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ABSTRACT

MEANING AND IMAGINED MEMORIES: 
EXPLORING LITERARY LANDSCAPE THEORY 
THROUGH THE AESTHETICS OF LUCY MAUD MONTGOMERY

Sarah C. Osborne
University of Guelph, 2014

Advisor: 
Professor Cecelia Paine

This thesis explores the theory of literary landscapes. The research is composed primarily of an interdisciplinary literature review that draws on landscape architectural theory, tourism studies, literary criticism, and landscape history and cultural geography, as well as archival research and site visits. It positions literary landscapes in relation to the landscape meaning discourse, and argues that they are an essentially experiential way of perceiving landscape through the use of “imagined memories” by the literary visitor. Using the example of L.M. Montgomery, the research explores how understanding an author’s landscape aesthetic can reveal past and present meaning in the landscape, and how this aesthetic—understood formally, thematically, and as embodied experience—allows us to understand the range of literary visitor motivations and expectations, as well as encouraging the exploration of how landscape architects might design, manage, and interpret literary landscapes based on an author’s aesthetic.
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CHAPTER 1: Introduction

This thesis was supposed to be a relatively simple affair. It was supposed to affirm that literary landscapes—landscapes closely associated with an author or their fiction—engaged visitors in an experience of landscape that used “real and imagined seeing.” It would then use the example of author L.M. Montgomery to show how landscape architects could navigate the tricky ground between approaching literary landscapes as either historic places or as imagined landscapes. The thesis would then be tied up in a bow with some tidy recommendations for landscape interventions at Montgomery-related sites. What the very first step in the research revealed, however, was that literary landscapes are a microcosm of certain essential concerns of landscape architectural theory, such as landscape meaning, the psychology of aesthetic landscape experience, and the relationship between the conceiver and designer of landscape and the visitors who follow. As there appeared to be a dearth of landscape architectural writings that addressed these concerns with literary landscapes as the foreground, it became the project of this thesis instead.

At the very heart of the phenomenon of literary landscapes lies the question of how we as humans perceive meaning in the physical environment. Literary seeing exercises our cognitive, affective, and physical responses to landscape in such deliberate ways that it is equaled only by the search for wilderness experience in terms of representing the deliberate pursuit of aesthetic landscape experiences that are intended to meet all three of these responses to landscape. Literary landscapes are a reflection of both our ways of seeing landscape and our relationship to reading, or “way of living with reading.”¹ Mike Crang points out that geography and literature “are both processes of signification, that is, processes of making places meaningful in a social medium,”² and thus particularly suited to inspire each other and to be the subject of research that explores our relationships with both. One could arguably add the practice of landscape architecture to this description, as even theorists who challenge the idea of meaning in the

---

² Mike Crang, *Cultural Geography* (New York: Routledge, 1998), 44
landscape—as will be discussed shortly—still acknowledge processes of signification in the landscape.

It seemed to me—as I learned more about the question of landscape meaning, the psychology of landscape preference and experience, and the creative and personally transformative effects of landscape on L.M. Montgomery and her readers—that literary landscapes sat at the crossroads of these subjects. And some landscape architects suggest that as a profession we should conquer our still-recent fear of aesthetics, poetics, and theory. James Corner, for instance, says that landscape architecture “has become increasingly estranged from a sense of traditional and poetic value… what might be perceived as the current inability of landscape architecture to simultaneously engage the recurrent and thematic workings of history with the circumstances peculiar to our own time.”

We have lost the “metaphysical and mythopoetic dimensions” of landscape architecture theory and practice. Today, the application and appreciation of cultural observations using the medium, symbols, and meanings of landscape architecture is largely unexplored or forgotten. We are “forgetful of the designed landscape’s symbolic and revelatory powers, especially with regard to collective memory, cultural orientation, and continuity.” If it is true that as a practice we must re-learn not be dismissive or fearful of the theory and methods of intentionally-meaningful design, then literary landscapes are a worthy and useful subject of study to help us take this step. What is the form of meaning and narrative in the landscape? How much of meaning is made up of personal projections? How does the pre-existence of authorial and literary meaning affect the expectations and experiences of visitors? What does the ecological position of the author, embraced by readers and visitors, tell us about reconciling the ecological and the cultural approach to landscape design? There is much that can be learned from literary landscapes.

---


MEANING IN LANDSCAPE

Simon Swaffield says the landscape architectural discipline has two responses to the topic of “meaning” in the landscape. One, after acknowledging that landscape is essentially culturally derived and a “symbolic system,” the landscape architect would aim to “explore fundamental relationships among culture, technology, and nature through meaningful design,” meaning their designs would also serve as “a strategy of social critique.”6 Second, the landscape architect could focus only on the experience, use, and impact of the design on its community, understanding that “significance and meaning will accrue over time.”7 Though Swaffield’s summary of the issue appears rather straightforward, the discussion about meaning, significance, and landscape is long and remains (at least for many) unresolved. The contemporary landscape architectural discourse on meaning was reinvigorated in 1989 by Laurie Olin with his Landscape Journal article “Form, Meaning, and Expression in Landscape Architecture.” Olin identified two “fundamental questions” regarding meaning in landscape design that serve as a starting point for landscape architecture’s discourse on landscape meaning:

“What sort of meanings can landscapes convey or hold?
How to they convey or embody these meanings?”8

The questions assume that landscapes can mean, and the role of landscape architecture theory is to determine what types of meaning and how to design these into the landscape. Olin identifies two overarching categories of landscape meaning, the “‘natural’ or ‘evolutionary’ meaning,” which embraces what geographers and historians would call the cultural landscape—the accumulation of meaning that appears in a landscape over time, according to human uses of the landscape which reflect the “hopes and fears for survival and social perpetuation,”—and

7 Ibid.
“synthetic or ‘invented’ meanings,” which imply purposeful landscape creations by landscape designers and which serve as landscape expressions of art.⁹

Olin’s article was followed by Marc Treib’s 1995 article “Must Landscapes Mean? Approaches to Significance in Recent Landscape Architecture,” also published in Landscape Journal. Treib argued that landscape meaning “comprises ethics, values, history, affect—all of them taken singly or as a group,” and made a further distinction between meaning, and familiarity or significance, which indicated a lower level of complexity or communication than meaning.¹⁰ These two articles have been republished in a book containing two other essays, Jane Gillette’s “Can Gardens Mean?” (2005) and Susan Herrington’s “Gardens Can Mean” (2007). Common to all four essays is the understanding that meaning does not inhabit a landscape, but that it is instead recognized and defined by the user, that it “results from a transaction between people and the landscape that serves as a sort of stimulus or catalyst for the transaction.”¹¹ Later on, Treib states that “meaning condenses at the intersection of people and place, and not alone in the form the designer’s idea takes.”¹² This position is important, because its position is that the “formula” for landscape meaning does not involve the designer, and it also reveals landscape architecture’s own embrace of theoretical movements in other disciplines that started to prioritize received meaning (the audience) over intended meaning (the author/designer/artist). For this understanding of landscape meaning to work, however, requires a culture of people who can “read” the landscape with a level of literacy so that they can actually derive some message from it. “Any symbolic system demands education for comprehending both the medium and the message,” Treib writes, as he identifies a problem with contemporary landscape meaning: the growing diversity of user groups.¹³ To Treib, the diverse population poses a limitation in that landscapes can no longer convey “instant meaning,” but he maintains that the ability for landscapes to develop meaning or “signification” over time remains intact.¹⁴

⁹ Ibid, 45.
¹¹ Ibid, xii.
¹² Ibid, 114.
¹³ Ibid, 106.
¹⁴ Ibid, 112-114.
Jane Gillette, however, identifies the diversity of user groups and symbols as further proof of her argument, that “real gardens are by definition incapable of meaning anything, or anything much…”  

15 By “anything much,” Gillette means that any garden meanings expressed “are frequently one-liners that state a theme but don’t develop it.” Among the restrictions preventing gardens from communicating complex meaning, Gillette discusses the paradox of landscape materials that must mean more than what they are (“We are unable to tell the represented from the representation”), the lack of a landscape equivalent to sentence modifiers (“but, maybe, not really, because”) and the non-linear experience of a garden, were it to be thought of as a narrative.  

16 Additionally, Gillette argues that a garden’s main purpose is to provide aesthetic and sensory pleasure, which precludes the garden ‘meaning,’ and that attempting to design meaning into a garden pulls the user away from feelings of pleasure and immersion in the experience.  

17 Treib’s suggestion that landscape architects should aim first to make landscapes that are pleasurable, so that they may be more likely to take on meaning, is easy enough to agree with. Gillette’s provocative challenge of the assumption that landscapes have meaning is, on the surface, unsettlingly convincing. Unsettling because, if it is true, how willing will landscape architects be to admit that the highest fulfillment of their profession is to create pleasurable places, when architects, artists, writers, and so on, are all allowed to create both pleasurable and meaningful works?

Susan Herrington argues that the either/or position, wherein landscapes can be designed for meaning (specifically, a narrative approach to design) or for pleasure and comfort, but not both at the same time, is a fallacy. Herrington drives her point home by re-analyzing one of Gillette’s examples meant to illustrate the ambiguousness of postmodern design. She shows how Peter Walker’s Tanner Fountain, rather than being accidentally reminiscent of a modern art movement, actually intentionally referenced and commented on it, and furthermore, that the design itself, as revealed by its popularity within the community and heavy use shows how it is

16 Ibid, 168.
17 Ibid, 134 and 161.
“simultaneously meaningful, comfortable, and pleasurable.”\textsuperscript{18} Herrington extends this analysis to other landscapes and art movements mentioned by both Treib and Gillette, showing that many of our most cherished postmodern landscapes are esteemed so highly because they do show an attention to both meaning/signification and comfort/pleasure, and in some cases they do this by challenging Gillette’s assumption that there is only one designer of meaning in a landscape.\textsuperscript{19}

This discourse about meaning and landscape is necessary for a study into literary landscapes and landscape architecture. When Gillette argues that gardens do not mean much, she frames the argument in contrast to fictional gardens by saying, “real gardens are different from gardens in novels, which must mean because they have no other function.”\textsuperscript{20} Though Gillette is using one garden that is all meaning (the fictional) to prove that another garden (the real one) has no meaning, the line that she draws is precisely the line that is blurred in regard to literary landscapes. Literary landscapes are unique for the reason that, more than any other landscape, the visitors of that landscape will purposely seek out meaning and intention as well as the physical sensations of being immersed in the place and environment that inspired the literary work. Visitors to literary landscapes occupy themselves with not only a search for cognitive meaning in the landscape, but also sensory and pleasurable experiences that will enhance and verify the authenticity of the site. While Gillette argues that there is no meaningful way to bridge the gap between designer intention and the sensory pleasure of the visitor, the position of this thesis is that embodied landscape experiences and the embedding of both visitor and authorial narratives in the landscape engages the cognitive, affective, and physical experience of landscape in a way that visitors are able to derive complex and highly personal meaning from their literary landscape visits.

Furthermore, the problem that landscape theorists have identified, that of diverse user groups hindering landscape communication, is overcome to a great extent by the fact that visitors to literary landscapes are already well-versed in (or at least familiar with) the symbol system by which to read the landscape, while the remaining population of visitors, by engaging in a form of cultural tourism, are inclined to rely on interpretation and onsite education to be instructed in


\textsuperscript{19} See Herrington in \textit{Meaning}, 194.

\textsuperscript{20} Gillette, \textit{Meaning}, 134.
how to read the landscape. Treib notes that “any symbolic system demands education for comprehending both the medium and the message”; literary landscapes are that rare place where a landscape architect has access to both, and with a reasonable expectation of user engagement in their design intention.

The discussion of meaning also has application when analyzing an author’s fictional landscapes. If fictional gardens are all meaning, then landscape architects should be legitimately able to use literary critique to “get at” not only what an author was saying, perhaps about characters, mood, and so on, but also what they were saying about real landscapes, real experiences of nature, and real gardens. For instance, Gillette proposes that the garden is where humans ‘return home’ to nature: this is also a theme of Montgomery’s writing. Anne Whiston Spirn suggests landscapes can be understood and designed as language, while Potteiger and Purinton plumb the depths of literary criticism and narrative theory to devise a set of design tools that landscape architects can apply to narrative landscape design. These ideas and writers are discussed in greater length throughout the thesis. The first step of understanding and designing for a literary landscape is to understand the author’s landscape aesthetic.

**THE CULTURAL LANDSCAPE APPROACH**

The project to define the meaning of the term “landscape” has been taken up by various fields of study over the years. Geographers, art historians, and landscape architects are among a few of the participants in the attempt to describe the limits of the word. The starting place for a definition of landscape usually explains how the word is not analogous with words such as “environment,” “nature,” or “geography”; Denis Cosgrove says that, “landscape denotes the external world mediated through subjective human experience in a way that neither region nor area immediately suggest.” Cosgrove continues, “Landscape is not merely the world we see, it is a construction, a composition of that world. Landscape is a way of seeing the world.” Paul Groth, in his introduction to *Understanding Ordinary Landscapes*, defines landscape as “the

---


interaction of people and place: a social group and its spaces, particularly the spaces to which the
group belongs and from which its members derive some part of their shared identity and
meaning. All human intervention with nature can be considered as cultural landscape.”

The cultural landscape has “physical, iconological and ideological” aspects, according to Robertson
and Richards, but even more, the cultural landscape approach “sees all landscapes, whether on
the ground or imagined, as representations,” and therefore all landscape representations in music,
film, literature, on television, in paintings, are objects worth scrutiny. For this reason, the
cultural landscape approach is well suited to a study of literary landscapes, particularly because
treating landscape as a cultural process, with an emphasis on phenomenological experience and
temporality reminds us as landscape architects to avoid the “false” separation of “mental and
material worlds.” The cultural landscape approach should always return us to the landscape
itself, however, in acknowledgement that while landscapes are cultural products, there is a
reciprocal relationship from the landscape back to culture. Lastly, if we consider the nature of
the products and objects that make up the cultural landscape, we see that they function as
symbols that store cultural, historical, and even physical information, or as Rowntree and
Conkey describe it, the cultural landscape serves as “an environmental archive.” And, like any
other archive, the cultural landscape can be used to tease out the narrative of place, landscape, or
environment—a role that can be carried out by writers, cultural geographers, historians, and even
landscape architects.

