latour labels them, where the scientist in the process enrolls allies to support the claim, allies of both human and non human character. These allies can be viewed as participants in a network, or actants as they may get termed in an Actor Network context. The Network ties all kind of material together, for example humans, physical structures, objects, text, machines, time and more. From this heterogeneous soup, phenomena of clear and unequivocal character arise, phenomena that appear to have been ever present. Actor Network as a theory is concerned with how networks get established and maintained, how phenomena get constructed and de-constructed and who in the network gets to speak on behalf of the rest (Latour 1987,1993, see also Law 2004:157; Dolwick 2009:36). In many senses, the maritime cultural landscape as a concept has established itself as a black box within maritime archaeology where its success has resulted in a degree of theoretical stability in both the academic and developer-funded fields.

Closely connected to Actor Network Theory (ANT) is a certain perception of the modern metaphysics (Latour 1987, 1993; Olsen 2003; Brattli 2006; Dolwick 2008, 2009). According to Latour's understanding of the modern metaphysics, all phenomena shall and must be categorised as either pure nature or pure society—a process that started with the mechanical view of the world and has become the very signature of being modern (Latour 1993, see also Thomas 2004 ch 1; Shapin 1999). Though, this is an illusion according to Latour, there exists no such thing as pure natural or societal phenomena. Latour wants us to appreciate that modern explanations of the world hide and neglect the hybrid relationship of nature and culture (Guttormsen 2008:456). Our belief in Nature separated from Society is simply depending upon our belief in the modern metaphysics. The claim is that Science

and Research bind together several heterogeneous elements and then define it as a pure form.

Bjørnar Olsen gives a good description of this in his article *Material Culture after Text: Re-Membering Things*, where he refers to the Saamis, who unaware of their ontological blunders kept on hugging and greeting pines after returning from the mountains to the winter pastures in the forest, and had long conversations with drums and stones, treated the brown bear as a relative and buried dead bears as humans (Olsen 2003:95). Unable to recognise where reality ends and its metaphorical representation begin, it was left to the anthropologist to draw the dividing line and purify this entangled mess. As Olsen puts it, although prescribed for the non-human side, material culture ended up occupying neither of the positions; neither culture nor nature. Being a mixture, a work of translation, material culture becomes a matter out of place. Or to rephrase it, they become quasi objects.

The binding of heterogeneous elements is according to Latour done in the network, where actually everything is done. What the network really produces then, as Olsen demonstrates in his example, are then quasi objects, which get sorted out either to the pole of Nature or Society by repertoires—a device that means to perform the sorting process. A repertoire can for instance be juridical acts like the Cultural Heritage Act, machines and scientific methods (Brattli 2006:17). The sorting of phenomena to either nature or culture requires that the repertoire of the natural scientists conclude nature to be something external. The social scientist's repertoire leads to the conception of society as an existence independent of something outside itself, kept in an up—right position solely by interpersonal relationships (Latour 1993; Brattli 2006).

An important issue for ANT is that all knowledge is of the same kind, it is only the length and stability of the network that differs. If the natural sciences are different from the social sciences, it is only because they are built with different kinds of material, like electrons, fuel cells and fish stocks (Holm 2001:153). Michel Callon demonstrates in a study of relationships between economic models and market phenomena, that economic theory performs, shapes and formats the economy rather than observing and analyzing how it works (Callon 1998). One could say that the economic model is not so much a map of the economy, as the working plan from which the economy has been constructed (Holm 2001:154). The same can be applied to sociology;

*What else does sociologist do? Like everyone else, they never stop working to define who acts and who speaks. They tape the recollection of a workman, a prostitute or an old Mexican; they interview; they hand out open and closed questionnaires on every subject under the sun; they unceasingly sound out the opinions of the masses. Each time they interpret their surveys they inform the Leviathan, transforming and performing it. Each time they construct a unity, define a group, attribute an identity, a will or a project; each time they explain what is happening, the sociologist, sovereign to authors—as Hobbes used the term—add to the struggling Leviathan's new identities, definitions and wills which enable other authors to grow or shrink, hide away or reveal themselves, expand or contract (Callon and Latour 1981:298).*

