BLOOMSBURY
COLLECTIONS

Hollis, Dawn, and Jason König. "Introduction." *Mountain Dialogues from Antiquity to Modernity*. Ed. Dawn Hollis and Jason König. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021. 1–20. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 3 Apr. 2023. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350162853.0008>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, **www.bloomsburycollections.com**, 3 April 2023, 09:56 UTC.

Access provided by: University of St. Andrews

Copyright © Dawn Hollis and Jason König 2021. All rights reserved. Further reproduction or distribution is prohibited without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

INTRODUCTION

Dawn Hollis and Jason König

In his 1711 *Essay on Criticism*, Alexander Pope famously contrasts the initial, short-sighted enthusiasm for poetic achievement ('Short views we take, nor see the lengths behind') with the longer view that comes from experience ('Hills peep o'er hills and Alps on Alps arise').[1] These lines capture something of the experience of a mountain ascent, in which hours of staring at the ground in front of one's feet can give way to a very different view as the clouds lift or a ridge is crossed. They encapsulate, too, something of the exhilaration that comes from taking a long view of mountain history. You may be familiar with the mountain literature of one period, but suddenly new landscapes from other periods and places are opened up to view, connected in many ways with the slopes that are familiar to you, but also quite distinct in their character. Our aim in this volume is to give the reader access to precisely that kind of view, by setting each of the texts and periods considered in what follows not just within their own distinctive contexts but also in a relationship of interconnection and intervisibility with multiple other chapters in the history of mountains, from classical antiquity to the modern world.

The current contours of mountain studies

The study of mountains in modern scholarship has in many ways never been more vital, in the sense of being both active and necessary. Mountain studies, broadly defined, have attracted increasing attention over the past decade or so, especially in the sciences and social sciences, driven by pressing contemporary concerns. The world's mountains offer many powerful examples both of the physical impacts of climate change and of its socio-economic consequences for people dwelling in what are usually seen as 'marginal' environments.[2]

Mountains also inspire cultural fascination. In a scholarly context, this has been reflected in increasingly vigorous discussion in the humanities and from historical perspectives in particular. Important work has been done over the past decade, adding nuance and richness to our understanding of mountains in many different historical contexts: in ancient Mediterranean and Byzantine culture, in Renaissance and Enlightenment responses and in the eras of Romanticism and modern mountaineering.[3] Valuable efforts have been made to bring these perspectives into dialogue with scientific and social-scientific approaches.[4] However, researchers working in different historical periods have not always been in dialogue with each other. This volume responds to that situation by opening a conversation between different timeframes and disciplines

within the humanities and by bringing the classical tradition of mountain engagement more into dialogue with its postclassical equivalents. As we shall see there are some precedents for this project, but they are relatively few and far between, and tend to take the form of single-authored works.[5] In *Mountain Dialogues* we have instead taken a collaborative approach, with the goal of generating new insights into the richness and interconnectedness of the different texts and cultures that we study.

Any longue-durée consideration of mountains in Western culture faces the challenge of a very long-standing but misleading perception which still casts its shadow over academic and especially popular writing on mountain history. This is the idea that the history of mountain experience in Europe is characterized by an eighteenth-century watershed, on either side of which can be found the 'mountain gloom' of premodern engagements, and the 'mountain glory' of modern ones. These terms are drawn from the seminal work on the topic by Marjorie Hope Nicolson, who published her *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite* in 1959.[6] In many ways Nicolson's work was new and revolutionary: she read works of early modern natural philosophy, or 'science', as literary texts and as harbingers of cultural and aesthetic change. At the same time, it was based on a conception that was already deep-rooted: by her own admission she set out to solve 'a basic problem in the history of taste' which predated her work by decades, namely the apparent dearth of positive responses to mountains in English literature from before around the end of the seventeenth century.[7] And it is in its titular, long-established claim, rather than in its methodology or nuanced textual analysis, that Nicolson's work has gone on to have the greatest influence. A large proportion of late twentieth- and early twenty-first-century accounts of mountain history, especially non-specialist accounts that deal with the subject in passing, cite Nicolson, often to support the simple 'fact' that Europeans in general did not appreciate mountains until the eighteenth century.[8] The idea has long since circulated in the popular historical consciousness: most prominently in recent years, Robert Macfarlane's bestselling *Mountains of the Mind* reiterated to tens of thousands of readers that three centuries ago, 'The notion barely existed ... that wild landscape might hold any sort of appeal'.[9]

There have been attempts to move beyond this overly simplistic model, although more so in some areas of study than others. Scholars on the later side of the supposed eighteenth-century watershed, including several of the contributors to this volume, have developed far more complex understandings of modern responses to mountains. Peter Hansen, for example, has introduced the concept of 'the summit position', proposing that the idea of the individual, alone and first upon a mountaintop, was crucial to the development of both modernity and mountaineering (which were themselves, he suggests, mutually constitutive phenomena) in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.[10] Hansen's analysis of mountaineering as a practice intertwined with and productive of new ideas regarding the fashioning of the self, the imperatives of empire, and political and individual autonomy, has offered an important corrective to the tendency to write modern mountaineering history in wholly uncritical and celebratory terms as a narrative of progress. As Hansen's insights make clear, the successive conquests

of the world's peaks in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were much more than just natural and inevitable responses to new perceptions of 'mountain glory'. In their study of the contemporary socio-political status of mountains, Bernard Debarbieux and Gilles Rudaz have drawn attention to the lack of consensus regarding any bureaucratic or governmental definition of the term 'mountain', arguing that the idea of the 'mountain' is itself a culturally variable construct, and that the forms that construct takes impact on the ways in which governments engage with mountains and how people living in the mountains experience them.[11] With that complex and multifaceted picture in mind the idea of 'mountain glory' as the unvarying, default modern response seems simplistic and misleading. Meanwhile, Cian Duffy has re-minted the famous term 'classic ground' (originally used by Joseph Addison with reference to the culturally and historically rich landscape of Italy), to emphasize the ways in which eighteenth- and nineteenth-century travellers experienced the Romantic sublime not as a disinterested aesthetic response but as a sensation embedded in an awareness and indeed active construction of the historical associations of specific landscapes. Duffy's work challenges the idea that romantic engagements with landscape were free from any connection with the past: on the contrary a sense of history was an essential feature.[12]