---

24 Paul Groth, “Frameworks for Cultural Landscape Study,” Understanding Ordinary
Landscapes, ed. Paul Groth and Todd W. Bressi (New Haven and London: Yale
University Press, 1997), 1.
25 Iain Robertson and Penny Richards, “Introduction” in Studying Cultural Landscapes,
26 Ibid., 7
27 Crang, Cultural Geography, 17
28 Lester B. Rowntree and Margaret W. Conkey, “Symbolism and the Cultural
Landscape,” Annals of Association of American Geographers Vol. 70 No. 4 (December
1980): 461
THE TOURIST GAZE

The cultural landscape approach and its contention that landscape is a “way of seeing” informs both tourism and literary landscapes. Cara Aitchison et al. argue that tourism is the natural result when landscape is a product of culture, especially when it comes to ways of seeing in which nature is “framed and set aside for contemplation,” such as photographs, literature, and parks. “It is clear that a strong association must exist between artistic representation, landscape appreciation and that other form of consumption: tourism.”29 Art, landscape, and tourism are compatible ways of seeing that can feed the desire to engage in all three activities, and cultural producers are often tourists themselves, further encouraging that compatibility. John Urry, one of the most significant tourism theorists of the last half-century, argues that a quality of difference from daily life and a search for authenticity are equally important characteristics that define the tourist’s motivation and experience.30 The object that most fulfils the tourist’s expectations and motivations becomes the “object of the tourist gaze.” Urry describes the tourist gaze as follows:

The tourist gaze is communicated through visual material and literary material which is easily replicated, both in mass production, and on an individual level (such as a tourist taking a picture of a scene or attraction). Indeed, the tourist gaze is, for the most part, self-replicating; once a landscape or an object is considered worthy of the tourist gaze, it will be viewed and ‘advertised’ by more and more people. Its popularity feeds its own popularity, until something should come along and stop it – a shifting idea of what is worthy to be looked upon, or the destruction of the object by too much use. The tourist gaze relies on objects and symbols, clues which reveal meaning.31

Not only do tourists search for these objects and symbols, but they must document them as well. Something worth photographing is something worth remembering, and a story worth sharing. Urry compares the photographer-tourist to “an amateur semotician:” “One learns that a thatched cottage with roses round the door represents ‘ye olde England’; or that waves crashing on to

29 John Urry
31 Ibid., 3.
rocks signifies ‘wild, untamed nature’; or, especially, that a person with a camera draped around his/her neck is clearly a ‘tourist’.”

The symbolism inherent in the experience of tourism puts the role of tourism councils and regional promotion boards into relief. Not only must tourism assets be maintained and developed, but sometimes the symbols themselves must be guided along—or an attempt made to do so—lest those symbols fall out of popularity with the public. Thus, the tourist gaze is self-replicating, symbolic (like the cultural landscape), and must be fulfilled by the individual tourist (seen with their own eyes) in order to feel the satisfaction of authentic experience. Because objects of the tourist gaze must be different from everyday life and work, this involves “the appropriation of images between different symbolic systems,” for instance art, literature, and other cultures. The tourist gaze provides context to the practice of literary tourism and even L.M. Montgomery’s own landscape aesthetic, and is discussed periodically in the chapters that follow.

**DEFINING THE LANDSCAPE AESTHETIC**

The two aesthetic concepts most commonly discussed in the field of landscape architecture involve aesthetics as a formal, prescriptive set of design rules, or as a spontaneous, transcendent moment of time-space synergy brought about by certain qualities of the environment. Gobster, Nassauer et al. adopt the latter approach to landscape aesthetic experience, defining it as “a feeling of pleasure attributable to directly perceivable characteristics of spatially and/or temporally arrayed landscape patterns.” This definition sets the threshold for aesthetic experience much lower than other scholars, requiring only “pleasure” and not the deeper affective-and-embodied experience found described among psychologists. Kaplan argues that “aesthetic reactions” and “environmental aesthetics” are important because they originate in landscape preferences that are deeply engrained in humanity as a function of biology and cognitive-affective processes, making them potentially the source of “traditional aesthetic

---

32 Ibid., 139.
domains” rather than an adjacent ‘type’ of aesthetic.\textsuperscript{35} Catherine Dee differentiates between aesthetic experience and aesthetic judgment. Aesthetic experience follows the affective-embodied definition of aesthetics, being “the pre-thought sensual encounter of a moment or series of moments that are gone as soon as they arrive,” that is marked in its ability to reveal the unity of ourselves and the universe, as it is also an “encounter of things as they are, and as we are bound to them (non-dual) in momentary conditions.”\textsuperscript{36} For Dee, the moment when our dualistic perception of the world breaks down has beneficial individual results, where the “reality” of the experience breaks us out of our typical patterns of “distraction:” “If reality is obscured by such preoccupation, aesthetic experience reveals it. In such encounter we are no longer a separate or fixed ‘I’ but a part of wider existence in transition. Beauty in landscape matters therefore, not as an ideal, but as lived reality.”\textsuperscript{37} Aesthetic experience, therefore, is deeply embedded in time, even as it has the ability to bring us out of ourselves for a short, transcendent moment. Aesthetic experience is hyper-reality and hyper-focus. Though aesthetic judgment does not have the same embodied, affective, and transcendent connotations as aesthetic experience, Dee sees important value in it as well, calling it “a formal system of reiterative doing and reflecting.” Good things can come from the “practical aesthetics” championed by Dee, who wants to “position practical aesthetics as the very means by which utility, and ethical and environmental concerns, are addressed and realised in designed landscape…”\textsuperscript{38} There is nothing inherently wrong with formal aesthetics when the goals are clear, thoughtful, and sensitive. In fact, as will be discussed in Chapter 4, formal aesthetics can actually help with the apprehension of affective-embodied aesthetic experiences and the development of ecological sensibilities.

Elizabeth K. Meyer has noted a tendency for landscape architects, especially those most preoccupied with ecological design principles, to dismiss the value of traditional landscape aesthetics in pursuit of sustainability. In their pursuit of improved environmental performance,


\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Ibid}.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}, 3.
they are inclined to equate “beauty and aesthetics with the visual and formal,” while missing “the distinctions between beauty and beautification or ornamentation.”\textsuperscript{39} Parsons and Daniel have also weighed in on the subject of aesthetic skepticism, specifically regarding the scenic/Picturesque aesthetic. Parsons and Daniel, refuting certain ecological aesthetic supporters, say that the scenic aesthetic is \textit{not} a superficial, “highly malleable sociocultural construction” but has its origins in neurobiology, evolutionary psychology, basic human cognitive-affective function, and a long, long historical record.\textsuperscript{40} They object to the idea that a duality must necessarily exist between the ecological and scenic aesthetics. Meyer responds more to the dismissal of formal aesthetics, arguing that landscape aesthetics are not only about form, visual appearance, and surface, but also involve embodied experiences of landscape, and have the potential to enlarge and enrich our relationship with the environment.\textsuperscript{41} Eva Gustavsson argues that there is more to aesthetics than “formal properties such as hierarchy, harmony, shape and rhythm,” and that the “expressive and knowledge-building aspects” of aesthetics could enrich the field of landscape architecture.\textsuperscript{42} Gustavsson does what even Meyer, Parsons and Daniel do not, and argues that there may also be value in the undefended concept of traditional aesthetics as it originates in the critical art world: “If aesthetics is the method for understanding the products of human expressions it is therefore also a method for people (landscape users) to both create and to interpret their own meaning, for example through their own interventions as well as their own stories as narrative landscapes.”\textsuperscript{43} This idea that we can find meaning in aesthetics, and perhaps create meaning using aesthetics, is one of the core premises of this thesis, and justifies just why we might want to spend so much time analyzing an author’s landscape aesthetic, beyond the bare recitation of facts.


\textsuperscript{41} Meyer, “Sustaining Beauty,” 7.


\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, 30)
If Meyer and the landscape architects she cites are correct, and aesthetics and beauty have an essential part to play in sustainably re-orienting our relationship to the environment, what role might an author’s aesthetic have to play in this? First, we must acknowledge the definition of aesthetics that the previous paragraphs have worked towards: this thesis asserts that an author’s landscape aesthetic is a combination of verifiable formal properties found in historical documentation, i.e. landscape history as well as the evidence left behind by the author, as well as the author’s description of their own embodied-affective aesthetic response. Not all literary landscapes are associated with writers with strong landscape aesthetics. Some novels only ever describe minimalist settings, while other novels laden with description might be evidence more of narrative voice than the author’s own landscape preferences. Determining the scope of an author’s landscape aesthetic is part of the process of literary landscape analysis. In the case of L.M. Montgomery, she left plenty of detailed evidence of her own abiding love of nature, landscape, gardening, photography, and favourite nature writers such as Emerson or poets such as Wordsworth. With Montgomery, or any other writer who left behind a comparative level of landscape information, it is quite possible to research and analyze the evidence Montgomery left behind and describe her individual landscape aesthetic. Montgomery’s personal aesthetic, in fact, is incredibly demonstrative of both the aesthetic experience and aesthetic judgment categories of Dee, and shows us how Montgomery put her aesthetic experiences to ‘practical’ use, encouraging readers to connect with the world around them.

What is the subject matter of an author’s landscape aesthetic? Reading the author’s work, personal writings (such as journals), and the analysis of literary critics helps reveal the visual and other sensory features of an author’s landscape, as well as likely guesses at what meaning those landscapes were meant to convey. In addition, cultural geography, environmental history, and other types of history can provide a picture of the writer’s contemporary environment, culture, and regional or national identity that can further illuminate the primary landscape themes, forms, and experiences of that person and their community. Finally, because the author is not the only source of meaning found in literary landscapes, the actions of literary site managers through

44 Consider William Wordsworth, Emily Dickinson, Virginia Woolf, H. Rider Haggard, Rudyard Kipling, just to start, as examples of authors who either incorporated landscape and nature into their work, or else left a legacy of gardening, home-building, and shaping landscapes.
time, and the experiences of visitors to these landscapes, help show ‘meaning over time’ in the landscape, and provide insight into which landscape experiences are most evocative for the literary tourist.

A NOTE ON LUCY MAUD MONTGOMERY

Lucy Maud Montgomery was born November 30, 1874 in a modest house in rural Prince Edward Island, Canada, and was raised by her maternal grandparents in the small community of Cavendish. Her first novel Anne of Green Gables, published in 1908, was a critical and commercial success. That novel, and all but one of Montgomery’s 20 succeeding novels, was set on Prince Edward Island, her home until she left the island in 1911. Montgomery lived in Ontario for the rest of her life; in two small towns (Leaskdale from 1911-1926, and Norval from 1926 - 1935), eventually retiring to a Toronto suburb until her death in 1942. At her request, she was buried in the cemetery of the Presbyterian Church in Cavendish.

While popular during her lifetime, in the years before her death, a critical backlash against Montgomery’s writing emerged among influential men of the Canadian literary scene who supported modernist styles of literature. The critical dismissal of Montgomery’s writing lasted decades, until new approaches in literary criticism – including post-modern feminist approaches – led to a reconsideration of her work, starting in the late 1960s, but with increasing vigour from the 1980s onwards. Even during the period when her work was unpopular among the critical literary establishment, L.M. Montgomery’s stories remained popular among the general reading public. Her popularity was enough that a tourism network of sites associated with her Anne character, and to a lesser extent with L.M. Montgomery, developed. Green Gables House is the most well-known L.M. Montgomery pilgrimage site, even though neither she nor the fictional Anne Shirley ever lived there. The foundation of Montgomery’s childhood home, as well as her resting place in the Cavendish cemetery, are also tourist destinations. Also in the Cavendish area is “Avonlea Village,” a tourism creation featuring relocated buildings and populated with “recreators” based on fictional characters. These are the most well-known sites associated with Montgomery on the Island, though beyond the Cavendish are a variety of museums and destinations associated with Montgomery, some with more historic legitimacy than others. In Ontario, the Leaskdale manse, a cottage in Bala, and the town of Norval, are presented as sites of L.M. Montgomery commemoration either through museums (Leaskdale and Bala) or a
memorial garden near Montgomery’s former home (Norval). Even a Google Maps tour exists showing Montgomery’s associations with Guelph. Shortly after her death in 1942, Lucy Maud Montgomery was recognized by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada as being a person of national historic significance, and a monument and plaque were erected at Green Gables in 1948. Green Gables, however, was not designated a National Historic Site until 2005, and is in fact only one part of Cavendish National Historic Site, sharing its status with L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish Home (referred to in this thesis as the Macneill Homestead for its family associations and its common usage among Montgomery academics).

**Research Question, Premise, and Methods**

**Questions**

This thesis is first based on the question, “what is landscape architecture’s relationship to the theoretical and practical underpinning of literary landscapes?” With the aim of adding clarity to what the literary landscape dialogue is, the literary landscapes associated with Lucy Maud Montgomery were selected to provide a specific, tangible example of the subject. Shelagh Squire suggests an approach to literary landscapes as a cultural geographer that involves “integrating different methodologies and coding the qualitative material around sets of narrative themes to build analytic structures in the data” was a way to use a particular case study to reveal “wider patterns of culturally defined attitudes and values.” This has been the approach of this research, with the exception that, following the research and analysis of the tourism studies, literary criticism, and history appropriate to the subject, landscape architectural theory has been considered as well, in order to explore which landscape analysis and design approaches might be appropriate to connect those narrative themes with the landscape.

As well as the question above, this thesis asks questions about the literary landscape that are more specific in nature, but remain in the realm of theory (this research does not go as far as developing an applied approach). These questions combine the general nature of literary landscapes within the specific example of L.M. Montgomery. They are:

---

How would we define L. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic particularly as it relates to the scope of landscape architecture?
What sort of landscape values or expectations are visitors likely to bring with them to these landscapes? and
What sort of aesthetic landscape message should be communicated to visitors unfamiliar with L.M. Montgomery’s life and work?

This last question actually raises the issue of landscape interpretation, a subject whose importance ranges far beyond the issue of literary landscape. This thesis does suggest a few different approaches to landscape meaning (and therefore) interpretation, but it mainly provides context and recommends it as a subject for further research.

Research Premise

The broad argument put forth in this research is that the literary landscape as both a type of place and a way of seeing is useful knowledge for the practice of landscape architecture; that there is value to landscape architects in understanding the different approaches to landscape meaning and these approaches can enrich the contextual research that precedes a design; and that embracing a literary and narrative approach to landscape reveals layers of meaning that can enrich the design of literary (but also cultural and heritage) landscapes.