And it doesn't stop with sociology. Maritime archaeology and its maritime landscapes can be viewed in the same sense, where the model applied to the landscape is not so much of a map of the archaeology in this landscape, as the working plan from which maritime archaeology or maritime cultural landscapes has been constructed. In the construction of maritime archaeology and its landscapes, an additional set of poles seems to be operating, a sorting where the dichotomy Land and Sea plays a similar role as the Nature—Culture dichotomy with the same mechanisms at play (Tuddenham 2008). Phenomena in between those extreme poles become quasi objects that get sorted to their proper place, a

purification performed within a network, maintained by different institutions. I have already suggested this sorting in the introduction as a result of semantics, and named the sorting process between the poles Sea and Land as a maritimity. If one views the sorting process between those poles as an activity performed within a network, the process of identifying and sorting phenomena to the pole of Sea or Land is to be regarded as a production of quasi objects. It is simply a network constituted by heterogeneous elements, where phenomenon according to Latour get translated and sorted between the poles of Nature and Culture, and perhaps also, as I try to argue for, between Land and Sea.

As for the construction of this maritimity, it will consist of a large range of heterogeneous elements, from chubby pink little divers to marine survey tools, saline and freshwater, wrecks and cannons, land and sea, gender, media, paragraphs, management and so on. Out of this heterogeneous soup, a maritimity appears; consisting of quasi objects that have been sorted out and translated in the network and then placed at its proper pole. In search of anything exclusively maritime, as Westerdahl points out is a challenging exercise, perhaps some of the challenges are not to be found in the phenomena itself, but within the network that performs the sorting of quasi objects toward the pole of sea.

As a small case study to explore some aspects of maritimity as we can see it in maritime archaeology and in the study of maritime cultural landscapes, I want to take a closer look at Norwegian CHM in the managing of different cultural landscapes and their monuments, and to have a closer look upon an important repertoire in the maintenance of maritimity within Norwegian CHM. The Cultural Heritage Act defines what is to be regarded as a monument, and how to protect it. As we shall see, this is a sorting process, where phenomena get sorted and valued differently according to its identification as a monument belonging to the sea or land. My case study is to be found in a joint venture project between NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet and Møre & Romsdal County Administration, on an industrial monument at the Island Smøla. Its history goes back to one of the first recorded financial bubbles.

### **Cultural Heritage Management in Different Landscapes**

One of the first famous financial bubbles can be found in the establishment of the South Sea Company in 1711, a London based company that converted outstanding short term war debts into equity in a new joint-stock company with exclusive trading rights in Spanish South America (Carswell 1960). As a trading company, the South Sea never made any substantial profit, due to the fact that the Spaniards obstructed any agreement between England and Spain. Nevertheless, the company continued to argue that its longer term future would be extremely profitable. The company stimulated an interest in investments that became a nationwide frenzy, where all sorts of people took part as investors. Most of the investments were put into the South Seas, but other stocks profited from this new interest as well. Among the many companies to go public in 1720 was an enterprise that advertised itself as *a company for carrying out an undertaking of great advantage, but nobody to know what it is (sic)* (MacKay 1996:78).

In Norway at the same time, the investor Nils Josten had bought a copper mine at Smøla, an island situated in between the urban centres of Trondheim and Kristiansund (Lie and Tuddenham 2009). Josten's idea was to sell the copper mine to English investors. A Thomas Cable was sent from London to investigate the copper mine, and after the inspection he gave a very optimistic report to his employer. When Josten learned about the report, he wasn't too keen on selling the mine after all. Instead, he wanted to exploit it

himself—a decision he came to regret later. In 1721 the enterprise had 47 employees in the mine and smithy's. But the cash balance was in a poor state. The prosperity of the mine also turned out to be grossly exaggerated. In 1722, the copper mine adventure was over. Josten got imprisoned for debt, and he died disillusioned in his cell in 1729 (Lie and Tuddenham 2009).