Others have begun to challenge the idea of premodern 'mountain gloom'. In some cases that has involved shifting the concept rather than overturning it entirely: for example, Martin Korenjak and William Barton have suggested that the moment of transition from 'gloom to glory' should be located several centuries earlier than Nicolson had assumed.[13] Others have gone further, most prominently Janice Hewlett Koelb, who has challenged Nicolson's stereotypes of 'Christian distrust' and 'Roman distaste' for mountains by pointing to the writings of individuals such as Dante, Quintilian and Cicero, to demonstrate that the concept of 'mountain glory' was rooted in premodern and indeed classical precedents.[14] Koelb rightly emphasizes Nicolson's 'enduring service' to literary scholars in highlighting for the first time 'the turbulent crosscurrents among theology, humane letters, and scientific speculation about the natural world' during the seventeenth century. She concludes, however, that the narrative of gloom and glory has served 'as a simple framework on which to pin a complex set of facts. But the facts ultimately will not allow so simple a framework to stand'.[15]

Despite all of these developments, however, there is still a tendency among academic and especially popular historians working on modern responses to mountains to use this oversimplified image of 'mountain gloom' in their attempts to sum up the 'prehistory' of the phenomena in which they are interested. That standard move leaves the impression of preceding swathes of human history in which relatively little happened: in which people neither liked nor spent much time around mountains. Many dismissals of premodern mountain experience see little need to provide a citation, Nicolsonian or otherwise: it is an idea which has entered the sphere of generally accepted historical knowledge.[16] Of course, no-one could deny that some things did change in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The period saw the development of a new vocabulary of emotional and aesthetic response to mountains, along with the development of mountain-climbing as a leisure pursuit. But our hypothesis in this volume is that the

gloom-glory model leads to a vastly oversimplified image of premodern mountain engagement, and to a systematic failure to understand what we can gain by exposing texts from different centuries to the same questions within a comparative framework.

It is inevitably difficult to generalize about 'premodern' responses. There are different factors lying behind the continued devaluing of premodern mountain engagements for different disciplines and different periods. For the centuries immediately preceding the supposed eighteenth-century watershed it seems likely that academic attention has been limited in part because of these long-lasting assumptions about premodern dislike of mountains. Why develop a research proposal on something that is widely believed, in both popular and scholarly discourse, to have been non-existent?[17] Recent scholarly discussions of early modern mountains can be counted on one hand.[18] The medieval period has seen a similar neglect of historical mountain studies, which is only now beginning to be remedied.[19]

For the classical world the picture is rather different. It is hard to imagine many classicists taking seriously the claim that the ancient Greeks and Romans were entirely uninterested in mountains. For some the gloom-glory dichotomy might in fact look like a straw man that is so easy to dismiss that it is not worth considering. Even for Greek and Roman antiquity, however, there do seem to be factors that encourage the impression of a disjuncture between ancient and modern responses. There has been important work on the history and archaeology of ancient mountains, for example in relation to their role as places of sacrifice and worship of the gods, or on their contribution to the economy and identity of particular regions.[20] There has also been some work on literary responses to mountains, especially in the pioneering publications of Richard Buxton.[21] Nevertheless there is still a tendency in Classics as a discipline to underestimate the complexity and sophistication of ancient landscape description, perhaps not directly because of the Nicolsonian model, but rather for the related reason that ancient landscape engagement tends not to follow the Romantic pattern of aesthetically inflected set-piece description: it takes a considerable effort to see beyond that absence and to appreciate on their own terms the much more disjointed, understated ways of engaging with landscape that we find in ancient narrative.[22] There has also been very little interest among classicists in the challenge of engaging with modern mountain writing as a way of opening up fresh questions and perspectives on the ancient material, presumably from an assumption that ancient and modern mountain responses do indeed belong to entirely different worlds.

The continuing tendency to think in terms of a sharp dichotomy between premodern and modern responses – the latter characterized by the desire to conquer mountain summits, and to produce writings which dwell at length on the sublime beauties of the landscape – has several consequences. On the one hand, it can lead us to underestimate the similarities between modern and premodern engagements. At the same time, and paradoxically, it can lead us to underestimate the differences. Ancient, medieval, and early modern responses to mountains tend to be judged according to how far they measure up to their more 'highly developed' modern equivalents, rather than being analysed on their own terms. Two prominent examples include Petrarch's ascent of Mont Ventoux in 1336, and Conrad Gessner's sixteenth-century writings in praise of mountains.

Both of these figures have been hailed as 'modern', as rare exceptions to a rule of mountain distaste, although Petrarch has also been criticized for falling short of a true appreciation of the summit when he turned from the view towards a consideration of his own spiritual failings.[23] In reality, of course, neither Petrarch nor Gessner were remotely 'modern', and nor were they the only authors of their eras to acknowledge mountains; they are simply the ones most frequently noted by virtue of their surface similarities with modern modes of mountain writing.

The aim of this volume, by contrast, is to consciously step out of the shadow of mountain gloom and glory: to encompass a wider range of past mountain writing, and to highlight congruences between mountain engagements of different periods where they exist, but also to utilize a comparative approach precisely in order to emphasize what is distinctive about responses to mountains in different cultures and periods. In terms of the former goal, this volume promotes a greater appreciation of connections across time, with chapters tracing the influence of particular classical texts and ideas on later responses to the landscape, and highlighting the way in which what we might at first glance take as modern ideas are in some cases actually rooted in ancient precedents. At the same time, we aim to avoid a simplistic sense of the 'classical tradition' at work, or any suggestion that ancient, medieval, early modern and modern mountain engagements were straightforwardly the same. Instead, our argument is that responses across time need to be read as part of the same history and exposed to the same variety of questions and approaches in order to produce distinctive but mutually intelligible answers. Rather than just tracing genealogical connections between different moments of mountain engagement, we propose a dialogue: between responses to mountains from different periods, and between the methodologies of different disciplines.

In doing so, we are building on the nuanced paradigms and ways of thinking developed in discrete corners of mountain scholarship of the past decade, but crucially bringing them together in order to develop new ways of understanding mountains in a historical perspective. We believe that this kind of collaborative, cross-disciplinary approach is vital in enabling the humanities in general and historical subjects specifically to play a significant role within the wider field of mountain studies. As noted in the opening to this introduction, mountain research in the sciences and social sciences has been driven by undeniably urgent questions regarding the preservation of the environment and the experiences of societies whose cultures and economies are intertwined with mountain landscapes. It is therefore perhaps no surprise that the field is dominated by environmental, geographical and socio-economic approaches. The current state of play, however, underestimates the extent to which historical, humanities perspectives have the potential to speak to contemporary concerns.