Regarding Lucy Maud Montgomery, this thesis argues that Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic was both formal and experiential. Montgomery believed that although true aesthetic experiences could not be willed into being, making a conscious effort to perceive beauty in the everyday and cultivating beauty in our immediate surroundings would make us more open to the possibility of aesthetic experience and enhance the quality of our lives and of society as a whole. Montgomery’s formal aesthetic combined visual motifs, an environmental awareness of season, plant communities, the passage of time, colour and, at its very core, the belief in a nurturing, spiritual connection to nature. This understanding of the physical, environmental implications of Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic in turn leads to a more complete understanding of how even basic site management decisions can be made in the context of Montgomery’s life and work, which may in turn enhance the visitor experience.
Methods

The research approach was largely modeled on personal past experience with cultural landscape history. The preliminary research stage was intended to define the interdisciplinary scope of the project and explore the various research fields that were anticipated to factor in to the research. Secondary research was largely the focus of this research stage, though some re-reading of L.M. Montgomery’s journals and fiction was also undertaken. This first stage of research was also used to select which L.M. Montgomery sites would be most suitable to capture a range of L.M. Montgomery landscape types with close associations with the author. The initial research stage revealed that there appeared to be no landscape architectural research or treatment of literary landscapes specifically, though one researcher, Jane Gillette, did provide an early demonstration of fictional landscapes in her article “Gardens of misery and perfection: introducing an annotated bibliography.” The early research also revealed that while conventional approaches to heritage landscapes could quite readily be adapted for the analysis of literary landscapes, basic questions about the nature of literary landscapes in the “real world” would remain unanswered without further inquiry. Furthermore, it seemed likely that it was in considering these more essential questions that we would be able to develop sensitive and enriching design approaches for literary landscapes. The result of this first stage of research, therefore, was to focus the thesis towards the essential nature of literary landscapes and their relationship to landscape architecture, rather than forging straight ahead with developing a heritage-based approach. The second stage of research identified three L.M. Montgomery sites that represented a range of management types, landscape types, had active and ongoing plans for landscape interventions, and had high levels of importance to either Montgomery herself or to readers of Montgomery. Visits to these sites focused on the current landscape use as well as landscape features that were consistent with Montgomery’s aesthetic but not fully developed or interpreted on the site at present. The results of the first and even second stage of research, shown in Figure 1, made it clear that, given the exploratory nature of the research, a rudimentary form of grounded theory approach was needed in order to provide the most cohesive

understanding of literary landscapes. The final stage of the thesis was therefore an ongoing process of writing, research and analysis.

RESEARCH LIMITATIONS

This thesis is concerned with engaging in the professional discourse about literary landscapes and landscape meaning generally, which also accounts for its informality and exploratory nature. This research is a qualitative study that as a matter of necessity draws from disciplines other than landscape architecture. Furthermore, this research is not a case study approach, since it uses only one “case,” and does not make a detailed comparison to similar sites. Although the research is an exploration of the subject matter, it is by no means a tested methodology for how all landscape architects should approach landscapes with literary significance. The dearth of prior landscape architectural treatments of literary landscapes demanded an approach that was more about gathering and summarizing the relevant concepts than about forging new paths. These factors may be seen as curtailing our ability to translate this research directly into practice; on the other hand, the obligatorily explorative nature of the thesis has helped identify a type of landscape that warrants further inquiry. Hopefully, despite these limitations, this work will be seen as a legitimate and possibly useful addition to how we think of and design for literary landscapes.
After developing the initial research question in tandem with preliminary research, defined the scope of the thesis (research goals) and approach. (Both revised as the research and writing progressed)

Identified subjects of interest were:
- L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic
- Cultural landscapes - tourism and conservation
- Visitor experiences at heritage sites and landscape interpretation

1. a) L.M.M. Primary Material
   - photographry
   - journals & letters
   - novels
   b) Site Visits
   - Green Gables
   - MacNeill Homestead
   - Leaskdale Manse & Church
   - Norval

2. Analysis/Discussion/Additional Research
   - in order to draw properly sourced connections between the disparate fields of thought used in the research, it was necessary to employ a rudimentary form of grounded theory that could embrace additional research and frequent re-organizing of the thesis structure.
THESIS OVERVIEW

Chapter One has introduced the subject of landscape meaning, the cultural landscape approach, and landscape aesthetics as the foundation of understanding literary landscapes. The next chapter, Chapter Two, is a literature review covering theoretical approaches to literary landscapes and literary tourism with an emphasis on audience/user interpretation of meaning. The literature review provides a theoretical grounding for the research specifically focused on L. M. Montgomery and on the potential role of the landscape architect in designing for literary landscapes. Topics include literary landscapes, literary tourism, and questions of audience/user experience of heritage and literary tourism sites. The chapter’s purpose is to introduce the landscape architect to the idea of literary landscapes, and to place the author (in this case Montgomery) in the context of her own participation in the consumption and invention of landscape meaning. The literature review also contains a history of literary tourism on Prince Edward Island as well as descriptions of the three sites chosen to represent L. M. Montgomery’s literary landscapes.

Chapter Three focuses on one specific type of literary landscape identified in the literature review: the writer’s house. The main thematic elements of Montgomery’s writing and life that speak to the tourism at the writer’s house museums/landscapes are discussed—primarily ideas of home, the practice of memory, and patterns of antimodernism. The narrative landscape approach is suggested as a way to understand visitation to these places and to enhance the visitor’s experience and understanding of the writer’s home.

Unlike the previous chapter, which emphasizes the thematic aspects of Montgomery’s landscape writing, Chapter Four focuses on Montgomery’s aesthetic experiences and aesthetic judgement. Landscape preference and ecological aesthetics are briefly discussed, as the two fields of research have relevance to Montgomery’s way of seeing and to contemporary thoughts about landscape design. Archival research was done at the University of Guelph Archives, where thousands of Montgomery’s own photographs are held. In addition to Montgomery’s photographs, her personal journals and some key novels were studied to help reveal some of Montgomery’s gardening activities, her thoughts about nature and her environment, and her imaginative manipulation of the landscape. This chapter suggests that Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is particularly suited to the suggestion by Elizabeth K. Meyer and others that beauty
and aesthetics can play an important role in redefining our relationship to the environment in healthier, more sustainable ways.

Finally, the conclusion of the thesis, Chapter Five, summarizes the primary observations and arguments of the thesis, highlighting their implications for landscape architecture and literary landscapes.
CHAPTER 2  

In 1911, L.M. Montgomery married Ewan Macdonald, a Presbyterian minister, and used earnings from her book sales to fund a honeymoon in Scotland and England. Montgomery had been discretely and privately engaged to Ewan Macdonald since 1906, though the marriage was put off as Montgomery cared for her elderly grandmother. When her grandmother died in March of 1911, the changes in Montgomery’s life were swift and final. Within days, she left behind the room in which she wrote *Anne of Green Gables*, her childhood home, and her cherished Lover’s Lane. She stayed with her Campbell relatives at Park Corner, and within five months was married and off on her honeymoon to Scotland and England. Montgomery looked forward to fulfilling her longstanding wish to see “those storied old lands,” even as she prepared herself for the “discomforts and inconveniences” of travel that were felt most acutely by people like herself who had “systematic and domestic tastes,” and preferred to feel rooted and comfortable in their own space.\(^{47}\)

While in Britain, Montgomery visited the home of Sir Walter Scott, and the hometown of J.M Barrie. She and her husband made a visit to the Trossachs, which Montgomery was keen to visit due to her enjoyment of *The Lady of the Lake*. They visited Flodden Field (the primary setting for Scott’s *Marmion*) with George B. MacMillan, a long-time pen pal of Montgomery. On the trip she and MacMillan talked so much about books and literature they annoyed MacMillan’s fiancée, whose ire was so great, “she gave a certain thunderstormy feeling to our mental atmosphere.”\(^{48}\) Montgomery and her husband even visited St. Mungo’s cathedral in Glasgow (a town which otherwise held almost no interest to her) because it contained a chamber featured in Scott’s *Rob Roy*, where they stood beneath a specific pillar that was integral to the plot. While touring the Lake District, the newlyweds enjoyed a picnic overlooking the lake from one of William Wordsworth’s most famous poems, and also visited the cottage he used to live in and spoke to a former maid. They visited Haworth Parsonage, home of the Brontë sisters, and

\(^{47}\) January 28, 1912, Vol. 3, 168-9, Journals of L.M. Montgomery, L.M. Montgomery Collection, University of Guelph Archives and Special Collections, University of Guelph.

visited Stratford-upon-Avon, birthplace of William Shakespeare. Even the location of their hotel in Russell Square made Montgomery want to populate the view outside her window with characters from the novel *Vanity Fair*, though she was too ill and uncomfortable during her stay to make the effort.\(^{49}\)

For a significant portion of her honeymoon trip, Montgomery filtered her enjoyment of the scenes that she saw through her own literary tastes. Even so, Montgomery’s most effusive descriptions of her trip came not in the long-awaited pilgrimages to literary places but in the in-between moments: the moonlight walks along the shore, two hours spent lounging by a lake, an attractive wooded drive on the way somewhere else. And there were annoyances that impeded her enjoyment of the literary sites. Sometimes it was the horde of tourists preventing her communing with the author she had come to pay homage to: “Abbotsford is more interesting and crowded with relics. I should have loved to dream over them in solitude. But that might not be. The rooms were filled by a chattering crowd, harangued by a glib guide. I wondered if Scott would have liked this—to see his home overrun by a horde of curious sight seers. I am sure I would not.”\(^{50}\) Sometimes it was health issues, or irritable travel companions, or just the exhausting nature of jaunting about the country. As Montgomery had anticipated, the real did not often live up to the imagined.

Montgomery’s honeymoon fulfilled a long hoped-for journey to story-laden lands, but an equally anticipated journey was made closer to home that summer, shortly before Montgomery’s wedding. This other journey forms an important contrast to Montgomery’s tourism experience. On an afternoon before her marriage, Montgomery carried out a different lifelong dream when she walked out to the end of New London Point. “I found it quite as beautiful and inspiring as I had imagined it might be,” Montgomery wrote in her journal. “The poignant beauty of it all cannot be put into words — the thoughts and feelings of my heart there cannot be expressed in symbols of heart. I seemed to be swept up into eternity. But the pang that came when I looked across to the distant homeland shore was of earth; and I was sad when I drove away, although

---


my long dream had come true and brought to me all I had dreamed into it.”\textsuperscript{51} Montgomery brought a companion with her on this short (but psychologically epic) journey, whose presence was not so much for company as for her shutter-finger: Montgomery composed a portrait of herself standing on the point that was then taken by her companion. It is important to note that the photograph that Montgomery had taken of her out on the point is a clue to just how much Montgomery intended the walk to be symbolic and meaningful.\textsuperscript{52} The journey had significance even before Montgomery made it, and as a result, even feelings of disappointment would have been appropriate to the feelings of loss and change that Montgomery had projected, ahead of time, into the visit. This journey prefigures Montgomery’s honeymoon voyage, but there is a key difference; Montgomery’s walk along New London Point was as enchanting as she had imagined it would be; the disappointment came when she left. In contrast, Montgomery’s literary pilgrimage to the landscapes and homes of her favourite authors was almost always accompanied by a sense of disappointment in the moment of fulfillment. For Montgomery, it seemed, literary places would always carry some seed of dissatisfaction that visits to nature never did.

Although L.M. Montgomery made her honeymoon literary pilgrimage over 100 years ago, there remains a thread of continuity between the literary tourism of then and now. Montgomery’s journey is still relevant today not just because her experience prefigures the literary tourism that was still in its infancy in her home town of Cavendish, but also because her experience is still shared by many literary tourists today. The goal of this literature review is to provide a historic, theoretical, and practical description of literary tourism, particularly focusing on aspects that might be of interest to the landscape architect such as authenticity, visitor experience, interpretation preferences, and typologies of literary place. The chapter aims to show the value in understanding how literary landscapes relate to contemporary and historical experiences of tourism as a whole. Literary landscapes and tourism were and remain one of the most significant ways that Western societies convey landscape meaning and landscape knowledge. In fact, they are possibly the most universal method for conveying meaning. Exemplary novels very often have cross-cultural relevance since they are widely available and


\textsuperscript{52} Mary Rubio, \textit{Lucy Maud Montgomery: The Gift of Wings} (Toronto: Doubleday Canada, 2008), 150-1.
frequently translated into other languages, and tourism is an activity with broad cross-cultural and class appeal. David Lowenthal points out that “more people apprehend the past through historical novels… than through any formal history” but he could have added in the same sentence that more people apprehend the meaning of landscape through those same novels (or other narrative of history, fiction or poem) than through any guidebook or informational plaque. Central to both the narrative method of analysis and literary tourism is a heightened acknowledgement of the role of the audience (whether reader, site user, visitor, etc.) in interpreting, modifying, and popularizing books, landscapes, heritage sites, and so on. Since visitor experience plays such a crucial role in the ongoing viability of tourism and heritage activities and places, it is important that landscape architects consider and design with visitor experience and the ongoing maintenance and evolution of the landscape in mind.

This chapter is just one attempt at composing a theoretical foundation of literary landscapes that may be useful for landscape architects. Because the subject does not have a well-populated bibliography in landscape architecture, this chapter draws from other fields of research such as tourism management and literary analysis, environmental history and museum studies. A preliminary review of literature in a wide variety of research fields showed that an exhaustive literature review would be nearly impossible to produce within the terms of the thesis. As a result, this review only claims to represent an abbreviated look at literature relevant to the specific scope of the research. The choice of sources to consult has been influenced by my previous graduate research in cultural landscape history.

The final section of this chapter is a description of the three L.M. Montgomery sites that were selected to be the representative ‘test cases’ of these explorations in literary tourism and landscape. The three sites were chosen based on how well they represent different key aspects of literary place, such as the interaction between real and imagined landscapes, biographical connections, and different types of site management. The selected sites are Green Gables Heritage Place and the site of L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish Home (the Macneill homestead), which combined make up Lucy Maud Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site, and the Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site in Leaskdale, Ontario. The description is based on

---

53 David Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country (Cambridge UK: Cambridge UP, 1985), 224,
research essays written about the site, government policy documents, and site visits carried out in October 2011.

**Literary Place**

If, as cultural geographer Mike Crang notes, literature is a window into the *genius loci* of a place\(^54\) and both literature and landscape architecture are processes of signification, then uniting these two actions creates a singularly potent form of place-making. Crang’s further statements give some support to this position, for instance when he says that literary landscapes should be seen and used as “a combination of literature and landscape, not with literature as a separate lens or mirror reflecting or distorting an outside world.”\(^55\) For the cultural geographer, Crang argues, literature is not to be used simply as a fictional overlay of a real place, but as its own geography that can be examined for place-building and the establishment of spatial divisions through the plot, characterization, and even the autobiography of the author.\(^56\) Crang proposes using literature to “[investigate] the meaning of landscapes” in two ways: as a source of information or data on place, and as the starting point or origin of specific places and geographies.\(^57\) In other words, literary landscapes should be studied both as another aspect of the total landscape, alongside geology, form, political and social structure, etc., and also as the starting-point of research into landscape meaning.

David Herbert defines literary places simply as places that are both “associated with writers in their real lives and those which provided the settings for their novels.”\(^58\) Herbert expanded his definition a few years later to add that literary place encompasses more than a historical association with an author; as Herbert puts it, “they are also social constructions,

\(^{54}\) Crang, *Cultural Geography*, 45, 46.

\(^{55}\) Ibid., 57.

\(^{56}\) Ibid., 47.