Today, the remains of the copper mine at Smøla constitute an industrial cultural heritage site of current interest, being the product of a financial bubble. The complex belongs to different cultural landscapes, where landlubbers and seadogs are about to meet each other in a joint venture to conduct investigations of the site in the near future both on shore and in the harbour belonging to the copper mine. The work on land will be conducted by archaeologists from Møre and Romsdal Country administration, while the underwater work is to be done by archaeologists from Vitenskapsmuseet, which is one of five museums with responsibility for sites under water in Norway. The harbour hasn't been investigated under water before, but we do have an idea what we will meet on the seafloor. Most likely, there will be deposits of clay pipes, ceramics, bottles and other typical items found in a harbour. According to Norwegian legislation, such items are regarded as legally protected as a result of the formulation of section 14 in the Norwegian Cultural Heritage act on ship finds:

#### Section 14

*The State shall have the right of ownership of boats more than 100 years old, ships' hulls, gear, cargo and anything else that has been on board, or parts of such objects, when it seems clear under the circumstances that there is no longer any reasonable possibility of finding out whether there is an owner or who the owner is.*

This is the most important section in the Cultural Heritage Act when it comes to sites under water, besides sites older than 1537; the year of the reformation in Norway, which are automatically protected. This means that the copper mine site on shore is not protected by the Cultural Heritage Act, since it is far too young to be defined as a pre-reformation site. Herein lies a paradox. A clay pipe deposited in cultural layers on shore for instance has no protection. But if the clay pipe is lost from a ship onto the sea floor, it will be regarded as once belonging to a ship and therefore protected by section 14. This is regardless of whether there is a wreck nearby or not, it is sufficient that it has been aboard a ship. True, most items imported to Norway have once been aboard a ship, but it is only when the item is in a context where it has been lost from a ship onto the seafloor that this rule applies (Holme 2001:123). One can argue that the clay pipe has been thrown on shore from a ship, and therefore it has to be protected by the law. But that claim won't stand up in court as this is a fairly unlikely practise. And if the clay pipe is suspected to be thrown from land onto the sea bed, even if it is obvious that it has been imported by keel, the protection evaporates immediately (According to Court Ruling Nordmøre Tingrett 2005).

In an Actor Network context, it is common to operate with an Obligatory Passage Point as a term defining a point in the network where all interests have to pass. The Obligatory Passage Point contributes to maintain the reality the network wants to communicate. The Ministry of Environment and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage can be regarded as Obligatory Passage Points, and have ultimate authority within Norwegian CHM. These institutions manage the stability of the network, and define and maintain the desired reality description. In this case, the Obligatory Passage Point within the network defines shipwrecks and its belongings as a monument to protect, and it states how to protect them. It also communicates a difference between terrestrial and maritime cultural heritage, by

separate limits for protection. To put it in other words, it is a maritimity in action that maintains a certain perception of reality within CHM.

If one takes the discourse within maritime archaeology regarding ship finds, it becomes obvious that the reality presented by the cultural heritage act does not correspond with the view of the relationship between land and sea, where in this case the ship and its belongings becomes almost independent of terrestrial affairs. Why should the same object be more interesting if it can be connected to a ship or the fact that it has been lost from a ship, in contrast to a terrestrial context which transform the same artefact into something of no archaeological interest?

Another example concerns important elements in the maritime cultural landscape, like moorings and navigation marks. These objects are highly maritime in their obvious connection to seafaring. They are not protected, however, even though a seamark or mooring from the seventeenth century may be far more exclusive than a wreck from the nineteenth century. In this sense, it can be said that present maritime archaeology has not played a decisive role within the network, to redefine what is to be regarded as a monument. To come to understand why this dissonance exists between maritime archaeology and CHM, one has to analyse the Management in the Making, instead of focusing on Ready Made Management. Shipwrecks and their belongings are given special attention in the legislation, and the article on ship finds was first articulated in 1963 as an addition to the legislation of 1951 (Trøim 1999:99). There are several obvious reasons why this article appears in the 1960s, but perhaps one important actant that seldom gets mentioned in the constitution of shipwreck as monuments and how to understand them in the present day CHM is sport divers and their technology. They have become hidden and silent, but in the post war period after the introduction of modern day diving equipment when the management policy was in the making, sport divers were not at all silent actants as Dumas so pertinently remarks. Later on, they have been translated, and then silenced. During early CHM under water, a lot of effort was made to interest and enrol sport divers in Norway. Today, sport divers have been marginalised within Norwegian CHM. The Norwegian situation is slightly different compared with e.g. the UK, where sports divers have remained a powerful voice over a longer period (personal communication J. Adams). Nevertheless they have been and still are important as actants in the network behind that which constitutes present day CHM. One might ask how the process toward a stabilisation of a network has influenced the perception of shipwrecks as monuments. The understanding of wrecks as monuments will according to ANT be a creation within a network, where heterogeneous actants play important roles. Perhaps those who have been silenced are the most interesting actants when it comes to this creation.