Explicit engagement with current issues through the mountain histories of the past is not our main goal in this volume, but we do see it as a high priority for the future. It might help us, for example, to understand more clearly the cultural variability of human responses to mountains, and to raise the possibility of alternative models for mountain life which are quite different from those we are familiar with. It might also at the same time shed light on continuities between past and present which can help to combat

simplistic notions of modern exceptionalism, whereby anthropocentric modes of engagement with mountains are celebrated or denigrated as uniquely contemporary phenomena. This volume does, however, aim to break some new ground in building consensus regarding shared concerns, questions and themes within historical mountain studies. Our hope is that an intensification of cross-disciplinary dialogue in this field will lead to a stronger sense of shared identity, and so in turn to an increased prominence within mountain studies more broadly, which will ultimately strengthen our ability as scholars of the past to speak to the present and future.

Mountain pathways

Of course, in crossing any mountain one must start from somewhere. In this volume, we take as our starting-point the literature and culture of the ancient Mediterranean world. Our initial invitation to our contributors was to consider, among other things, how far postclassical ways of thinking about mountains had been shaped by classical understandings, and how a comparative approach, in bringing ancient and modern material together, can help to generate both new methodological developments and also fresh perspectives on long-standing scholarly views. In that sense this volume aims to make a distinctive contribution to the series in which it is published, in proposing an interpretation of 'ancient environments' that extends into modernity. The history of ancient Mediterranean environments and landscapes does not stop at the end of late antiquity. If we want to understand that history in its full richness we need to take the opportunity to expose it to questions and challenges from other periods and disciplines, and we need to understand its afterlife. What does it look like not only to read ancient mountains through the lens of modern experiences but also, more radically, to read 'post'-classical experiences through the lens of ancient mountain engagements?

Historically, mountains stand as places of connection. Traditionally there has been a tendency to assume, particularly for premodern culture, that mountains were wilderness spaces that obstructed travel and exchange and kept their populations cut off from the outside world. Recent work, at least on classical culture, has argued precisely the opposite: that mountains were often zones of interconnection and communication that brought the communities on either side of them together.[24] The diverse contributors to this volume came together to present their papers in Scotland in December 2018, and over and over again we recognized connecting concerns between papers on different periods which would otherwise have never been brought into conversation with one another. Our experience of that workshop and of the resulting volume has been that the topic of mountains offers an exciting and valuable meeting-place for a variety of disciplines, genres and scholarly literatures.

The chapters that follow deal with a series of themes and questions which we see as central to the study of mountains in past contexts, and crucial to any attempt to understand the relationship between ancient Mediterranean engagements with mountains and their later equivalents. This volume makes no claims to be exhaustive. It

is designedly far from comprehensive in its chronological and geographical coverage. Each of the chapters focuses on specific issues or moments: these are case studies within a broad history, portions of an as yet incomplete outline map of a vast territory. In the history of mapping, mountains have traditionally posed great challenges: mountain regions have often been left empty because of their inaccessibility and because of the challenges of high-altitude cartography. Many of the individual case studies in the volume deal with areas that are still more or less blank in the history of scholarship; some by contrast offer a fresh view of often-studied ground. Nevertheless, we do aim to cover a set of recurring issues that have emerged repeatedly in our discussions as core issues from many different periods and genres.

We have chosen not to divide the chapters formally into subsections precisely because we want to maximize the opportunity for readers to draw out for themselves the variety of possible connections between different chapters in the volume. We have also chosen to avoid a chronological organization for the chapters, so as not to detract from our aim of promoting interconnection and communication between the study of mountains in different periods: often, the most significant overlaps between chapters have little to do with chronological proximity. We have, however, arranged the chapters in thematically related pairs in order to offer one possible pathway through the volume.

Our two opening chapters consider the classicizing mountain responses of figures on either side of the supposed eighteenth-century watershed in mountain perceptions, offering us a first glimpse of some of the continuities across that boundary. Dan Hooley elucidates the 'mountain sublime' of the sixteenth-century botanist Conrad Gessner, and Cian Duffy explores the tensions between 'scientific' and 'literary' responses to volcanoes in the writings of the traveller Patrick Brydone and the poet Anna Seward.

Chapters three and four delve further into the relationship between past and present in a pair of texts dedicated to compilation of knowledge about mountains. Dawn Hollis charts the uneasy authority of classical texts in seventeenth-century attempts to understand the natural landscape, in the work of Thomas Burnet and his interlocutors, whilst Sean Ireton's chapter on W. A. B. Coolidge and Josias Simler unpacks the erudite complexity of a twentieth-century climber's translation of a sixteenth-century guide to the Alps which was in turn indebted to ancient impressions of the mountains.

Douglas Whalin and Janice Hewlett Koelb, in chapters five and six, turn our attention from mountains as spaces of knowledge-making towards traditions of thinking about mountains as spaces of retreat and holiness that are reused repeatedly over many centuries from the ancient world onward: Whalin offers an overview of late antique Christian construction of mountains, and Koelb focuses specifically upon mountains as motifs in the lives and later representations of the saints Jerome and Francis.

Alley Marie Jordan reminds us in chapter seven that those classical ways of thinking about mountain retreats could be found even as far afield as Thomas Jefferson's eighteenth-century Virginia estates. Both Jordan's chapter, and Jason König's contribution in chapter eight on the travel writing of Edward Dodwell, address the intertwining of classical ways of thinking about mountains with aesthetic concepts such as the picturesque and the sublime which became so prominent in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century landscape writing.

From there we return to the work of Patrick Brydone, another famous example of the Mediterranean travel-writing genre, in the chapter by Gareth Williams. Both he, and Chloe Bray in chapter ten, explore in different ways the relationship between representation and experience in mountain narratives. Williams looks at the constant tension between real, embodied experience and imagined, even fabricated representations of ascent in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century antiquarian mountaineering, and also in Petrarch's famous account of an ascent of Mont Ventoux in 1336 and Pietro Bembo's account of his ascent of Etna in 1493. Bray unpacks the phenomenologically resonant character of portrayals of landscape in classical Greek tragedy, for example Euripides' *Bacchae*, which not only represents mountains as places of mythological fantasy, but also prompts its audience members to recall their own bodily experiences of mountain landscapes.

Finally, chapters eleven and twelve consider mountains and the construction of national or regional identity. Harriet Archer focusses on a series of rich sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts, including John Higgins' *Mirror for Magistrates*, in order to unfold the relationship between poetic allegory, mountains, and a Tudor sense of British identity. In turn, Peter Hansen takes a long view of the history of Mont Ventoux as the nexus for developing ideas of modernity and nationhood, from the much-interpreted ascent by Petrarch to the ambivalent visions of the summit position in the writings of Provençal poet and Resistance leader René Char. Hansen's chapter offers an apt conclusion to the volume by then gesturing 'upland' to the future of mountain environments and our relationship to them.