\(^{57}\) Ibid., 42.

created, amplified, and promoted to attract visitors.”\textsuperscript{59} Although Herbert connects literary place indelibly with literary tourism, literary places can exist separate from tourism activities—for instance, author homes that are not open to the public, or literary sites that are not developed for any number of reasons. Literary place and literary tourism are not by default one and the same thing. Smith notes that literary places do not equate to literary tourism, as they can exist without being developed or open to the public.\textsuperscript{60} The process of tourism development is what turns a literary place “into tourist actuality.”\textsuperscript{61} In the tourism field, researchers are less likely to recognize the extra-touristic aspects of literary place. MacLeod, Hayes and Slater summarize the practical functions of literary place thusly:

“They enable the celebration and preservation of the memory of an individual author and serve as a focal point for ongoing research and investigation. They deepen understanding and appreciation of an area by exploiting the popularity of a local literary persona or theme. In addition, they can create imagery or even a mythology for a region, possibly as a source of creative inspiration or as having magical or authentic qualities. Finally, an association with literature can bestow the image of an intellectual tradition on a place, which is popular with local government and planners as a useful means of developing or communicating civic pride.”\textsuperscript{62}

Nicola J. Watson argues that literary places are as much a text as the novel or poem that ‘creates’ them: “literary place is produced by writing mediated by acts of readerly tourism, and in that sense literary place is itself a ‘text’.”\textsuperscript{63} For some academics engaged in textual analysis, literary place challenges their discipline’s methodology, since it seems to declare the author’s text insufficient. The reluctance to acknowledge that landscape is a “text” is based on the worry that


\textsuperscript{63} Watson, \textit{Literary Tourist}, 12
if landscape is a text, it is a “dangerously supplementary” one: “…to go to a place by the light of a book is at once to declare the place inadequately meaningful without the literary signification provided by the book, and to declare the book inadequate without this specific, anxiously located referent or paratext.” Acknowledging landscape as part of the literary text, for the literary critics, is to undermine the importance of the literary work. However, Watson argues that this discomfort with the idea of literary place is a very recent one, and even today, only felt by the most erudite or academic of readers—who, despite their discomfort, visit literary landscapes anyway. “Until rather recently, texts have been just as much a matter of place as of print for many of their readers.” In other words, the idea that place enlightens text and text enlightens place is the older, more popular understanding of literary place rather than the desire to separate a text from all biographical or geographical realities. It is this much more long-standing relationship between text and place that feeds the desire to visit the real-world counterparts of fictionalized places, according to Watson.

**Cultural Aspects of Landscape as Text**

Like any cultural phenomenon, the source of meaning at literary places cannot be tracked back to just one originating point, e.g. the author. Shelagh Squire says that literary places and literary tourism are tied in to the same “circuits of culture” process that guides most cultural phenomenon. The “circuit” is the system where public and private influences instigate the creation of a cultural object. This object, the “text,” might be unique but will likely employ in some way forms that are familiar to the broader culture. Different “readings” of this text will be made, which are also influenced by cultural inputs and individual knowledge, which may then influence the culture and society in new ways, finally informing the production of new cultural texts. Squire points out that an interaction between private and public occurs at each point of creation/production/interpretation, and is key to the practice of finding and developing

---
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meaning. This meaning is not confined exclusively to mental or emotional understandings of a text or landscape, however. “…From an initial point of production, meaning is transformed at each point along the circuit of culture. Changes in meaning are then expressed through changes in material form.” In other words, changes in individual understandings of meaning will be expressed in public alterations of the object, be it a novel or a landscape. Watson has also noted a reciprocal relationship between the literary text and the landscape text. The quotation from Watson previously referenced, that “literary place is produced by writing mediated by acts of readerly tourism” does not just confirm literary place’s position as a text, but also its position as a malleable object, subject to interpretation and modification by readers and authors.

An essential element of the cultural process described above, and perhaps more essential to the creation of literary landscape meaning, rests in the author and the reader’s relationship. The author is not a passive participant in the process: he or she actually plays an active role in the development of literary place: “…No author or text can be successfully located to place unless their writings model or cue tourism in one way or another…it is the text itself that invents and solicits tourism…a historically specific kind of text which converts readers into tourists.” Historically speaking, the creation of literary place emerged in tandem with a style of writing referred to as “fictional narrative organized within realist settings,” in other words, fiction that is written with either a direct or indirect claim to being representative of an actual place (even if disguised). The creation of literary place is solidified when the audience chooses to locate fictional events and characters in a real place, and literary tourism is the act of visiting these places. Under these circumstances, the author merely provides the inspiration. At the same time, however the author is the audience, because he or she exists in the same cultural and historic moment as the audience; this shared culture of reading and tourism means that authors who participate in literary tourism are highly likely to create texts that will inspire literary landscapes and subsequent tourism.

68 Ibid., 107.
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Harald Hendrix observes that the meaning the public finds in literary places has much less to do with texts and ideologies, and far more to do with a “general idea of authenticity,” which is about “getting in touch with the world of the past and of the imagination.” Although Hendrix is correct to highlight the place of authentic experience in the tourist’s motivation, Hendrix overlooks that tourists often measure their experience of authenticity based on whether a literary place has confirmed their pre-existing textual, ideological, or cultural assumptions. In their exploration of literature’s role in nostalgia, place, and meaning, Lily Kong and Lily Tay describe how “imaginative literature is a site of struggle over meaning,” including the meaning of landscape. That is, various works of literature may represent different approaches to the same cultural phenomenon or object, and that even one specific work may have multiple interpretations based on the characteristics of the readership. Anti-modernism and nostalgia already play a role in simplifying the past to meet the requirements of the narrative; when the fictional landscape becomes identified as a literary landscape, these struggles over meaning can move into the ‘real’ world. The continued evolution of the site’s meaning can come from other authors, visitor impressions, travel articles, film and television adaptations, and even cultural trends that move a culture away from valuing the symbols and meanings inherent in a literary landscape that might not be adaptable to changing values.

**Fading Literary Meaning**

In some cases, the popularity of a text and its widespread cultural dispersal can actually serve as the reason that a literary landscape seeks to be relevant as such. Past examples have shown that the literary landscapes of authors who were highly skilled at weaving together fact and fiction have been particularly susceptible to the *loss* of literary meaning. Nicola Watson has shown how texts can become so well-known that they actually stop being read, which leads to a
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cessation of literary tourism (e.g. Rousseau), or so convincing at making fiction appear to be fact that literary associations in the landscape disappear, and become understood as historical fact (e.g. Sir Walter Scott). Closer to home, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s poem *Evangeline* became the cornerstone of Nova Scotia’s early tourism industry in the late 19th century, yet by the middle of the 20th century, though parts of the province continued to be promoted as the “Land of Evangeline,” most tourists were unfamiliar with the poem, and understood the narrative of the lovers Evangeline and Gabriel as a romantic story out of the distant past. In short, if a literary work has too much of the appearance of reality and history, the author becomes an overlooked aspect of the literary landscape, the characters become understood as “real people,” and the meaning of the landscape becomes relegated to history, not imagination. The best way to get an impression of the ‘health’ of a literary place is to find out what materials visitors use to inform themselves about a site before they visit. A study of Haworth, the Brontë home, host to over 100,000 visitors a year, revealed that guidebooks and brochures had “not much” and “no importance” to the large majority of visitors; the tourists chose to inform themselves by using the Brontë sisters’ fiction and biographies as their guidebooks. So long as the author’s life and literature continue to be the primary source of motivation and information for tourists, these writings will continue to be the lens through which landscape meaning is interpreted. When guidebooks are the primary way that tourists are informed that a landscape is literary, this is evidence that an erosion of literary meaning is taking place, and being replaced with more conventional heritage tourism understandings of place.

---

75 Watson, *Literary Tourist*, 149. “The realism of Rousseau’s novel, which led to tourism in the first place, has resulted finally in the discarding and disembowelling of the novel - a guidebook map, studied with amputated quotation and pallid anecdote, will do.”

76 See Watson, *Literary Tourist*, 149-50 and 164.

**Literary Places as Heritage Landscapes**

In his essay *Seeing an Unliterary Landscape*, William Morton describes his attempt to find in Western Canada “a landscape in which inner and outer vision were reconciled.”\(^{78}\) Morton sought a way to read and understand the prairie landscape he inhabited, but understood that he was encumbered by the unsuitability of the only type of landscape meaning available to him, the European literary and landscape tradition. To Morton, the practice of writing about a place, particularly in literature, is an essential (if not the most essential) step that allows us to perceive a place as a cultural landscape, and in turn frees us to write about place historically and materially. Morton argues that literary landscapes are cultural landscapes, and are in themselves historic artifacts. Writings about place provide and inform the cultural context—the meaning—from which history must draw on either explicitly or implicitly if it is to represent anything other than a dry recitation of facts. The connection to the past landscape, especially its role in shaping people’s perception of the meaning and narrative of that landscape, means literary landscapes, as part of our cultural heritage, are also, therefore, heritage landscapes. Literary landscapes may qualify for the same protections and management as other heritage sites. In addition, if we recognize literary landscapes as a type of heritage landscape, we can consider them in the light of heritage visitor attractions, a subject which has garnered much attention for other heritage sites but is lacking with regard to literary place.\(^{79}\)

**Literary Tourism**

Cultural geographer Shelagh Squire defines literary tourism as simply as “the phenomenon of tourist travel to areas made famous through literary associations.”\(^{80}\) Extending their definition a little deeper, Robinson and Anderson define literary tourism as the “tripartite relationship between authors, their writings and the concept of place and landscapes, which can...
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\(^{79}\) Karen Smith, “Literary Enthusiasts,” 84. See also MacLeod, Hayes and Slater, “Reading the Landscape,” 161.

\(^{80}\) Squire, *Tourist Development*, 1.
over time transform the space and how it is perceived by visitors." Nicola J. Watson offers the most comprehensive explanation for the phenomenon of literary tourism. She argues in *The Literary Tourist: Readers and Places in Romantic & Victorian Britain* that since the 18th century, literature has been written and read in such a way that it both created and was alternately inspired by the practice of literary tourism: “…It is the text itself that invents and solicits tourism, that it is a historically specific kind of text which converts readers into tourists, and that tourism is, moreover, a historically specific kind of reading.”

Literary place, according to Watson, was not just a new way of seeing, but also “a new way of living with reading.” The implication of this argument is that literary landscapes reflect not just a cultural-historical way of seeing landscape, but our relationship to reading as well. Literary pilgrimage originates with the late Early Modern practice of paying homage to deceased writers through visiting their tombs, graves, or memorials. Eventually, a desire to visit the biographical landscapes of authors emerged—to see their birthplaces or homes, their desks or even the beds where they engaged in affairs. The biographical form of tourism culminated in visits to the imagined landscapes of the author, pointed out in tour guides and post cards as the ‘real place’ found in the work of fiction.

Watson’s work shows how the historic origins of literary tourism continue to influence our impulse to visit literary places. Watson makes three foundational arguments about the nature of literary tourism. One: that the existence of a literary society, realist styles of literature, and the ability to ‘read’ the landscape as if it too was a text, are all interrelated, and feed the desire to visit literary places. Two, that literary ways of viewing the landscape and literary tourism have a reciprocal relationship with the creation of literary landscape writing, and third, that the experience of literary tourism is almost always accompanied with feelings of disappointment, and this disappointment feeds our ongoing relationship with the source text and with our relationship to the landscape.

---


82 Watson, *Literary Tourist*,12.

Seeing Real and Imagined Landscapes

In L. M. Montgomery’s *Emily of New Moon*, Emily’s arrival at her new home inspires a catalogue of observances about the farm setting and family home. In the sitting room, Emily is struck by the attractive diamond-and-rose-patterned wallpaper, which she is pleased to see can be viewed using “one of her secret joys”: a trick of the eye she has discovered, where “by a certain movement of the muscles of her eyes...she could produce a tiny replica of the wallpaper in the air before her - could hold it there and look at it as long as she chose, making it larger or smaller as it went farther away or came nearer.” Though Emily’s peculiar way of seeing is explained here as a physical manipulation of her sight, the author has already shown us that Emily also has a way of manipulating her sight so she is able to “see” the invisible, imaginative aspects of nature as well, for instance the Wind Woman, who is a personification of the wind. In describing Emily’s ways of seeing, Montgomery has provided us with a metaphor and an example of the same sort of seeing that we use when visiting literary landscapes. When we visit these places, we exercise a mental and emotional “trick of the eye” to perceive what is not technically there—landscape meaning. Edward W. Soja would actually call real-and-imagined seeing a new type of space entirely. “Thirdspace” is “simultaneously real and imagined and more (both and also...).” Thirdspace is a place where the real world of mass and space are also the imagined, mental space, and the spatial is recognized as just as essential to narrative/life stories as time and relationships. Hunt suggests that landscape architecture is already well suited to designing for real and imagined landscapes, since it already deals with “reality” and “virtuality,” creating place through the material world and sensory experience, as well as through the heightened experiences of “place” that well-designed landscapes project.

The act of seeing literary landscapes is a practice engaged in by the writer and the visitor that involves the perception of real landscape and imagined landscape simultaneously. Watson

---

states that “the act of discriminating between the actual setting and the romance naturalised there” is one of the primary pleasures of literary tourism.\(^{88}\) Realist literary styles, particularly historic novels, inspired tourists for two reasons, according to David Lowenthal. First was the affective response to the story—“it let readers feel the past as formal history could not”—while the second played with our concepts of memory and time: “fiction put readers in the past like people of the time, who could not know what was coming next.”\(^{89}\) Seeing in a real-and-imagined manner is a uniquely pleasurable experience of imaginative projection that even historical sites cannot evoke without literary associations. McKercher and du Cros, speaking from the position of tourism studies, agree with Watson and Lowenthal, saying, “transforming fantasy into reality, even if that reality is experienced in a fleeting and vicarious manner, is an important element in the cultural tourism experience of a large number of people who are motivated to participate for entertainment and escapist reasons.”\(^{90}\) This last point positions literary tourism and real-and-imagined seeing within the greater context of cultural tourism.

Seeing the “real and imagined” is a skill developed through experimentation and allows the viewer to entertain multiple meanings and versions of a place at the same time. Literary landscapes, as the result of this way of seeing, is a practice of “seeing double.” Nicola J. Watson calls her description of real-and-imagined seeing the “emotional experience of the literary tourist”: “It is not simply that so and so was there, but rather that so and so imagined something there, and it was and was not the same thing… It is a perfect description of the eruption of the uncanny, the familiar rendered strange.”\(^{91}\) Visiting literary place is one of the “most direct ways we have of unsettling our sense of the real.”\(^{92}\) Montgomery herself noted the uncanniness of literary tourism. After visiting Concord, Massachusetts in 1910 and seeing the homes of Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathaniel Hawthorne, and Louis May Alcott, Montgomery wrote, “It gave a

\(^{88}\) Watson *Literary Tourist*, 96.

\(^{89}\) Lowenthal *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 226.


\(^{91}\) Watson *Literary Tourist*, 4.

strange reality to the books of theirs which I have read to see those places where they once lived and labored.”