As demonstrated, the legislation and the CHM organisation can provide a challenge in managing cultural landscapes under and above water as an entirety. It can be said that this example demonstrates a maritimity within Norwegian legislation and CHM, where the cultural heritage act operates as a repertoire to maintain a desired reality, where ships and their belongings are to be regarded as of different value compared to sites on shore. The maritimity within Norwegian CHM sorts and pushes phenomena toward the pole of sea. To investigate this black box within Norwegian CHM, one has to follow the creation of the legislation, where heterogeneous actants play a role in the establishment and maintenance of the network.

Another question that could be asked in this case study is: what kind of cultural landscape does Smølen kobberværk belong to? It obviously belongs to both a maritime and a terrestrial landscape. But can they or should they be viewed separately? Which parts of the complex are to be defined as maritime or terrestrial? And who is to decide? *Maritime-related*

*archaeological data acquired through terrestrial archaeology by excavations on land are often studied by land-archaeologists who feel no need to refer to their problems as maritime or their field of research as maritime archaeology* (Jasinski 1999:3). Jasinski's statement can be interpreted as a stabilisation of a network that aims to draw attention toward the pole of sea, where the sub-discipline Maritime Archaeology is the best suited to study maritime matters. Maritime archaeology is something else than terrestrial archaeology, which focuses on terrestrial matters. Archaeology according to this view simply consists of two poles with different agendas but with the same empirical base:

*That terrestrial and maritime archaeologist view, investigate and document cultural heritage objects on the coast from different perspectives is something I sometimes notice when studying photographs and drawings made by archaeologists. The same objects are often photographed or drawn by terrestrial archaeologists while standing on the shore with their backs to the sea, using the inland as the background for their documentation. Maritime archaeologists generally do the opposite. They take up a position with their backs to the land and use the sea as the background. This almost mechanical and often unconscious action reflects the way of thinking and the attitude of the researchers. Co-operation between these two categories of archaeologists would give the discipline a chance to acquire a more all-embracing understanding of the maritime cultural heritage* (ibid:12).

If so, the cooperation between landlubbers and seadogs at Smølen Kobberværk should secure an all embracing understanding of both maritime and terrestrial aspects of this cultural complex and its landscape, where both poles meet and cooperate between physical and academic borders. Though, as Tim Ingold points out about landscapes; *...it is important to note that no feature of the landscape is, of itself, a boundary. It can only become a boundary, or the indicator of a boundary, in relation to the activities of the people (or animals) for whom it is recognized or experienced as such* (Ingold 1993: 156). The question is then; who identifies those boundaries and for what reason? Who decides what is to be identified as a phenomenon belonging to sea or land? Who in this network speaks on behalf of the rest and what kind of obligatory passage points can be identified? What kind of repertoires maintain the sorting process and production of quasi objects, which also can be termed as a maritimity?

## Conclusion

Maritime archaeology and its maritime cultural landscapes clearly draw attention to the need for study of maritime matters. The concept of maritime cultural landscape illustrates the multitude of elements belonging to seafaring and the maritime way of life. But it also maintains a division that is created within a network, where the maritime cultural landscape becomes something different to other landscapes, as a result of a sorting process. In an Actor Network context, one can claim that it is as much a producer of quasi objects as a description of a reality to be found. When Westerdahl points out that the problem is to define the specifically maritime in relation to what is specifically land—oriented (2008:191), the answer to why this is challenging might be found in the network, as the result of a translation of quasi objects, or a maritimity as argued for in this paper. Poles like Sea and Land, or Maritime and Terrestrial, can according to ANT be viewed as creations within a network, as with the Nature—Culture dichotomy. In this article, I have discussed maritimity as an example of purification within the dichotomy Land—Sea, as equivalents to the modern metaphysics as described by Latour. In CHM and research this maritimity

can represent a challenge, where the danger is as Westerdahl points out for those who have an interest in matters maritime (or pure terrestrial for that matter), becomes excessively narrow, even though the intention was exactly the opposite.