The above represents just one attempt at route-finding through the chapters of this volume. In the Greek poetry of Hellenistic Alexandria, from the fourth and third centuries BCE, and later in Roman elegy, the idea of the poet travelling an untrodden path, sometimes explicitly a mountain path, was routinely used as a metaphor for literary originality.[25] We hope that readers will look beyond the possible pairings we have outlined above in order to trace their own original connections between the chapters, texts, eras and contexts represented here. As a starting-point for that process, in the remainder of this introduction, we offer a number of alternative routes by drawing out some of the thematic clusters that we have been most struck by in our reading and in our conversations. These fall under four main and overlapping categories – temporality, knowledge, identity and experience – although we recognize that these themes are inevitably intertwined with each other.[26] Some of what follows expands upon the connections sketched already in the previous paragraphs; other sections draw attention to further areas of common ground.

Temporality

Mountains across human culture are often associated with the past, sometimes a very ancient past, in distinctive ways. These often involve imagining mountains as places of origin, as Hansen shows in his account of Cézanne's fascination with Mont Sainte-

Victoire as a place linked with the dawn of human existence. Richard Buxton has pointed out that mountains are 'before' in ancient Greek thought too, envisaged as places linked with the earliest human populations and with the pre-human.[27] The deep time of modern geological understanding of mountains, recently charted at length by Veronica della Dora, is another way of thinking about the antiquity of mountains,[28] but the uniqueness of that modern view has often been overstated. In her chapter in this volume Hollis demonstrates that early modern notions of geological temporality were themselves formed with reference to classical (and also biblical) ideas about the antiquity of mountains,[29] particularly their ideas of an original 'Chaos' in the early stages of creation. These ideas were used not as inert embellishments, but as crucial evidence, albeit less highly valued than the authority of Scripture or rational observation and inductive reasoning. Duffy similarly emphasizes that eighteenth-century understandings of the timescales of Etna's volcanic landscape are indebted to classical predecessors. Many different cultures, then, have shared a sense of mountains as places with a deep antiquity which stands as a puzzle to understanding and analysis.

The antiquity of mountains also has a historical and mythological dimension. Mountains are wilderness spaces, but they are also places of human culture and human history, and the tension between those two elements is one source of their fascination. During the last two centuries the human past of mountains has been envisaged most often in relation to the history of mountaineering: famous peaks gain much of their fascination from the stories of those who have climbed on them and died on them in the past. But that phenomenon is only one subset of a much older process of understanding mountain landscapes according to the stories that are associated with their slopes and summits. The connection between landscape and memory that Simon Schama traced influentially more than two decades ago has a long heritage stretching back into the classical past.[30]

Much of our discussion of that issue in what follows focuses on the distinctive relationship with the past that we see in the mountains of the Mediterranean. For centuries and even millennia the communities of mainland Greece and Asia Minor processed to mountaintops to sacrifice, as a way of acting out their connections with the divine and with the customs of their ancestors.[31] The status of mountains as places of mythological memory continued even into the Roman empire and beyond, for example in the work of Pausanias, who travelled in Greece in the second century CE, and whose work is full of descriptions of mountain shrines and mythological stories associated with them.[32] For the ancient world it was hard to separate mythological and scientific explanation, as Duffy illustrates in the case of Mount Etna: he sees them as 'blurring . . . rather than reinforcing any sense of these as distinct ways of knowing and describing the world'.[33] One version of the history of these sites might emphasize the way in which those mythological associations died away in the postclassical world, or at any rate became more and more confined to literary game playing, but Duffy also demonstrates that the mythological strand in those discussions continued to have an influence over the modern accounts – we see traces of it absorbed and reconfigured within the empirical language of writing about Etna in the eighteenth century, or in Anna Seward's writings on the volcanic quality of eighteenth-century industry and technology. In later centuries too that very

ancient classical past continued to have a powerful resonance, as highlighted by König in his study of nineteenth-century travel writers, who were similarly aware of the way in which ascending the mountains of Greece connected them with an ancient history and mythology that might be less conspicuously visible at ground level. Veronica della Dora has drawn similar conclusions, for example in writing about mountains as memory theatres for Mediterranean travellers in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.[34]

Side by side with these traditions of mythological and historical memory we also see an alternative strand in the association between mountains and the past in early Christian culture where the characterization of mountains as sacred spaces is repurposed to convey the holiness of the saints who now inhabit them, as Whalin details in his contribution.[35] The mountain now becomes a space of retreat: in that sense it is about as far removed from human culture as possible, and the association of the saints with these spaces is itself partly dependent on the kind of ancient connections that Buxton has traced, where mountains stand outside civilization, as the home of divine figures, marginal, prodigious creatures and strange happenings. At the same time, however, the image of the mountain retreat quickly becomes a deeply conventional, cultural one, whose resonances still have a hold not only in the Renaissance, as Koelb demonstrates, but even in Thomas Jefferson's eighteenth-century America, as we see in Jordan's chapter.

It is also evident, however, that the normal rules of time can be suspended or disturbed in mountain contexts. For example, as König further makes clear, mountains can possess a temporality which is startlingly different from that of the spaces around them: the association with classical antiquity that Edward Dodwell and his contemporaries sense as soon as they begin to ascend the mountains of mainland Greece is at odds with the present-day realities of Ottoman Greece.[36] Alternatively, and appropriately for this volume, different layers of time can co-exist with each other on mountains. Conrad Gessner's sixteenth-century mountain writings, explored in Hooley's chapter, resist any easy narrative of periodization, standing in a kind of 'diachronic continuum': 'Gessner presents the opportunity to identify strains of thought and sensibility that leak through literary-historical framings, permeate through periods',[37] attitudes and motifs that are associated with both modern and ancient. His immersion in ancient ways of thinking about the sublime, which at the same time feels closely familiar from postclassical aesthetic discourse, is a good example. The most unexpected version of that phenomenon, as Hansen shows for Mont Ventoux and for Mont Sainte-Victoire, is the way in which mountain pasts can resurface in the present or be reactivated for the future, disrupting the linear flow of history. That image of mountains as spaces that have the potential to disrupt a straightforward sense of temporality seems particularly appropriate to the way in which this volume aims to challenge our sense of a linear narrative of mountain history.