The real-and-imagined literary landscape is composed of two exercises in seeing: in the first one, the visitor is conscious of retracing the author’s path and, by comparing the text and the place, of projecting themselves into the author’s way of seeing. Much like art students painting copies of masterpieces, when visitors engage in this way of seeing they expand their own sense of landscape meaning by assuming, as best as they can approximate, the way of seeing of the author. The second exercise of seeing is the most enjoyable for visitors, and the research on literary tourism indicates it is also the most popular, perhaps because of its accessibility. This exercise toys with the hypothetical, with the question, “what if the book were real?” In this way of seeing, the real landscape becomes populated with fictional characters, and places where fictional events occurred are approached the same as if they were a place of historic significance. Authors have encouraged this way of seeing by siting their stories or poems in the places of their own lives, for instance, Robert Burns and Alloway, Scotland, a poet Montgomery was familiar with and paid a literary pilgrimage to, or novelist Sir Walter Scott (whose house Montgomery also visited), and Montgomery herself, who openly acknowledged the local inspirations for her fictional settings. Adapting real places into fictional places, especially when coupled with historic events, makes history more vivid to readers, rather than less authentic, according to Lowenthal. “That the novelist deliberately invented was held a virtue; his past was more vital than the historian’s because it was partly self-created.” The open manipulation of historic events and real-life places that is the fiction writer’s prerogative allows the reader more freedom to engage with place, past, and fiction than the more hidden subjectivities of the historian. The invention of the author encourages the imaginative projection of the reader-tourist.

---

93 Montgomery, Selected Journals, 2:32.
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Christine Alexander calls the expectation of experience that visitors bring to Haworth Parsonage “imagined memories” gathered from the fiction and biographies of the authors.\textsuperscript{97} Some of the most obvious examples of how “real and imagined worlds fuse in the minds” of literary place visitors can be found in the distinction between what visitors expected to find at a literary site, and what they actually learned at that site, particularly when there is minimal connection between the author and the settings of her novels.\textsuperscript{98} Another method of real-and-imagined seeing, one that Montgomery frequently drew upon in her own journals and fiction, is the practice of imaginatively populating literary place (or past place) with the ghosts of characters or authors.\textsuperscript{99} The Brontë home, Haworth Parsonage, is particularly prone to this way of seeing, perhaps due to the perceived unhappy life the sisters led and to the heightened emotional experiences of the sisters’ characters. Like all tourism, however, the journey must eventually end, and the literary tourist’s return to the parking lot—to bare reality—can create a lingering sense of disappointment.

\textit{Disappointment}

The disappointment of literary tourism resides in the paradox, identified by Hunt, of how imaginative and/or aesthetic landscape experiences serve as sources of inspiration but also as reminders of our more enduring existence in the world of the mundane: “the strong sensual, physical presence of things is both the means by which its imaginary zones are created or mediated and the brake on our total absorption in them.”\textsuperscript{100} “Seeing double” can only ever be a temporary exercise that must give way to the “real.” The presence of the real world vivifies and strengthens the effects of real-and-imagined seeing, but the distinctions we start to perceive between the real-and-imagined and the just plain real brings us back to earth, like being roused from a daydream. The inevitability of disappointment mirrors certain aspects of nostalgia, particularly the idea of a lost past (it is often irrelevant to the tourist whether that past was real or fictional). The “emotional experience of the literary tourist” identified by Nicola Watson and

\textsuperscript{97} C. Alexander, “Myth and Memory,” 100.
\textsuperscript{98} Herbert, “Literary Places,” 327.
\textsuperscript{99} Watson Literary Tourist, 123.
\textsuperscript{100} Hunt, Afterlife of Gardens, 38.
discussed previously is not just about imaginative projection. At its heart is the failure of the real landscape to meet expectations set up by the novel, whether it be a problem of time, modernity, or fictional fabrications. Disappointment is a key experience of the literary tourist, and according to Watson occurs for a variety of reasons, such as not being able to locate important literary sites in the landscape due to change or because the site was purely imaginary, or even because of a “failure of sentiment” on the part of the tourist. Frustration can be another emotion of the unfulfilled reader-tourist. While Watson says frustration comes from the reader-tourist’s irrelevance, leaving them forever on the sidelines to a story they wish to join, Smith says that the “unnecessary restraints” authors place on themselves by situating their narratives in actual geographic space causes frustration for the reader-tourist when they visit those places and find “inconsistency” in the depictions. Crucially for Watson, rather than causing disillusionment, disappointment in the real-landscape text serves the important function of reaffirming for the reader-tourist the significance and magic of the literary text, returning them “back to memories of the text in preference to the real.”

Experience does not necessarily follow expectation when it comes to real-and-imagined landscapes. Herbert’s example of Chawton, Jane Austen’s home, explores how tourists visit with the expectation they will learn more about Austen’s fictional settings, and anticipate being able to make correlations between Austen’s life and that of her characters. Herbert’s survey-based study showed that, upon leaving, visitors indicated very strongly (91.1%) that they had learned something about Austen’s life and family, while a significant minority (40.4%) “felt they had learned nothing about the settings for her novels” and a third felt they had not learned anything about Austen’s inner writing life (32.3%—“nothing about Jane Austen as an
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Visitors to a literary site such as Chawton expect that the biographical place will make the fictional place visible to them; though Chawton could very well invent that fictional place for visitors, the interpretive management of the site remains factual, and therefore very ‘real.’ The disappointment experienced by visitors at Chawton has to do with their failed attempt to locate the fictional setting (and therefore fictional characters as well) at the home of the author.

In the past, visitor disappointment has been the impetus for site guardians to make significant changes at literary places. The original destination for pilgrims of poet Robert Burns was the poet’s grave. These pilgrims had difficulty summoning the appropriate reverence and closeness to Burns at his grave, however. On the one hand, the original grave site and then the mausoleum in which the poet was interred was perceived as being too allegorical and literary, when the mythos of Burns was largely built around the poet’s life. On the other hand, commemorating the poet’s life at his grave was also felt to be problematic, since he had lived rather recklessly and died ignominiously. A collective decision to refocus Burns pilgrimages from his grave to his birthplace was soon made and, even better, this was felt to be more consistent with Burns’ own use of his birthplace in his writing. The disappointment of the original Burns site had to do with a failure of sentiment. Visitors could not place themselves in the proper mood when they disapproved of the interpretation and cause of commemoration.

If it is addressed at all in the tourism literature, disappointment is seen as something to be avoided or managed away. Watson turns this idea on its head, arguing that it is inseparable from the experience of the literary tourist. By acknowledging this, we are able to plan for disappointment and manage it in ways that ensure better tourist experiences of a site. Literary tourists’ ability to find meaning and authenticity despite inauspiciously book-accurate landscapes should not be used as a free ticket to disregard visitor expectations of literary sites. However, the realities of “disappointment” in literary landscapes do provide landscape architects and site guardians with more freedom to focus on specific aspects of the literary landscape that can be fully realized for the literary visitor, with the understanding that those highlights will reflect favourably on the entire visit.

106 Watson, Literary Tourists, 69-70.
RECEPTION THEORY

Though he teaches landscape architecture students and borrows some of the theory of cultural landscape geographers, John Dixon Hunt is first and foremost a garden historian. In *The Afterlife of Gardens*, Hunt adapts reception theory to the subject of garden history, calling the book an exploration of “how gardens can be experienced” rather than the typical garden design history. Reception theory is a literary critical theory that addresses audience and how they interpret a work, rather than focusing primarily on the author’s intentions, which are considered either irrelevant or unknowable. Reception theory assumes that there is a second creative action that occurs when a reader consumes a work that exists independently of the meaning the author might have intended to communicate. The question of how people have experienced a landscape over time has the potential to reveal the historical, cultural milieu of these interactions with the landscape, some of which are experiential and passive, and other interactions that resulted in interventions in the “original” design of a place. If a garden has undergone significant material change and deviated from its original design over decades or even centuries, we can say that its adaptability has contributed to its ongoing survival. This adaptability also means that the way the garden has been experienced by visitors (its reception) becomes “the only true form of historic preservation.” In short, visitor experience, recorded in journals, news articles, paintings, fiction, and so on, is a more authentic and enduring aspect of a garden than its original design intention, and can be more accurately and easily preserved.

Because the designer’s intention can represent only a short period of time in a garden’s history, Hunt argues the primary source of landscape meaning available to the garden historian is the “Implied Visitor.” The implied visitor takes the place of the site designer in the landscape historian’s field of vision. Instead of design intention, the landscape historian is aware of the “constant interaction of the subject and object” and seeks to know and describe. Reception theory and implied visitor-based landscape history only spotlights the designer when their
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existence has been central to the “mythology of reception” of a garden—when the designer is part of what visitors consider the main story or meaning of the garden. By removing the designer from the center of garden history, the range of valid research subjects expands to include “urban, vernacular and even imaginary garden-making (in novels, paintings, poems).”\textsuperscript{111} The disappearance of the designer/author is already recognized in the history of literary tourism. The real-and-imagined seeing inspired by “realist narrative strategies” has a long tradition of documentation that shows how visitor perception and understanding of landscape meaning can result in the disappearance of the author from the landscape when visitors attempt to “find” fictional characters naturalised within real landscape settings,” rather than the author/creator.\textsuperscript{112}

The type of information to be gathered using reception theory would follow the same methods as modern design evaluations, for instance how the visitor has experienced the site, and the type of information they sought out (if any) in advance of a visit such as guidebooks, speaking with previous visitors, and so on. Visitor-generated materials would be consulted as well as both historic and contemporary materials such as sketches, photos, “memoranda” or journal writing, discussion with companions during or after visit, reading guidebooks, purchasing engravings/postcards, etc.\textsuperscript{113} To Hunt’s list, it is worth noting that literary tourists are quite active on the internet (L.M. Montgomery’s fans among them, as the Anne Profile mentions), with a broad range of reactions from both literary pilgrims and general visitors recorded in blogs, specialized literary tourist websites, and general travel sites such as Trip Advisor available to help us understand the contemporary experience at literary sites. The point of this research is that visitor expectations — “the motives and assumptions of visitors”—are important to the entire narrative of a site.\textsuperscript{114}

Like the reluctance to acknowledge literary landscapes because that might imply that the text is insufficient, literary scholars feel reception theory is limited in its ability to address how the solely cognitive and imaginative world interacts with the indescribable sensory experience of the “real world.” However, Hunt argues that since gardens and landscapes are simultaneously
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real and imagined, they form a bridge between the two worlds that literary texts cannot, and this makes applying reception theory to gardens even more fertile ground for inquiry.\footnote{Ibid., 13.} Reception theory is particularly suited to exploring imaginary gardens and landscapes, because everything written about them is already pure reception or projection.\footnote{Ibid., 24-27,} Imaginary landscapes, and by extension literary landscapes, are subjective both to the author who describes them and the readers/visitors who experience them. Mike Crang observes that subjectivity is not a drawback of the literary landscape approach; it is the source of its value and meaning.\footnote{Crang, Cultural Geography, 44.} (Subjectivity, as will be addressed in the next section, is also key to the tourist experience of authenticity) In Table 1, we see the adjustments Hunt proposes to reception theory to show its application in gardens and designed landscapes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literary Theory</th>
<th>Rezeption (reception)</th>
<th>Wirkung (affect/effect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Readers’ judgement of text “particularly concerned with a reader’s grasp meaning in a literary text.”</td>
<td>“directs attention to the potential effect of the text, to the interaction with its readers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Adaptation</td>
<td>“responses to a garden that seek to understand, judge or explain it.”</td>
<td>“responses to a garden that seek to articulate a visitor’s interaction with it.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 “Two modes of reception theory” adapted from Hunt, 13.**

**Typologies of Literary Place, Interpretation, and Experience**

Some literary place and literary tourism researchers have found it valuable to create typologies of literary sites to aid their research and arguments, and these may have some

\footnote{Ibid., 13.}
\footnote{Ibid., 24-27,}
\footnote{Crang, Cultural Geography, 44.}
usefulness to landscape architecture, though perhaps only to define the scope of a project. For instance, Karen A. Smith’s review of the literature leads her to identify only two types of literary places, “real-life” and “imagined.” While Nicola MacLeod, Hayes and Slater are reluctant to adopt a typology approach, they ultimately do so due to their adaptability, variation, and a tolerance for outlying examples that more rigid forms of classification obscure. However, because earlier literary tourism research focuses on tourists, not “the tourism product,” they determine to make the latter their focus. MacLeod, Hayes and Slater apply experiential design principles drawn from Pine and Gilmore to analyze 46 literary trails and develop a typology of trails. The study considered a variety of characteristics to build their typologies and sort literary trails, specifically “developers’ focus, purpose, philosophy, experiential aspects of the product offered and design principles. The latter comprises interpretive style, visual devices, story, language used to interpret the trail and opportunities for engagement.” Figure 2 illustrates the type of experiences, which occur on sliding scales of participation (active-passive) and connection/response mechanism (absorption-immersion) are: 1. Escapist (active and immersive), 2. Aesthetic (passive and immersive), 3. Educational (active and absorbed), and 4. Entertainment (passive and absorbed). Tourism sites can offer one or all of these experiences to their users.

The categories of trail MacLeod, Hayes and Slater identify are: biographical, literary landscape, and generic literary. Biographical literary trails are aimed at the literary pilgrim, with the expectation that the visitor already has a significant level of knowledge about the subject matter. There are usual formal arrangements for the conservation and sharing of knowledge (for instance, museums, literary trusts, relatives of the authors), but the subject matter has a tendency to be uncontroversial and sanitized. Literary landscape trails are more about “communicating sensory impressions” than they are with communicating narrative. They use
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text carefully to connect the landscape to emotion and mood. In a striking resemblance to Montgomery’s own landscapes, and especially some of the signage along the trails of Green Gables, the authors point out that these landscapes encourage the visitor to “‘discover’, ‘experience’, ‘immerse’, ‘visualise’ and ‘remember.’” The vocabulary chosen “is powerful in guiding visitor consumption of the experience and is often reinforced with sensory language and moods enhancing devices e.g. ‘taste’, ‘feel’ and ‘hear’. References are sometimes made to
wildlife and aroma associated with landscapes, flora and activities.”124 The “generic literary trail” is about establishing a town or region as a centre of intellectual activity, is established by local authorities, and is primarily about raising the profile of the town or region both locally and with potential visitors.125

Watson, unlike the more social-science-based studies of literary tourism, does not use explicitly defined typologies in The Literary Tourist. However, by telling the story of literary tourism in a more or less linear fashion, the narrative reveals distinct forms and patterns of tourism that remain with us today. The emergence of new forms of literary tourism over time resulted in a multiplicity of literary tourism activities and motivations, rather than a situation where new forms replaced the previous. Watson breaks her own book into two parts that, if we are to translate her research in typological terms, define two categories of literary site: “The first deals with touristic efforts to locate the author, and the second with efforts to locate the fictive text.”126 To break her work down further, we see that Watson identifies four main types of literary pilgrimage. The first, based on the death of the writer, is usually related to graves and monuments, and possibly locations of the writer’s death. The second, the birthplace, is about the environment that may have contributed to the creative life of the writer, but Watson notes that the extent to which the birthplace will become an important literary pilgrimage site has to do with whether or not that birthplace is understood to have played an important role in the author’s work.127 There is an L.M. Montgomery birthplace museum in Prince Edward Island, for instance, but its importance pales next to the Montgomery sites in Cavendish, since Montgomery’s ‘life story’ truly starts with her move to Cavendish as an infant and with the death of Montgomery’s mother in the home Montgomery would be raised in. Next on Watson’s list is the writer’s house, the most successful of which “speak of the writer’s creative labour.”128 Writer’s houses are a little bit like writer’s journals; some are written for eventual public consumption, while some are never intended to be revealed, are destroyed after the author’s death and can only be put back
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together with snippets of letters and accounts from acquaintances. Lastly, Watson identifies “the fictional landscape,” which as its name suggests, is a literary landscape where the fictional is more important than the author.