**Acknowledgments** I am most grateful to Terje Brattli, Jesse Ransley, Pål Nymo, Jostein Gundersen, Stephen Wickler, Jon Anders Risvaag and Øyvind Ødegård for reading and commenting on the text.

## References

- Adams J (2002) Maritime archaeology. In: Orser C (ed) *Encyclopedia of historical archaeology*. Routledge, London, pp 228–230
- Bass GF (1966) *Archaeology under water*. Thames and Hudson, London
- Bass GF (1967) Cape Gelidonya: a bronze age shipwreck. *Trans Am Philos Soc New Series—Volume 57*. 8: 1–177
- Bass GF (1983) A plea for historical particularism. In: Gould R (ed) *Shipwreck anthropology*. University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque
- Brattli T (2006) *Fortid og forvaltning. En analyse av norsk kulturminneforvaltning I perioden 1990–2005, med hovedvekt på arkeologiske forhold*. Doktoravhandling for graden doctor artium. NTNU 2006
- Callon M (1998) *The laws of the marked*. Blackwell, Oxford
- Callon M, Latour B (1981) Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: how actors macrostructure reality and how sociologists help them to do so. In: Knorr Cetina K, Cicourel AV (eds) *Advances in social theory and methodology: toward an integration of micro and macro sociologies*. Routledge, London, pp 277–303
- Carpenter S (1991) *Fra undervannsarkeologi til maritim arkeologi*. Hovedfagsavhandling i arkeologi, Universitetet i Tromsø
- Carswell J (1960) *The South Sea bubble*. The Cresset Press, London
- Crumlin-Pedersen PO (1978) *Søvejen til Roskilde*. Historisk Årbok fra Roskilde Amt, Roskilde
- Dolwick JS (2008) In search of the social: steamboats, square wheels, reindeer and other things. *J Marit Archaeol* 3. 1: 15–41
- Dolwick JS (2009) “The Social” and beyond: introducing actor-network theory. *J Marit Archaeol* 4. 1:21–49
- Dumas F (1972) *30 Centuries under the sea*. Crown Publishers, New York
- Firth A (1995) Three facets of maritime archaeology: society, landscape and critique. In: Paper presented at the theoretical archaeology group, Durham 1993. Internet publication, University of Southampton. <http://www.southampton.ac.uk/archaeology/research/Firth/>
- Flatman J (2003) Cultural biographies, cognitive landscapes and dirty old bits of boat: “theory” in maritime archaeology. *Int J Naut Archaeol* 32.2:143–157
- Gundersen J (2000) *Havn og sjøfart på Nidarneset 700-1681—Forskningsstatus og kunnskapsbehov fra et maritimt perspektiv*. Hovedfagsoppgave NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet
- Gundersen J (2007) *40 år med norsk marinarkeologi*. Nicolay nr.102. Oslo
- Guttormsen TS (2008) *Natural catastrophes and landscape archaeology: landslide History in the Romerike landscape in South—Eastern Norway*. Facets of Archaeology. Essays in honour of Lotte Hedeager on her 60th birthday. Oslo Archaeological Series 2008
- Harpster M (2009) Keith Muckelroy: methods, ideas and maritime archaeology. *J Marit Archaeol* 4. 1:67–82
- Hedeager L, Kristiansen K (1985) *Arkæologi leksikon*. Politikens forlag 1985
- Holm P (2001) *The invisible revolution. The construction of institutional change in the fisheries*. PhD thesis. Norwegian College of Fishery Science. University of Tromsø
- Holme J (2001) *Kulturminnevern. Lov, Forvaltning, Håndhevelse*. Vol II. Jørn Holme (red). Økokrim 2001
- Ingold T (1993) The temporality of the landscape. In *Conceptions of time and ancient society*. *World Archaeol* 25. 2
- Jasinski ME (1993) *Maritimt kulturlandskap—arkeologisk perspektiv*. Viking:129–140
- Jasinski ME (1994) *Maritime cultural landscape-archaeological perspective*. *Archaeologia Polaki: XXXVIII*, 1:7.21
- Jasinski ME (1995a) *Land og hav—data og kildepekter for maritim arkeologi*. Spor 1. Trondheim
- Jasinski ME (1995b) *Maritim arkeologi-genesis, definisjon og kunnskapsbehov*. *Marinarkeologi*. Kunnskapsbehov. Rapport fra seminar 22.25 september 1993, Korshavn. Norges Forskningsråd FOK 1995