Knowledge

Another overarching theme that unites all of the chapters that follow is the relationship between mountains and human knowledge. How can we know a mountain? What range

of techniques have humans as individuals and communities used in their attempts to make sense of mountains? What continuities and differences do we see in those techniques of knowledge and control over time? Some of the chapters following address that question of knowledge in very explicit ways, in engaging with ancient and modern scientific discourse:[38] examples include Hollis's account of the development of the geological thinking of Thomas Burnet, and Duffy's mapping of the influence of ancient scientific thinking over modern responses to Mount Etna. Ireton analyses a nineteenth-century mountaineer's heavily annotated translation of a sixteenth-century classic in mountain literature, revealing a text that takes an eclectic, encyclopaedic approach (again partly in an ancient tradition of scientific writing) to produce a vast and multifaceted account of all that can be known about the Alps. In all of these cases we can see that mountains have been objects of fascination over many millennia as challenges to human attempts at decipherment and comprehension.

These attempts at knowing mountains crucially draw on a range of traditions and inheritances crossing multiple genres and eras. Mountains are spaces which particularly lend themselves to a kind of multifacetedness, where many different texts and ideas can be placed side by side with each other. Here once again the chapters by Duffy and Ireton are particularly relevant, with their attention to the accumulation of knowledge and precedent, with classical accounts and responses integrated with post-Enlightenment ways of knowing. Mountains have also historically been understood through a merging of classical and biblical heritages, as revealed in Whalin's account of mountains in late antiquity, and in Koelb's close reading of the writings of Saint Jerome.

Moreover, mountains are never known in a vacuum. The ways of knowing mountains that we chart here are rooted not just in ancient precedents but also in contemporary debates and priorities. Hollis, for example, emphasizes the dual influence of classical and biblical traditions in early modern mountain knowledge, but also shows that representations of mountains in that period often made controversial theological and scientific interventions: discussions of the origins of mountains in the late seventeenth century intersected with urgent debates about the geological history of the Earth and the accuracy of Scripture.

Identity

Representations of mountains also contribute to formations of identity. In many cases their antiquity plays a key role in that identity-forming function: for example the multifaceted past (or pasts) of Mont Ventoux is precisely what has made it so powerful as a symbol of Provençal identity, as explored in Hansen's chapter. In Jordan's chapter, we see classical influences shaping a new national landscape, with Thomas Jefferson conceiving (and physically constructing) his self-consciously 'American' mountain-spaces with ancient villas and the ideals of retirement uppermost in his mind.

Mountain ranges often act as borders for particular regions, or alternatively as heartlands. Either way they often have a prominent and very public role in representations

of national identity; Bernard Debarbieux and Gilles Rudaz have mapped out the varieties of that relationship exhaustively for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[39] Mountains are also spaces in which personal or local identities are articulated, sometimes in tension; the term 'mountaineer' is most commonly used today to express an individual's engagement with the sporting pursuit of climbing to the summit, but the older usage, meaning someone who lives in the mountains, is still embraced by some communities, such as in the Appalachian mountains of North America.[40] Archer's chapter on a series of English Renaissance texts explores a number of different ways in which mountains were used as vehicles for articulating national identity, including images of mountain peoples whose identity is shaped by the harshness of the land they inhabit. The principles of environmental determinism on which those images are based have a vast classical heritage that work on modern mountains and identity often fails to acknowledge.

In other cases the link with identity is tied up with the lived experience of local populations. Recent work on the anthropology of mountain communities has emphasized among other things the richness and creativity of their adaptive strategies, and the way in which that often leads in turn to a strong sense of autonomy and regional consciousness.[41] Whalin makes the same point for the mountainous regions of the ancient Mediterranean in the opening pages of his chapter, emphasizing the way in which they stood apart from the urbanized norms of the coastal plains that accommodated the majority of the inhabitants of the Roman empire. The recovery of these kinds of engagements – the everyday, the non-elite – is arguably a significant potential contribution that historical mountain studies can make to contemporary discussions, in providing historical contexts to the rights of mountain-dwellers to have a say over the future of the landscapes they inhabit.

Experience

Humans also know mountains by imagining them, and imagined landscapes can in turn shape real experience. This is a central factor in the link between mountains and identity, but it also lies at the heart of aesthetic responses to mountains. Often the two are connected with each other, as in Thomas Jefferson's powerful vision of the aesthetic qualities of the American landscape. This is shaped by an engagement with classical categories as well as with the distinctively eighteenth-century language of the sublime, in much the same way as Edward Dodwell's portrayals of the mountains of Greece (see Jordan's and König's chapters, respectively). Likewise, Jefferson's explicitly American vision of mountainous landscape simultaneously draws on and stands in rivalry with its European and especially English equivalents. Here aesthetics, imagination and political sense-making go hand in hand.

Indeed, one of the recurring themes of this volume is the tension between expectation and reality, between imagination and experience. The idealization of landscape is sometimes so powerful that it can overwhelm and condition our real experience – although idealized landscapes may also be contested sites, especially when they are

linked with particular national or local identities. In this volume, Williams traces a tradition of ascent narratives in which literary expectations are the dominant shaping force: whether or not Pietro Bembo or Patrick Brydone really climbed Mount Etna, the most striking fact in their accounts, he suggests, is their literariness, their imagined quality – and of course there are long-standing similar debates about Petrarch's ascent of Mont Ventoux. The narratives they create are powerful and memorable, but a knowing reader will have some awareness of this veneer of fictionality, in fact will appreciate it as part of the conventional procedures of landscape representation. Historically, and perhaps even today, this process of stretching for an image of the mountain that is just out of reach but almost attainable, through the power of literary imagination, is a central part of the thrill in elite engagements with mountains.

It is tempting, of course, to contrast that kind of artificial literary experience with another strand in ancient and modern engagement with mountains that is bodily, tactile, sensory. Bray's chapter draws on phenomenological approaches to landscape from recent scholarship to highlight the importance of that theme even for ancient Greek literature, especially tragedy. We tend to imagine – because first-person accounts of the experience of ascent are rare in ancient texts – that the physical experience of climbing and walking in mountains was alien at least to the literary elite, but in fact we find traces of that kind of bodily response scattered right through the surviving evidence for the ancient world, often combined with an interest in the way in which mountains can be places of heightened sensory engagement. That said, we should not assume a tight distinction between the imaginary and the real. Portrayal of the real and the bodily can be just as conventional, constructed, fictional as more detached, aesthetic portrayals of landscape. In some cases, perhaps in all cases, what we are dealing with is as much as anything a 'reality-effect, rather than an unmediated portrayal of bodily experience. Bembo and Brydone are once again good examples, as Williams shows: their accounts are packed with very tactile details of ascent and descent that at first sight might seem to be a guarantee of authenticity, but that on reflection turn out to be paralleled within their source texts. It is also striking that this kind of phenomenological engagement is not separate from a historical sensitivity to the links between landscape and memory; rather those two perspectives have the potential to be intricately intertwined with each other. As illustrated in Bray's chapter, memory is aided and stimulated by the kinds of exertion and immersion that mountain travel involves, and potentially reactivated at a later stage by textual or auditory triggers.