Fawcett and Cormack consider the types of authoritative voices that are represented by literary tourism sites and identify modernist, rationalist, and eclectic forms of site interpretation. The authors provide their own succinct summary of these typologies. The modernist form “presents only one unambiguous and “true” touristic interpretation.” It is an aesthetic and theoretical approach that employs nostalgia for the lost past. The rationalist form “designates a highly self-conscious plan to separate out and channel a number of bureaucratically sanctioned interpretations.” Lastly, eclectic site interpretation “indicates a form that is unstructured, multifaceted, and inviting of many touristic interpretations.” The site guardians at the first two types of literary site engage in a greater level of information selection to help shape a more cohesive understanding of the site’s meaning and narrative than the eclectic site guardians do.

**VISITOR EXPERIENCE AT HERITAGE SITES**

One of the key understandings arising out of the previous discussions on literary tourism and reception theory is that literary landscapes are highly experiential, and exist not just as creations of the author and site managers, but as projections of the reader-tourist as well. Figure 3 reconfigures Hunt’s reception theory approach to include the additional inputs and relationships that are made at literary sites. Both tourism and landscape architecture recognize the value in knowing who the site users are intended to be and how they are likely to use a site. In the case of literary tourism, it is important to know not just visitor expectations and motivations but also visitor experience, especially how they find meaning in the site. There is not a great deal of research into literary tourists and how they experience literary sites, therefore this section draws from heritage and cultural tourism studies of tourists in addition to the literary tourism research. Because of the dearth of research into how tourists find meaning at literary
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sites, the concept of authenticity—particularly existential authenticity—is suggested as a possible avenue of research.

Figure 3 Adapting reception theory to literary landscapes

Visitor Motivation and Expectation

Motivation is the tourist’s purpose for travel. Motivation is a core concern for those engaged in tourism studies because the ability to identify tourists based on their reasons for travelling is important in the marketing, developing, and customer service aspects of tourism. Motivation is not measured by the activities that the tourist wishes to engage in or the benefits they expect to gain from their travels, since the actual motivations behind these reasons for travel

may vary from person to person. Even a shared purpose for travel might belie very different motivations. While motivation may inspire a tourist’s choice of activities, there is no direct correlation between motivation and experience, since the latter is site-dependent and will not always fulfill the purpose for travel. The visitor’s motivations, however, will determine the type of experience and interpretation sought at a heritage site.

Poria et al. argue that a significant number of tourists who engage in heritage tourism (to which literary tourism is related) cannot be explained solely by the “tourist gaze,” education, or leisure, but instead seek out heritage places for personal, emotional reasons. Taken to its end, the result of this approach to heritage tourism is to cause the authors to set aside the question of heritage site content and instead define heritage tourism by those who seek it out, rather than what they see when they visit heritage sites. In other words, when exploring visitor perception and behaviour, it is best to define heritage tourism in terms of demand, not subject.

Research and survey methods about visitor motivation and experience have been adopted by managers of heritage places, who understand that having a better understanding of visitor expectations and experience can be used to guide both short-term and long-term decisions. Parks Canada has made visitor experience part of a “cohesive management approach,” alongside two other objectives (protection – “conserving heritage resources” – and education – “fostering public understanding and appreciation”). This integrated approach marks a shift from the Agency’s previous approach that attempted to balance conservation needs against public use, as though conservation and use were diametrically opposed in perpetuity. Parks Canada has developed an approach towards visitor experience that encompasses visitor profiles, motivations, stages of visitor experience, and performance measures such as satisfaction, learning, and

____________________
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enjoyment.\textsuperscript{136} Using information gathered from tools such as the “Visitor Experience Assessment,” Parks Canada includes visitor experience in its decision-making, applying it to additional information-gathering, interpretation, operational guidelines and programs, staff training and even, where applicable, infrastructure decisions.\textsuperscript{137} The agency, like other tourism operators both large and small, private or public, recognizes visitor experience as “key to the success and sustainability” of the parks and sites it is enjoined to steward, not because visitor attendance is a measure of popularity and a potential source of income, but because fulfilling visitor experiences foster greater connection to the “living legacy” and character of individual sites and cultural heritage.\textsuperscript{138} With the continued and growing focus on tourism, heritage, and even wilderness conservation, landscape architects should also have at least a basic understanding of the theory and practice of the visitor experience approach to site management.

\textit{Interpretation at Heritage Sites}

Interpretive choices by site guardians and site designers (landscape architects) influence the development of landscape features such as the location of trails, the choice to restore original gardens or to make real fictional gardens, how to sensitively incorporate modern amenities, and so on. In the case of literary landscapes, every design intervention has the potential to be an interpretive choice. Poria et al. define interpretation as “the process of the transmission of knowledge, its diffusion, and its reception and perception by the individual.”\textsuperscript{139} If tourism interpretation is “an outcome of an interactive process,” it is the position of this thesis that landscape architecture is as well.\textsuperscript{140} Research has shown that the primary interpretive consideration at cultural heritage sites is not the amount of interpretation on offer, but “the sources of the information or the narratives.”\textsuperscript{141} Interpretation as it is discussed in the tourism

\textsuperscript{136} Ibid., 185-187.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 187-88.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 189.
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., 103.
studies field has two general points of connection with landscape architecture, first in site
development and management and, second, in the communication of knowledge/interpretation
and its effects on landscape perception. The former, in which the interpretive goals of site
guardians guide the site development and management, is especially relevant to the work of
landscape architects at literary places and cultural landscapes, but it seems to be less explored by
tourism researchers. The latter, where interpretive goals and methods inform the information
conveyed to visitors in interpretive panels, brochures, and guided tours, has been studied at
greater length. There may be exceptional cases where site guardians are willing to consult with
landscape architects on the content of written and oral site interpretation, but for the most part,
landscape architectural concerns with post-design interpretation is limited as to qualitative and
quantitative research into how people experience and aesthetically rate landscapes when they are
given additional knowledge to do so. Even within this limited scope, landscape architects may
still have valuable recommendations to make to site guardians who—often more focused on the
built structures of their site—may be unfamiliar with the range of landscape interpretation
methods open to them. Interpretation decisions should be made in consideration of the emotional
experiences visitors are in search of, as they can help direct the narrative and educational aspects
of the interpretation. Like landscape architecture, heritage site developers are encouraged to let
the cognitive and affective expectations of site users lead the interpretive program.

The tourism literature about visitors and audience generates different categories of visitor
experience, motivation, and so on that can be used to develop, evaluate, and anticipate the needs
of a given tourism site or focus. For instance, one set of categories for heritage visitors includes
“(1) those who expect to feel the heritage, (2) those who expect to learn, (3) and those who
expect other experiences.”142 The categories of heritage visitors that Poria et al prefer are derived
from a combination of tourist motivation and interpretation preferences. They technically
identify two categories but do not describe them as discrete from each other, acknowledging
cross-over is possible. The two categories are “identity reinforcers” and “knowledge seekers.”143
Because the information sought by either of these categories of tourists range from personal and
identity-based to more distanced educational information, these visitors will have different
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preferences for the interpretation of sites. Generally heritage sites are encouraged to capture as large a swath of visitors as possible, though within this, sites are also supposed to make visitors feel like their experience of the site is individualizable to themselves.

Though Beeho and Prentice also acknowledge “individualized products” as a goal of contemporary tourism sites, they focus on describing tourist experience rather than tourist motivation; the authors seek to understand more fully how interpretation at tourist attractions interacts with the “thoughts, feelings, expressive behaviours, emotional reactions, activities, evaluation and stimulation through sensation” of visitors. In tourism development that seeks to “facilitate an experiential product,” “attraction managers, in effect, become engineers of experience through the provision of context.” Site interpretation, then, is just one aspect of the entire experience of a heritage site, requiring a thorough understanding of potential visitors and the type of experiences they anticipate. For a long time heritage sites have been managed in a hierarchical way with fewer opportunities for visitor-oriented interpretation. In the type of experience-oriented approach that Beeho and Prentice advocate, a sort of tourism version of reception theory is applied to a heritage attraction, and the subjective responses of visitors are used to improve the experience and interpretation of the site. In their proposal, the best visitor experiences would provide a benefit that can be “spatially divorced” from the site itself, such as a cherished memory or a newly embraced value like ecological stewardship. Despite being in its essence a site-based practice, landscape architecture theory also acknowledges that there are ‘take-away’ affective and cognitive benefits that can arise from designed or natural landscapes. Beeho and Prentice move heritage site management towards the field of landscape architecture by pointing out that heritage attractions are “constructions for experience,” not simply information.
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**Literary Attraction Visitors**

Heritage tourists, according to Poria et al. (2003 and 2009) generally feel that a heritage site is either definitively a part of their personal heritage or not part of their personal heritage. Literary sites have an advantage over other heritage sites in that they often feature a pre-existing close personal relationship between the reader-visitor and author or literary character, making literary landscapes “often more powerfully affecting than generic heritage sites.”\(^{148}\) This is why literary landscapes associated with historical sites—that is, the landscape setting of historical novels—can be so powerfully moving for people. Through the experience of reading, visitors are already vicariously attached to the fictional/fictionalized characters who inhabited a space, and are more easily able to identify personally with historic events that may otherwise have no personal heritage attachment for them. Herbert identifies four reasons that tourists are drawn to literary places, but only one of those motivations could be interpreted as “personal heritage” or identity-building. The types of places and visitor motivations are inseparable, however; Herbert gives a number of reasons, first that visitors may desire to visit places associated with a writer’s life for purposes of feeling “nostalgia, awe, or reverence.”\(^{149}\) Settings are another tourist draw because of the interaction of the real and the imagined that gives the place “special meaning.” Then, a search for a “broader and deeper emotion” may be the cause of a visit; this is generally the case where literary places have strong associations with memory, identity, and nostalgia. Finally, Herbert says people may be drawn to a place for its biographical and historical significance to an author—for instance, the place of the author’s death. Visitors may also visit literary places without any motivation whatsoever, merely because it occurs along an established heritage or tourism route.\(^{150}\)

**Literary Pilgrims**

Literary landscapes are a well-known phenomenon; an awareness that they exist and being able to name a number of literary places does not necessarily qualify a tourist as a literary
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pilgrim. Visitors can know what literary landscapes are and list a number of different literary places without actually having much prior knowledge about specific sites. Smith suggests that it is possible to distinguish between literary place visitors by identifying them as either literary pilgrims or merely as general heritage site visitors. Prior knowledge is one of the primary indicators that a visitor qualifies as a “literary pilgrim.” Although 46 per cent of visitors to Jane Austen’s Chawton professed themselves to be “fans” of the author, Herbert does not treat self-professed interest levels as adequate. In order to be considered literary pilgrims, these visitors should be self-described fans, have a specific interest in the writer, have read the writer’s work, and finally have professed all this as their reasons for visiting. At Chawton (Jane Austen’s home) and Laugharne (poet Dylan Thomas’s home), survey results showed that only 15 per cent of visitors qualified as literary tourists under these criteria. This is a slightly higher number than the visitors to Prince Edward Island who give L.M. Montgomery as their primary reason for visiting (about 13 per cent), but appears to fall in the range of expected literary pilgrims to literary landscapes.

Perhaps because they already have a high level of knowledge about the author and his or her writing, literary pilgrims seek first and foremost an “emotive experience” in literary places. While general literary tourists were contented to see the literary place as being merely set apart from the usual everyday life, tourists with higher levels of prior knowledge responded to “the atmosphere and the spirit of the place.” However, Smith found that, although most visitors and volunteers at literary places did not describe their visits as literary, their experiences of these places were still evaluated on their literary aspects. C.S. Sweet’s interviews with visitors to Prince Edward Island about their experiences at Montgomery sites showed that as tourists articulated their relationship to L.M. Montgomery and their Island experiences—for instance, Montgomery’s importance to them as children, the spiritual dimensions of their nature

---
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experiences on the island, and the spirit of remembrance they felt imbued with—they felt more and more comfortable identifying their visits as, if not spiritual pilgrimages, then secular ones.\footnote{156}

**Authenticity**

The tourism industry is interested in authenticity because the more authentic a tourist feels an attraction is, the more money they will spend on their visits.\footnote{157} Tourism theory of the 1970s and 1980s (usually emerging from the field of sociology) embraced the concept of authenticity with vigour. Within the theory, Steiner and Reisinger identify two concepts of tourism authenticity: “authenticity as genuineness or realness of artifacts or events, and also as a human attribute signifying being one’s true self or being true to one’s essential nature.”\footnote{158} Objective authenticity, the first concept Steiner and Reisinger describe above, is adapted from museological judgements of an object’s provenance and has been applied to both “toured objects” and “tourist experiences.”\footnote{159} Constructive authenticity is more experience-based than objective authenticity, but it rests on the agreement between tourist expectations (based on tourism producers, images, etc.) and the toured objects. As a result, it, like objective authenticity, establishes authenticity based on objects, even if the burden of authenticity on the objects is that they be symbolically accurate rather than historically accurate.\footnote{160}

of Being which is to be activated by tourist activities.”\(^{161}\) The “liminal process of tourism”—the differentiation from everyday life that Urry says is essential to the tourist gaze—is important to existential authenticity but, beyond the act of touring, no objects are actually required to achieve a moment of “existential state of Being;” it can be (but is not necessarily) entirely self-contained.\(^{162}\) When tourists are “in search of their authentic selves with the aid of activities or toured objects,” the question of objective authenticity is moot, or at least minimally important.\(^{163}\) This is how tourists are able to have satisfying experiences at literary landscapes that fail to display the necessary features that would make them objectively authentic. Visitors are able to simultaneously complain about the hassles of being a tourist at a popular site, and also note the suspension of the “real” that they felt as they experienced the site itself.\(^{164}\) At Haworth Parsonage, the long-established impression of the house as a lonely place perched on the edge of the moors is embraced by visitors even though the parsonage is surrounded by modern houses, parking lots, and sheltering trees. Even the view from the manse over the moors, a view that is crucially important to both the narrative of the Brontë sisters’ lives and to their fiction, is hidden by additions to the original building.\(^{165}\) The authors of literary tourism papers usually attribute this disjunction to the strength of visitor expectations or to the central meaning/narrative of the fictional work, but “existential authenticity” is almost certainly as good a term to describe the phenomenon.