- Jasinski ME (1999) Which way now? Maritime archaeology and underwater heritage into the 21st century. In: Paper presented at the world archaeological congress 4, maritime archaeology: challenges for the new millennium. Cape Town, South Africa January 1999
- Kvalø F (2000) Oversjøiske reiser fra Sørvest-Norge til Nordvest-Jylland i eldre bronsealder—en drøfting om maritim realisering og rituell mobilisering. Hovedfagsoppgave i arkeologi ved Universitetet i Oslo
- Latour B (1987) *Science in action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Latour B (1993) *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Law J (2004) *After method. Mess in social science research*. Routledge, London
- Lie RO, Tuddenham DB (2009) Kobbervirket på Smøla. Spor 2009:1 NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet
- Løseth K (2006) Det maritime kulturlandskapet på Hitra. Et studium i forhistoriske gravminners beliggenhet i kystlandskapet. Masteroppgave. NTNU Vitenskapsmuseet
- MacKay C (1996) Extraordinary popular delusions and the madness of crowds. George G. Harrap, London
- McGrail S (1984) Maritime archaeology. Present and future. In: McGrail S (ed) *Aspects of maritime archaeology and ethnography*. National Maritime Museum, Greenwich, pp 11–40
- Muckelroy K (1978) *Maritime archaeology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Nymoen P (1997) Arkeologi med dykkemaske. Erfaringer fra en havneutgravning og synspunkt på samarbeidsprosjekt som forskningsstrategi. Arkeologi og kystkultur. Foredrag ved seminaret “Arkeologi og kystkultur”. Red. Helge Sørheim. Sunnmøre museum. Ålesund
- Olsen B (2003) Material culture after text: re-membering things. *Norwegian Archaeol Rev* 36. 2: 86–104
- Shapin S (1999) *Den vitenskapelige revolusjonen*. Spartacus forlag
- Trøim I (1999) Arkeologisk forskning og det lovregulerte fornminnevernet. *Varia* 40. Universitetets Oldsakssamling, Universitetet i Oslo
- Thomas J (2004) *Archaeology and modernity*. Routledge, London
- Trigger B (1989) *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Tuddenham DB (2008) The construction of a maritimity within Norwegian archaeology. In: Paper presented at the British theoretical archaeology group; session: maritime identities: museum, communal and personal uses of heritage. University of Southampton 2008
- Westerdahl (1978) *Marinarkeologisk inventering med utgangspunkt från ett norrlandskt exempel*. C-uppsats i arkeologi, VT 1978. Stockholms Universitet (Not published)
- Westerdahl C (1986) Die Maritime Kulturlandschaft. Schiffe, Schifffahrtswege, Häfen—Überlegungen zu einem Forschungsansatz. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Schifffahrtsmuseums*. Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv 9
- Westerdahl C (1989) *Norrlandsleden I*. Arkiv för Norrlandsk Hembygdsforskning XXIV 1988–89 Örnsköldsvik
- Westerdahl C (1992) The maritime cultural landscape. *Int J Naut Archaeol* 21. 1: 5–14
- Westerdahl C (1995) Det maritima kulturlandskapet—et återseende. In *Marinarkeologi*. Kunnskapsbehov. Rapport fra seminar 22.25 September 1993, Korshavn. Norges Forskningsråd FOK
- Westerdahl C (2007) The relationship between land roads and sea routes in the past—some reflections. *Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv*. *Wissenschaftliches Jahrbuch des Deutschen Schifffahrtsmuseums* 29. 2006
- Westerdahl C (2008) Fish and Ships. Towards a theory of maritime culture. *Deutsches Schifffahrtsarchiv*. *Wissenschaftliches Jahrbuch des Deutschen Schifffahrtsmuseums* 30. 2007