Mountains are also, for many different authors and ages, places of pleasure. In many cases, of course, that pleasure is tied up with aesthetic appreciation. But it is clear that there is a whole spectrum of other possible foundations for positive response to the idea and the experience of mountains. As Hollis establishes, Thomas Burnet's seventeenth-century critics were clear that this had been the view of the ancients, and cited a range of classical texts on the links between mountains and paradise to demonstrate that; their response focuses on the conviction that mountains were places associated with God's goodness, and in many cases places of 'beautiful usefulness'. Elsewhere, as in Conrad Gessner's work, the pleasure of the mountains is much more personal, shaped by a wide-ranging sensory satisfaction which is connected with but not narrowly confined to the

sublime. The language of the *locus amoenus*, the poetic stereotype of the 'beautiful place', is repeatedly applied to mountains – paradoxically so given the contrasting pull towards representation of mountains as wilderness – both in the ancient literature, for example in the late antique Christian texts that Whalin describes, and in many centuries of later writing. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century versions of the sublime and the picturesque clearly do represent new departures in some respects (although even that assumption turns out be far less secure than has usually been assumed),[42] but in other ways they are just one small subcategory of a much larger and more ancient set of associations between mountainous landscape and pleasure.

In the end, however, we must remember that mountains were and are real places – places of work, economic productiveness, religious observance,[43] habitation – not just playgrounds for the imagination. The standard mythological image of mountain as wilderness space which we find in many of our ancient sources is contradicted by the material evidence: mountains were often inextricably intertwined with the culture of the cities and communities around them,[44] and that basic tension – of mountains both within and beyond human control – is crucial to our experience of these places even now.

Mountains could also be places of exploitation and human hierarchy. The ways in which mountains are experienced and imagined are of course deeply implicated in social, cultural and gender hierarchies, and vary according to perspective and privilege. We know that now for the mountaineering culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which in some of its manifestations had an elitist, even imperialist character. It has long been clear, from the work of Denis Cosgrove and others, that the concept of landscape whereby the earth's surface is subjected to aesthetic assessment from a position of detachment and elevation, developing from the Renaissance onwards, was closely linked with the priorities of elite self-definition.[45] Other discussions in this volume open up new chapters in that history. Particularly striking is Jordan's account of the contrast between Jefferson's idealized representation of his hilltop retreat at Monticello, which relied heavily on an all-mastering view from above, and the underlying experience of slavery which enabled it. König too shows how Edward Dodwell's assessment of the mountains of Greece, which claims mastery both over the classical past and over judgements of sublime and picturesque landscape, stands in contrast (as for many of his contemporaries) with a more negative attitude to the modern inhabitants of Ottoman Greece and of their ability to appreciate the territory that surrounded them.

The gendering of mountain experience, by contrast, is still little understood for many of the centuries we focus on in this volume. Recent work has shown that modern mountaineering has largely been constructed as a masculine endeavour, but has also highlighted the increasingly creative ways in which many generations of women climbers and inhabitants of the mountains have manipulated and challenged that heritage.[46] The premodern equivalent of that story still remains to be told. Many of the phenomena we examine in what follows, for example the link between mountaintops and saintly retreat, represent mountains as spaces occupied by men. However, even that tradition is open to challenge in late antiquity, for example through Egeria's late fourth-century CE account of her ascent of Mount Sinai as an act of Christian religious devotion, which is one of the

first surviving first-person mountain accounts of any length.[47] Side by side with the link between mountains and marginal populations – divinities, holy men, mythical creatures – was an image of mountain wilderness as a feminine space, outside the masculine realm of urban civilization, most famously in the evidence for Bacchic ritual on Mount Parnassos and other Greek mountains where women celebrated the god Dionysus in a state of trance. Those assumptions about the wild, untamed places of nature as feminine spaces have a long afterlife, in opposition to the masculine-controlled spaces of urban civilization: they find distant echoes in Thomas Jefferson's gendering of nature as feminine as he looks down from Monticello 'into the workhouse of nature, to see her clouds, hail, snow, rain, thunder, all fabricated at our feet'.[48] The challenge for the future is to expand on that outline map of gender associations for other periods and other genres.

Finally, but perhaps most urgently of all given our current ecological concerns, one of the other very powerful ways in which we experience and imagine mountains is as spaces that can unsettle anthropocentric certainties about the human capacity to dominate the natural world. This makes them useful vehicles for thinking through questions that have been central to the ecocritical and environmental humanities; they provide us with powerful models against which to measure our own imaginings of what it means to be human in confrontation with the more-than-human world.[49] At the same time we also experience mountains in some contexts as environments which undergo physical change as a result of the human relationship with them. The stories told by environmental historians about the roots of our current environmental thinking have often been vastly oversimplified. One standard account suggests that we need to look to early Christian culture for the origins of modern anthropocentric treatment of the environment, which stands in contrast with Graeco-Roman closeness to nature.[50] Others see Greek and Roman culture, and especially the globalized world of the Roman empire with its alleged deforestation of the mountain slopes of the Mediterranean, as a precursor of modern environmental damage.[51] In practice the truth is a much more complex one.[52] In fact what we see across the many centuries examined in this volume is a tension between alternative views, a mosaic of different possibilities for interaction with the environment,[53] due in part to the extreme variability between different micro-regions, and in part to the sheer difficulty of summing up what mountains mean for human culture. On the one hand their bulk can seem intimidating, invulnerable, permanent, utterly insulated from the pinpricks of human intervention; on the other hand they can seem surprisingly fragile spaces in need of protection, as we see in Hansen's discussion of the way in which Mont Ventoux served as a beacon for environmental thinking in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Accepting the complexity of that history of mountains and the environment may make us less inclined to tell over-simplifying stories about the situation we face today.

The increasing prospect

The aim of this volume, to return to the passage from Pope with which we opened, has been to 'see the lengths behind' human responses to mountains in the past and the

present. Pope's ode promises that the reader who takes the long view will be rewarded with 'New, distant scenes of endless science', and an 'increasing prospect' for their 'wand'ring eyes'.[54] Each case study in this volume accordingly offers a new addition to our understanding of the complexity of the mountain past, and of the way in which mountain encounters are so often marked by a palimpsest of earlier texts and ideas.

To be more specific, we hope that this volume will serve two key purposes in further expanding the prospects that are visible from and through the history of mountains. The first is to challenge the continuing influence of the traditional narrative of mountain gloom and mountain glory and the way in which it reinforces a sense of stark division between modernity and premodernity. Classicists, medievalists and early modernists alike have struggled independently with the epistemic limitations that dichotomy has placed on their research; this volume has brought together work from across these periods and disciplines with the goal of beginning to frame a new narrative or narratives.