Because objective and constructive authenticity is object-based, it fails to address tourism experiences that are scenic or nature-motivated like landscape or coastal vacations, nature adventures, and travel to visit family and friends. (Incidentally, this list of motivations accounts for the majority of reasons tourists travel to Prince Edward Island, and will be addressed shortly). Existential authenticity, on the other hand, is better able to address the nostalgia brought on by the “ambivalence of the existential conditions of modernity.”\(^{166}\) The desire to indulge the
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romantic, emotional side of human nature in a world where the rational is preferred, and to find a balance within oneself between the rational and non-rational self, is why people become tourists, and it is the nature/scenic/coastal/adventure form of tourism that best nourishes the emotional and bodily aspects of ourselves.\textsuperscript{167}

Existential authenticity has also been useful to explain how tourists can find satisfying, authentic experiences as individuals even in highly staged and manufactured tourism settings. The staged tourism of heritage festivals, for instance, is a modified copy of a copy of an original, but its authenticity is judged based on how well it speaks to an individual’s internal motivations, not how well it replicates the perceived original.\textsuperscript{168} It is not the objective ‘accuracy’ of any cultural tourism activity that gives it its existential authenticity, but the doing of the activity by the tourist who, even knowing that their experience is not “the way it really was,” still find a sense of existential authenticity “due to its creative and cathartic nature.”\textsuperscript{169} I would argue that visiting literary landscapes in which the tourist is able to move around the house or landscape as though they were a character of the novel, seeing at once the real and imagined landscape, is an activity that authenticates the experience and only then, by extension, the landscape, for the tourist. This also explains the satisfaction many visitors find in interacting with actors portraying fictional characters (since they cannot be re-enactors) such as “Anne” at Green Gables of Avonlea Village, since the tourist themselves becomes an active part of the story of the place. Literary visitors are able to understand that the landscape is a copy of a copy of an original, but unlike at heritage sites, museums, and other traditional bastions of the “objective authenticity” myth, tourists already know, expect, and celebrate the existence of a place “where real worlds and dream worlds are so closely intertwined.”\textsuperscript{170} What they require of the literary place is an experience that feels authentic.
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Taking into account the evidence about heritage tourists and literary tourists, we might characterize visitors to L.M. Montgomery sites—and in fact all literary landscapes—as either “specific” visitors (motivated by prior knowledge of author and setting) or “thematic” visitors (motivated by feelings of nostalgia). In addition, visitors of either persuasion may be seeking experiences that are more cognitive and educational side or experiences that are more affective, either for pilgrimage or pleasure (See Table 2). This does not mean that literary landscapes must necessarily express all four characteristics, however. The thematic, pleasure-oriented visitor could enjoy an apple orchard or cherry orchard—an example because the fictional Green Gables had an apple orchard while the real-world Webb farm had a cherry orchard—just as much as the specific literary pilgrim, since both tourists can derive different meaning and experiences from the same setting.

Table 2 Literary Visitor Experience Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Expectation of experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific: siting of real-and-imagined landscape from prior knowledge of writings and author</td>
<td>Cognitive, educational: Knowledge-based, analytical, informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic: motivated by thematic associations of author and landscape with nostalgia, i.e. “The old days,” rural idyll, etc.</td>
<td>Affective: pilgrimage/commemoration, or pleasure, emotional connection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Montgomery's Literary Landscapes

PEI Tourism Before and After Anne

Prince Edward Island’s early tourism industry was centred on the same sort of healthful urban escape that characterized much of Eastern North American tourism. The province’s pastoral landscape qualities were emphasized from an early time, especially the idea of a ‘garden
island.’ Prince Edward Island was understood to be fully domesticated. As in the other Maritime provinces, railway travel transformed the landscape in ways beyond travel modes, infrastructure, and geographical relationships. From the late 19th century on, railway, steamship, and the provincial governments all started producing tour guides and offering tourist information as a way to increase ridership and attract investment and consumer spending from outside the province. Edward MacDonald notes that the earliest tourism activity on the Island was focused on the beaches and shorelines, in keeping with an emphasis on the healthful aspects of leisure, climate, and the sea. Because the most accommodating shore for tourism development was along the north of the island, and because getting there required crossing the settled landscape, eventually the pastoral landscape took on as much importance as the shore.

Maritimers seem to have always had a fascination with how their small corner of the world was represented and interpreted by the cultural and economic forces beyond their borders, and Lucy Maud Montgomery shared this curiosity as well. Mary Rubio says Montgomery was “very alert” to the public discussion on Prince Edward Island about the promotion of the province as a tourist destination, particularly a flurry of discussion between 1903-1907. Montgomery used photographs clipped from an 1897 tour guide to illustrate her scrapbooks. Rubio even suggests that this awareness possibly had some expression in the text of Anne of Green Gables (written within this time period) and in Montgomery’s search for a publisher. Montgomery also pasted into her scrapbook an article about the promotional lectures of an enterprising and beloved Islander, Edwin Smith the “nautical clergyman.” Up until her time of writing Anne, Montgomery’s published work was made up of relatively generic short stories and poems that tended to feature vaguely described rural settings, if the story even required a setting. Edwin Smith’s speaking engagements about the Province were covered in the Island newspapers, and Rubio says that it is possible his career made Montgomery realize the province was a setting ripe for popular fiction. The magazine serial story Una of the Garden, for instance, was
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retroactively made to be set on Prince Edward Island when Montgomery expanded it into the novel Kilmeny of the Orchard.

Historians and tourism scholars agree the public’s reaction to Anne of Green Gables caused an almost immediate increase in tourism visits to Prince Edward Island.\textsuperscript{175} The American tourists who regularly vacationed on the Island were joined by new tourists attracted by Montgomery’s depiction of the uncomplicated pastoral beauty of field, wood, and sea. On Prince Edward Island as in New England, mass tourism was usually preceded by a combination of resort tourism for the upper-middle and upper class tourists (in PEI represented by Dalvay-by-the-Sea) and smaller bed-and-breakfast type arrangements: women who took in summer lodgers, farm vacations, tea rooms operated out of homes, and so on. While this sort of tourism development could provide valuable income to a family, it increased the work load for the women of the family, and it eroded the public-private distinctions that maintained order between visitor and local. “Cavendish is being overrun and exploited and spoiled by mobs of tourists and my harmless old friends and neighbours have their lives simply worried out of them by car loads of “foreigners” who want to see some of Anne’s haunts. I was down home a month this summer and there was hardly a day that was not spoiled for me by some such irruption.”\textsuperscript{176} Tourists were wont to walk in on a family while they were sitting down to dinner, treating private homes like a sort of tourist attraction. Anita Webb, who owned “Green Gables” with her husband, first opened a tea room to tourists, later taking in summer lodgers. Montgomery stayed at the home during her visits to Cavendish as well, but it is not clear from her journals if she spent any time with the tourists under the same roof. The timing of Montgomery’s complaint is rather late in the day, as part of the house was actually renovated in 1914, 14 years previous, to fit it up for guest stays (both family and paying tourists).\textsuperscript{177} Jealous of the attention or tired of the nuisance (Montgomery suspected it was a bit of both), the home the author grew up in was razed by her vindictive uncle John F. Macneill.\textsuperscript{178} Even as a ruin, the house continued to attract visitors, who
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continued to carry off any object they saw that they considered worth of a souvenir: rusty kettles, stones, bits of the house. Then, as now, tourists were able to enjoy a Montgomery landscape as either a surviving remnant of a pastoral past, or a memorial to that pastoral past, now fallen into ruin.

In 1936, Montgomery wrote to her pen pal of three decades, telling him about the new national park that was to envelop her beloved Lover’s Lane and the Webb house:

The government decided that the place for the P.E.I. Park was Cavendish, because it was already a sort of shrine on account of my books and because it had a magnificent sand beach and was situated between two beautiful harbors—Rustico and New London Harbors (the latter being “Four Winds”). And, because of the Anne books they decided to buy these farms for the park, as they run out to the sandshore. At first, as aforesaid, I felt very badly. The old Webb house and barns would have to go and much change would come. But when I found out that Mr. Webb was to remain as a caretaker of the Park, I felt reconciled. The Premier assured me that the woods and paths and dykes would be kept just as they were etc. So I began to feel that it was all for the best because those places will never be desecrated now. Still, there will be a good deal of change and I felt very very sad my last night there.179

An additional benefit, Montgomery wrote rather waspishly, was that at least there was no longer any risk that Acadian farmers would start buying up the Cavendish farms. But despite her public acceptance of the National Park, Montgomery did feel the loss keenly. The same words she used to describe visiting Sir Walter Scott’s home, navigating “hordes” of “chattering” tourists, were now the fate of Lover’s Lane: “they will be open to the public—desecrated by hordes of sightseers and by pleasure hunters.”180 Montgomery had been a literary tourist herself; she knew what was to come. Her October 1936 visit back to the Island gave her the opportunity to say goodbye to the lane that had supported her through so many dark periods.

The National Park in Prince Edward Island was established to appeal first and foremost to the educated class of tourists. American tourists were also a desirable population of tourists throughout the Maritimes. Twenty per cent of the tourists to Green Gables and Dalvay-by-the-
Sea were American before the Second World War.\textsuperscript{181} The idea was to attract “good” tourists so
the economic and cultural benefit could rub off on everyone else: “Prince Edward Island’s
Dalvay was selected, as has been noted, to draw the best people and in doing so draw the rest.
Cavendish would prosper when mass followed class.”\textsuperscript{182} The purpose of the golf course was to
appeal to this elevated group of tourists; flashy attractions were to be discouraged. “The only part
of the park seen specifically as a middle-class attraction was the beach itself, but it was
acceptable because it was natural.”\textsuperscript{183} Middle class people were to be raised up through their
interactions with wholesome nature, not crass commercialism. The picturesque rather than
sublime landscapes of the Maritime provinces were considered perfectly appropriate to this sort
of tame family adventure. It was a successful choice; by the 1950s, Prince Edward Island
National Park attracted 412,000 visitors a year, an increase over the early days of 470 per cent.\textsuperscript{184}
This popularity was indicative of a healthy mass tourism appeal, and it meant that the areas just
outside the park were prime for the sort of family-oriented tourism development that the first
park founders had hoped to avoid. This mass culture tourism legacy is, along with the golf
course, the most visually dominant characteristic of present-day Cavendish, and the source of
many tourists’ (and PE Islanders’) distaste for the \textit{Anne} industry.

The National Park did not exactly protect the landscapes of home that were closest to
Montgomery’s heart. The golf course that was planned for the Webb farm property meant tearing
down the evidence of farming, that is, the farms and outbuildings, fences, and so on. Though the
Webbs had been told they could stay on as caretakers as long as they wanted, there were still
plans to turn the house into the clubhouse for the golf club.\textsuperscript{185} Indeed, for over forty years, the
eleventh hole was practically on the front step of “Green Gables.” Squire says the construction of
the golf course on the agricultural land of the Macneills and their neighbours was a clear sign
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that the National Parks branch prioritized recreation over preservation.\footnote{Squire, Tourist Development, 13.} The house was opened as a museum and tearoom by 1950. James De Jonge characterizes work done on Green Gables farmhouse and surroundings throughout the 1940s and 1950s as being “primarily in response to consumer demand and the public’s desire to experience Montgomery’s fictional world, rather than the historical reality of Cavendish.”\footnote{De Jonge, “Through the Eyes of Memory,” 253.} “Consumer demand” is key to the history of Green Gables house for much of its time as a National Parks property, because it emphasizes the interpretive focus of even the imaginary landscape as being a product of audience interpretation, not textual accuracy.

In 1985, the first volume of L.M. Montgomery’s \textit{Selected Journals} was published, allowing Montgomery aficionados the first look into the complex, sensitive, and often judgmental mind of the author of so much happy fiction. The current owners of the Macneill Homestead site, the much more kind and pleasant descendants of Montgomery’s spiteful Uncle John F. Macneill, were inspired by their readings of the journals to open the homestead property to the public. Green Gables had all the tourist amenities: the Macneill Homestead had all the sentiment.

\begin{quote}
“In the Cavendish landscape, the two sites can be considered ‘complementary opposites,’ one intimately associated with Maud’s real world and the other best known as the setting for her \textit{alter ego}, Anne. Whereas the childhood home is preserved in a ruinous state with modest interpretation, Green Gables is the product of an intensive program of development involving the ‘re-creation’ of former site components intended to portray the setting of Montgomery’s novel.”\footnote{Ibid., 254.}
\end{quote}

Though it did not replace Green Gables, the Macneill Homestead has become known as a site where literary pilgrims can escape for a moment the overall disappointment of Cavendish and find a little bit of what Montgomery loved still intact.
Visitor Profile of L.M. Montgomery Tourists

Although L. M. Montgomery is credited with being largely responsible for Prince Edward Island’s tourism industry, there was in fact a healthy growing industry before Anne of Green Gables was published, and the industry today actually owes much of its success to non-Montgomery tourism. Nevertheless, Montgomery’s literary creations do remain an important symbol for Prince Edward Island tourism and a growth target for tourism promoters. In 2012, 12.3 per cent of surveyed first-time visitors to Prince Edward Island reported L.M. Montgomery and Anne of Green Gables as the primary reason they visited the island, while 38.7 and 17.8 per cent (56.5 per cent total) of people reported the “natural beauty and pastoral settings” or the beaches and coastal area were their primary cause for visiting.\(^{189}\) Of those first-time visitors, 23.3 per cent did report visiting “Anne of Green Gables attractions” while on the island, meaning Anne remains a significant part of the Prince Edward Island tourism industry.\(^{190}\) However, there remains a sizable percentage of tourists who do not visit Montgomery sites, especially repeat visitors. A 2008 tourism industry study cites this return visit factor as “a very troublesome finding,” presumably because it indicates Montgomery-related tourism has limited growth potential and possibly even a less replenishable audience than other types of tourism attractions.\(^{191}\) In 2012, there were 127,460 visits to Green Gables, but 786,358 overnight visitors—and about 1.2 million visitors in total.\(^{192}\) While Green Gables continues to have
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This means approximately 56,000 of the visitors who participated in L.M. Montgomery tourism did not visit Green Gables. If we take the overall number of tourists to include day visitors, the gap between Montgomery tourists and Green Gables visitors rises to
significant visitor participation, the province’s landscape and coastal features appear to have a higher profile among visitors than L.M. Montgomery and Anne does. Tourism marketers still consider Anne a tourism “motivator,” however, because she continues to have “brand market appeal.”