The second, related purpose that we hope this volume will serve is as an exemplar for the ongoing study of mountains in past contexts. Our goal has been to model the value and importance of intervisibility and interconnection between scholarship on different periods and from different disciplines. We believe that research on human engagements with mountains in the past can help to raise new questions about contemporary concerns as we look towards the future for the world's mountain environments. We also believe that collaborative scholarship, with its capacity to highlight both shared ideas and diversity of perspectives between different cultures and different responses over time, is especially suited to enable this. In this volume, we have sketched out one possible set of views of 'the length behind'. We expect that there are many more 'distant scenes of endless science' to explore.

Notes

1. Alexander Pope, *Essay on Criticism* (1711), Part 2, lines 22 and 32.
2. See Price 2015. The journal *Mountain Research and Development*, founded in 1981, has been an important forum for the second of those issues especially. See also the work of the Mountain Legacy Project, 'capturing change in Canada's mountains' through the use of repeat photography to highlight the retreat of glaciers, loss of precipitation, and other forms of landscape change: http://mountainlegacy.ca/ (accessed 30 August 2020).
3. See further bibliography below on all of those periods, particularly notes 5, 10–14, 18 and 19. On modern mountaineering, the literature, both popular and academic, is vast; recent studies on the cultural and aesthetic contexts of mountaineering in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have included Colley 2010, Davis 2011, McNee 2016, Anderson 2020, S. Bainbridge 2020, W. Bainbridge 2020, Pitches 2020 and Schaumann 2020; the last five were published after the final draft of this volume was completed and it has therefore not been possible to include a detailed account of them here.
4. The promotion of such conversations has been the aim of the triennial 'Thinking Mountains Interdisciplinary Summit' (2012, 2015 and 2018) hosted by the University of Alberta. The University of Alberta also plays host to 'Mountains 101', a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) which is freely available to all and covers topics including the geological origins of mountains, their cultural significance through time, their climatological significance, and practical safety in a high alpine environment: http://thinkingmountains.ca/about.html

(accessed 30 August 2020) and https://www.ualberta.ca/admissions-programs/online-courses/mountains-101 (accessed 30 August 2020).

5. Notable precedents can be found in della Dora 2011, 2016a, 2016b: 147–75; see also Schama 1995: 383–513, who brings together texts from many different periods, classical texts included. Perhaps the most obvious precedent for the collaborative project we are engaged in here is Ireton and Schaumann 2012, which like our volume weaves together chapters by many different authors working on either side of the traditional eighteenth-century watershed that we discuss further below; and similarly Mathieu and Boscani Leoni 2005; Kofler, Korenjak and Schaffenrath 2010; Kakalis and Goetsch 2018.
6. Nicolson 1959. Nicolson herself borrowed the dichotomy from John Ruskin's essays on 'The Mountain Gloom' and 'The Mountain Glory', published in the fourth volume of his *Modern Painters* (Ruskin 1856).
7. One of the earliest expressions of this can be found in a letter written by William Wordsworth to *The Morning Post* in 1844, later republished in Grosart 1876: 325–33. The full and complex genealogy of the concept of mountain gloom and glory is further explored in Hollis 2019.
8. Studies that mention Nicolson's work explicitly include (among many others) Tuan 1971: 70–4; Thomas 1983: 258–60; Porter 2000: 34–6; Rigby 2004: 131–40; Isserman and Weaver 2008: 27, terming Nicolson's work 'the classic and still indispensable study of the origins of the mountain aesthetic'.
9. See Macfarlane 2003: 14 for this passage; also 22–31, which closely follows the work of Nicolson in focussing on the figure of the seventeenth-century natural philosopher Thomas Burnet, discussed also in Dawn Hollis's chapter in this volume, and 137–67. Works intended for general audiences produced long before *Mountains of the Mind*, and indeed before *Mountain Gloom and Mountain* Glory, expressed the same general view: see for example Brown 1934: 17, which opened with the assertion that 'it is common knowledge that mountains were once regarded as things of terror and horror'. For a good recent example aimed at a non-specialist audience, see Sanzaro 2018, who claims that 'the origins of mountain climbing lay in the middle of the nineteenth century. Before that, they were seen as landscapes of evil otherness, where the tempestuous gods exercised their wrath. The curious ventured not.'
10. Hansen 2013: 2–3, 16–17, and throughout.
11. Debarbieux and Rudaz 2015.
12. Duffy 2013: 7–10; see also Duffy and Howell 2011: 4.
13. See for example Korenjak 2017 and Barton 2017. Korenjak argues that sixteenth-century rather than eighteenth-century sources represent the beginnings of mountain appreciation in Europe, whilst Barton suggests that the more positive attitudes identified by Nicolson in English-language texts of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are present somewhat earlier in Neo-Latin writings.
14. Koelb 2009; and see also now Hollis 2019. That is not to say that ancient people did not experience dread in certain landscapes and in certain contexts: see Felton 2018.
15. Quotations from Koelb 2009: 464.
16. See for example: Black 2003: 3 and Smethurst 2012: 130, who gesture towards the changing responses of European travellers and British natural aesthetics respectively without reference to Nicolson; also Thacker 1983: e.g. 3–4; Ring 2000: 7–25; Bates 2000: esp. xvii–xviii and 1–11; Fleming 2000; Hiltner 2015: xv; Dhar 2019: 345, in the opening section of an otherwise excellent account of mountain travel writing.

17. For example, di Palma 2014: 10–11 expresses just such an assumption about the absence of sources regarding 'marginal or repellent landscapes' (among which she included mountains, for the premodern period), arguing that 'lingering in order to pen an extended description or to delineate a view was simply out of the question when the goal was to put as much space between one's self and the offending environment as quickly as possible'.
18. In addition to Korenjak, Barton, and Koelb, noted above, see also Hollis 2017a with key points (and an account of the resistance among the mountaineering community to any revision of the 'mountain gloom' narrative) summarized in Hollis 2017b. For the Renaissance, see Williams 2017 on Pietro Bembo's ascent of Etna.
19. For the medieval west see Thomasset and James-Raoul 2000, Société des historiens médiévistes 2004; Carrier and Mouthon 2011. For medieval Byzantine culture and its origins in late antique responses, see esp. della Dora 2016b. Anthony Bale has noted in as yet unpublished work the emotional experiences facilitated by mountains during late medieval pilgrimages through the Holy Land, in which summit viewpoints were mentally constructed (and frequently named) as mountains of 'joy', a complex and theologically-implicated sensation associated with setting eyes upon the pilgrim's ultimate destination: Anthony Bale, 'What did it mean, and how did it feel, to look out from a mountain in the Middle Ages?', University of Edinburgh, Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 9 February 2016; and http://blogs.bbk.ac.uk/research/tag/holy-land/ (accessed 30 August 2020).
20. On mountain societies and economies see among others Garnsey 1988, McInerney 1999, Horden and Purcell 2000, esp. 80–97, Roy 2009; on mountain religion, see Langdon 1976, Romano and Voyatzis 2010.
21. See Buxton 2013, and earlier versions in Buxton 1992 and 1994: 81–96; also König 2013 and 2016; de Jong 2018.
22. Cf. della Dora 2016b: esp. 2–10 on the importance of the concept of 'place' (*topos*) for understanding Byzantine engagement with space, and on the way in which that has been 'overshadowed' (3) by the concept of 'landscape'.
23. For Petrarch, see Williams 167–8 and Hansen 215–16, below. For Gessner, see Hooley 22–3, also below. On the adoption (or rejection) of Renaissance figures as precursors to modern mountaineering see also Hollis 2019: 1050–3.
24. E.g. see Thonemann 2011: esp. 239–40 on the way in which the cities clustered around the slopes of Mount Kadmos in the Maeander Valley shared the territory of the mountain as a common source of pasturage and timber. The degree of interaction between members of the elites on either side of the mountain is much more visible in the surviving evidence than their relationship with the more accessible cities of the plains below. Their shared use of the mountain, where their shepherds and timber-gatherers would have crossed paths with each other repeatedly, is surely one of the reasons for that. On mountains as places of travel and communication, see Horden and Purcell 2000: 130–2.
25. E.g., see Propertius, *Elegies* 3.1.17–18: 'My page has carried down this work by an undefiled track from the mountain of the sisters [i.e. the Muses], so that you can read it in peace'; one of the key influences over that passage is Callimachus, *Aitia* prologue 25–8 (although the untrodden poetic path in that case is not explicitly a mountainous one). See also Worman 2015 for repeated discussion of these and other related metaphors as vehicles for ancient literary self-definition.
26. The concept of cultural memory is relevant to this intertwining of temporality, knowledge and experience. E.g., see Meckien 2013 (summarizing unpublished works by Jan and Aleida Assmann): 'Cultural memory is formed by symbolic heritage embodied in texts, rites, monuments, celebrations, objects, sacred scriptures and other media that serve as mnemonic

triggers to initiate meanings associated with what has happened. Also, it brings back the time of the mythical origins, crystallizes collective experiences of the past and can last for millennia. Therefore it presupposes a knowledge restricted to initiates'; see also Assmann 2013. We are grateful to Janice Hewlett Koelb for drawing our attention to this passage; see also her chapter in this volume for further use of this concept of 'cultural memory'.

27. Buxton 2013: 20–1.
28. See della Dora 2016a: 141–55.
29. Cf. Schama 1995: 249: 'The possibility that mountain peaks and valleys might not be the accursed places of the world coincided with the recovery of classical texts of natural history, especially the many congested volumes of Pliny the Elder. To the first generation of Renaissance fossil-hunters and mineralogists, mountains began to seem as if they had their own histories to tell'; one might quarrel with Schama's conventional (and by his standards untypical) dismissal of premodern mountain engagement, but this acknowledgement of the importance of classical precedents is nevertheless suggestive for our goals in this volume.
30. Schama 1995: 383–513 on mountains.
31. See Langdon 1976; and cf. Bernbaum 1997 for a sweeping survey of the role of sacred mountains in many different cultures.
32. E.g. see Jost 2007.
33. Cf. Buxton 2016.
34. della Dora 2008a; cf. della Dora 2016a: 155–9.
35. Cf. della Dora 2016b: 147–75.
36. Cf. della Dora 2008a.
37. Hooley, this volume: 23.
38. Cf. Debarbieux and Rudaz 2015: 13–41 on 'The mountain as object of knowledge'; della Dora 2016a: 165–89.
39. Debarbieux and Rudaz 2015: esp. 45–71.
40. Cf. Debarbieux and Rudaz 2015 for the figure of the 'mountaineer' (i.e. mountain inhabitant) in national self-definition from the eighteenth century onwards.
41. E.g. see Brush 1984 for a concise and still thought-provoking statement of that claim.
42. E.g. see Porter 2016, with discussion in Hooley this volume; also König in this volume on the way in which the concept of the picturesque was often articulated through classicizing images of landscape.
43. Cf. above on Pausanias, with Jost 2007; also Bradley 2000 on evidence from prehistoric cultures for the use of natural features as sacred places, esp. 20–8 on the way in which Pausanias's account parallels the evidence for other cultures.
44. See Jameson 1989, König 2019.
45. See esp. Cosgrove 1984.
46. E.g. see Debarbieux and Rudaz 2011 and 2015: 229–34 on the potential role of women (not yet fully activated in their view) in sustainable mountain development; Louargant 2013 for a collection of articles covering among other things women's involvement in the masculine-dominated fields of twentieth-century mountaineering and mountain-guiding and the role of women in mountain economies.
47. See della Dora 2016a: 109–11.
48. Discussed below by Jordan, 133.

49. The bibliography within mainstream ecocriticism is now vast, but see especially Buell 2005 and more recently Clark 2019 for two accounts that are particularly valuable for mapping out new models of environmental criticism. For recent ecocritical engagement with classical literature and culture, see among others Schliephake 2017; Hunt and Marlow 2019.
50. See esp. White 1967.
51. For the argument that depletion of the environment led to the collapse of Roman civilization, see Hughes 1996; and McNeil 1992: esp. 72–4, summarizing the standard arguments for a very high degree of deforestation in classical antiquity; however, see also Horden and Purcell 2000: 328–41 on the importance of avoiding a simplistic view of catastrophic deforestation.
52. Cf. Armbruster and Wallace 2001: esp. 8–11, which similarly challenges the tendency of modern environmental history 'to characterize Western thought through the Enlightenment as profoundly environmental and deeply invested in the notion of human beings as separate from and superior to non-human nature' (9), arguing instead for a much less 'monolithic' account; Fitter 1995: 84–155.
53. Cf. Coates 1998: 12 (but not for mountains specifically): 'We are hard pressed to find a single doctrine of man-nature relations in any era . . . A number of attitudes, notions and orientations invariably coexist in often messy contradiction'.
54. Alexander Pope, *Essay on Criticism* (1711), Part 2, lines 24 and 31.