At the moment, most visitors to Anne of Green Gables-related sites will make only one visit, even when they may make repeat visits to Prince Edward Island in subsequent years. Less than ten per cent of people travelling to the island to visit family or friends also visit Anne-related attractions. In addition, we know that the most motivated visitors to Montgomery sites—the ‘literary pilgrims’ who visit PEI primarily for its connections to Montgomery and Anne—make up only a small subset of the total visitors to both PEI and Anne-related sites. The Profile of Anne’s Tourism Market report noted limited potential for tourism growth among the people who indicated the highest levels of Anne-related motivation for visiting. One quarter of students gave Anne as their primary motivation for visiting the Island, for instance, but they make up only 2.5 per cent of the province’s tourism visitors. Senior citizens, on the other hand, make up one quarter of all first-time visitors to the Island, but less than 10 per cent of them are motivated to visit for Anne, even though they make up a significant proportion of Anne-related visits. These most motivated consumers of Anne are also the least likely to anticipate ever making a return visit to Prince Edward Island, indicating they view the visit as a one-time occasion. This last fact adds another dimension to the question of whether which tourism audience should be courted to make return visits: the literary pilgrims or the scenic/recreational tourists who already make repeat visits to the Island, though they only “do” Anne once. As a challenge to Green Gables’ apparently tenuous visitor growth prospects, consider the 2008 attendance figures of the Brontë’s Haworth Parsonage—possibly one of the most famous literary sites in the English-speaking world—which Christine Alexander puts at 100,000 visitors a
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Clearly, in order to exceed the Haworth attendance figures, Green Gables must be drawing on a broader swath of the tourist population than literary visitors and cultural tourists, relying as well on the attendance of traditional pleasure-seeking tourists. Rather than consider how to capture even more market share—to the benefit of whom?—Parks Canada might consider first whether they are serving their current visitor audience as well as they might.

SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Green Gables Heritage Place

Green Gables is the most well-known property associated with the L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site. Although the main feature of the site is a house, the Green Gables museum is not technically a writer’s house museum because Montgomery never lived or wrote at the house. Green Gables would be more accurately categorized as a literary place. Fawcett and Cormack call the interpretation at the site “multifaceted and rationalist,” indicating the application of highly thought-out interpretive goals meant to appeal to a broad range of visitors. The site themes that have been identified as suitable for interpretation are intended to meet the standards of historical accuracy and cultural significance set by National Parks, but the site struggles to define itself as a purely heritage site. The interior of the house, for instance, is presented as simultaneously a typical 19th century Prince Edward Farmhouse and also as the home of “Anne,” “Marilla,” and “Matthew.” Interpretation of the landscape switches between a focus on the natural world Montgomery loved, and invitations to populate the landscape with fictional characters. Fawcett and Cormack call this interpretation rationalist, but the logic is apparent only to the site guardians who understand its inner workings. Although the interpretation is based on clear organizational goals and modern tourism theory, the effect on the tourist who misunderstands the pick-and-choose approach and instead attempts to follow along with each interpretive theme would be a sort of real-and-imagined whiplash, periodically asked

197 C. Alexander, “Myth and Memory,” 93.
to engage and then suspend their sense of disbelief. Fawcett and Cormack say that tourists sift through the various types of interpretation and find the ones that appeal to them most.\textsuperscript{198}

Attempts to make the site more accurately “historic” have been met in the past with resistance; Squire describes how the resistance has stymied Parks Canada personnel who, in the past, were “attempting to interpret authentic literary place as opposed to place created in response to previous tourist interest.”\textsuperscript{199} For instance, the proposal to remove the shutters from the house in the 1980s was protested despite the fact that they were not historically connected to the house either factually or in fiction, but had been added between 1936 and 1947. The shutters are still part of Green Gables today. Other interventions that could have been taken to make the

\textbf{Figure 4 Green Gables House from the Haunted Wood bridge}

\textsuperscript{198} See Fawcett and Cormack, “Guarding Authenticity,” 695-97 for more.
\textsuperscript{199} Squire, \textit{Tourist Development}, 16.
grounds more historically accurate and literally authentic have not been taken as well—for instance replanting a cherry orchard that Montgomery once identified as very fine, or making the bedding plantings less formal, or even just replacing the picket fences with a weathered post and rail fence (the last depending on the time period the site chooses to represent). Even a simple measure such as opening the curtains inside Green Gables to provide a view of the yard and gardens is not observed; while scholars have frequently pointed out the importance of thresholds, windows, and the union of interior and exterior space for Montgomery, both personally and in her fiction, most views from inside the house looking out are obscured by curtains.

The primary landscape features of the Green Gables site involves the immediate house yard, surrounded by a white picket fence, and the network of trails that are in turn surrounded by the Green Gables Golf Club, formerly farmer’s fields. The golf course is almost indisputably the most significant intrusion to the integrity of the literary landscape of Green Gables. Shelagh Squire pulls no punches when she says, “an authentic literary setting was replaced by one making a mockery of literary place.” Following a fire in 1997, a long-standing goal of the National Parks service was realized, when they were able to build farm buildings and washrooms and office space disguised as outbuildings, in the location of the original barns and buildings that were torn down when Green Gables was first added to the park. These new buildings form a buffer between the extensive parking lot and modern visitor centre and gift shop, and the house itself, serving as a sort of threshold between the reality of tourism infrastructure and the daydream of literary landscape.

The trail system of Green Gables Heritage Place features the Haunted Wood Trail, the Balsam Hollow Trial, and a short surviving fragment of Montgomery’s cherished Lover’s Lane. The character of the trails, in which the loop is completed in only one direction, and the interpretive panels are supposed to be sequential and somewhat narrative, verges on prescriptive and could inhibit the visitors’ sense of discovery and adventure by dictating their presence in the literary landscape, rather than allowing them to find their way on their own. The Haunted Wood persists as an example of second-growth Acadian forest dominated by spruce and balsam fir, so its character is quite similar to what Montgomery might have envisioned although it has become more open with age and so visitors are unlikely to feel the fingers of ghostly children touching
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their hair as they walk the trail. The Haunted Wood Trail crosses the golf course in one place before continuing on in a very winding way in the direction of the cemetery and Macneill homestead. Many of the birch trees in the upper part of the Haunted Wood Trail have been stripped of their bark by visitors (Figure 5). The Balsam Hollow Trail is meant to represent Montgomery’s attachment to nature, and the interpretive panels highlight native species of the Acadian forest, although these species are often nowhere to be found in the vicinity. The presence of the golf course becomes rather intrusive during the second half of the trail as it makes the turn back towards Green Gables, with the presence of netting, fairway, and golf balls distracting from what is supposed to be a contemplative nature walk. Perhaps the greatest

![Figure 5 Birch trees at Green Gables showing damage from souvenir-collecting and graffiti.](image)

problem with the trail system is Lover’s Lane. Lover’s Lane is quite possibly the most important historical-cultural feature of the Green Gables Heritage Place due to its deep significance to Montgomery’s personal and creative life. Much of the original lane, however, ended up directly adjacent to the golf course. At the moment, most of the lane serves as utility access for golf course maintenance, and the visual and natural character of the lane that Montgomery captured so carefully in her photography no longer exists. Tourists are not told this on any maps or
plaques although it is possible guided tours may mention it; the shorter surviving portion of Lover’s Lane is seamlessly integrated into the Balsam Hollow Trail.

One of the most significant problems with Green Gables rests in the failure of the romantic gaze. The tourism landscape of Cavendish is largely inherited from the collective-gazing tourism of 40 years ago and its imprint is not entirely conducive to the types of experiences that cultural tourists seek. Urry sums up the distinction thusly: “The collective gaze requires other people to be ‘in the picture’ with the tourist; the romantic gaze seeks to exclude others from the ‘view,’ even as it seeks to join others with the cause.”201 The mass tourism of 40 or 70 years ago and the recreative tourism of today employs a “collective gaze” approach to tourism, while cultural tourists, scenically-motivated tourists and literary pilgrims tend to employ the romantic gaze. Literary pilgrims to Green Gables seek to be alone with Montgomery’s inspiration, but the small house and grounds, especially during peak tourism season, can attract thousands of visitors each day. Line-ups form to enter the house, and a walk along the trails is never the solitary, creative excursion of the author. As long as Parks Canada and the PEI tourism industry seeks to maintain or increase the current number of visitors to Green Gables, the literary pilgrim’s visit to Green Gables will almost certainly inspire a certain amount of that “failure of sentiment” and disappointment that Montgomery herself predicted.

_L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish Home, The Macneill Homestead_

The Macneill Homestead, also called L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish Home, is a site with well-defined biographical and creative connections to Montgomery. Literary scholars and literary pilgrims of Montgomery generally prefer this site to all others, next to their general experience of the entire Prince Edward Island landscape.202 The experience of the homestead site is generally aesthetic and educational, depending on whether visitors explore at their own pace or participate in a tour of the property. Fawcett and Cormack call the Macneill Homestead a modernist memorial site for L.M. Montgomery, with the authenticity and authority for the
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201 Urry, _Tourist Gaze_, 46-47.

202 The interviews in Catherine S. Sweet’s thesis of attendees of the L.M. Montgomery Conference, for instance, appear to be representative of the sort of comments left by literary pilgrims on online travel review sites, or of PEI travel articles, such as the one referenced in Chapter 5.
interpretation resting in the familial connections of the site guardians (John and Jennie Macneill) and the biographical significance of the site to Montgomery. Although visitors are encouraged to make use of their ‘imagined memories’ while walking the grounds, the memories emphasized by the site are of Montgomery and her life, not the characters of her fiction. Interpretive panels draw exclusively from Montgomery’s journals and letters, and emphasize themes of home and nature.203

Figure 6 Paths and interpretive panel at the Macneill Homestead.

Although the Macneill Homestead was the site of Montgomery’s home, it is not a writer’s house museum. The house itself is no longer extant, but persists as a ruin—the stone foundation—and the property bares only the echo of its past as a cultivated farm. De Jonge says

the ruinous aspect of the site is the source of its “essential value.” Unlike the Green Gables Heritage Place, however, the Macneill Homestead is actually bordered by agricultural land on two sides, making its borrowed landscape views far more evocative of the place Montgomery might have experienced than the golf course at Green Gables. The interpretive panels on the site are incredibly well placed for evoking Montgomery’s emotional connection to the landscape, and through the landscape to the visitor. For instance, at the top of the lane that was the main approach to the house, the visitor is treated to a view of the front of the old house foundation and the side of the foundation that would have held Montgomery’s bedroom window. An interpretive panel with a quotation from Montgomery describing the emotional experience of seeing home is placed just at the spot where the foundation reveals itself. This panel, and the others, make the visitor truly aware that they are walking in the author’s footsteps.

Some surviving landscape features that are of interest on the site include the old stone dykes that enclosed the front orchard, a few surviving descendants of the front apple orchard, the location of the old well, the persistence of the balm-of-gilead trees (*Populus balsamea*) that Montgomery mentioned, views from the location of Montgomery’s bedroom window across extant farm fields, and the house of Montgomery’s Uncle John F. Macneill (now owned by the site guardians).

**Leaskdale Manse and Church**

The Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site, a museum composed of the former Leaskdale Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Manse, is run by the L.M. Montgomery Society of Ontario, and is the only Montgomery museum in Ontario with historic site recognition. From 1911 to 1926, Montgomery lived in the Manse with her husband and two sons, born in 1912 and 1915 (another son was stillborn in 1914). The Leaskdale Manse (Figure 7) is the only true “writers house museum” in the repertoire of Montgomery literary sites, as it is the only house that Montgomery lived and wrote in that is still standing and is open as a
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205 A museum dedicated to Montgomery in Bala is significant as the source of inspiration for Montgomery’s novel *The Blue Castle*, but its connection to Montgomery’s life represents only the duration of a summer vacation.
museum. Rather than roping off rooms like at Green Gables, visitors are free to move through the rooms of the house, with museum volunteers as guides. Visitors start their tour by joining up with a guide at the church, before proceeding a few doors down the road to the manse. Some orientation is given for the grounds, as the laneway is on the opposite side of the yard, and the museum’s volunteers have added two garden beds to the front in an approximation of Montgomery’s own gardens (though they are not a complete restoration), but the focus of the tour is on the interior of the house, Montgomery’s modifications and impression of it, her life, and her work. Visitors to Montgomery’s home in Leaskdale must rely on prior knowledge of Montgomery’s writings and personal life if they wish to make sense of the landscape without the aid of a tour guide. There are excellent opportunities on the Manse property to not only restore Montgomery’s gardens and establish a short walking trail (paths that Montgomery frequently walked herself), but to show how important gardening and nature was to Montgomery’s sense of wellbeing and as a source of creativity. In purpose and in particulars, Leaskdale is most like—or
with the potential to be like—the Emily Dickinson Museum, which has two houses, with a purpose of educating visitors about Dickinson’s “life, family, creative work, times, and enduring relevance” as well as the preservation and interpretation of the properties for scholars and the public. The Dickinson museum has different themed and focused tours on the same site, and two landscape/grounds tours (one audio) including the “Grounds of Memory” tour, which has 30 of Emily Dickinson’s poems “and surveys the Dickinson family’s fascination with landscapes and the natural world.”

Additional images and further description of the site visits can be viewed at the end of the thesis in Appendix 1.

SUMMARY

The objective of this chapter was to offer a theoretical and practical introduction to the concept of literary landscapes. Tourism plays an important historical role in the formation and popularity of literary landscapes, but they are not exclusively tourism- or even heritage-related. Above all, literary landscapes are experiential, and this understanding of literary landscapes offers a way of designing and studying them that has potential to be used across disciplines and interest groups. L.M. Montgomery and her literary landscapes are an excellent example of this intersection of fiction, tourism, and landscape aesthetic, where landscape experience becomes a common language that can be shared by landscape architects, site managers, and tourism operators.

Tourism experiences are found to be authentic by the tourist when he or she feels their experience is “true” in some way, very often through fulfillment of their nostalgic impulses. But each tourist is a product of their own times. Though this thesis frequently returns to the idea that Montgomery’s literary landscapes have always held nostalgic appeal to herself and to visitors, it is important to remember that this nostalgia has never been static. Squire points out that Beatrix Potter heritage has been always been a combination of literary and nostalgic meanings, none of
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which were unchangeable but have altered with changing values.\textsuperscript{208} The nostalgia of 1936 is not the nostalgia of 2014, no matter that the affective response—the feeling of nostalgia—remains the same. This is where reception theory plays a role, in allowing us to understand how the physical history and current form of Montgomery’s literary landscapes has much to do with the history of our changing cultural nostalgias. It also allows us to understand the tourism literature about visitor expectations at literary sites, and to consider what role landscape architecture might play in furthering the goal of individualized tourism experiences at Montgomery attractions. Tourism researchers such as MacLeod et al recommend that both knowledge and nostalgia should be a part of the experience of literary sites but that, above all, the affective response—an “evocative mood”—should be the goal.\textsuperscript{209} Variety is useful, allowing visitors of differing knowledge levels and interests to find meaningful reasons to interact with the landscape. One of the points touched on in this chapter has been to consider just who the literary tourist is. Audience is an essential concern of any commercial or artistic work, literary landscapes being no exception. The characteristics of visitors to Montgomery tourism sites has certain implications for any (hypothetical) re-focusing/redesign of the author’s literary landscape. The \textit{Profile of Anne’s Tourism Market} authors state that “the current Anne product has an extreme burn-out factor,” and that if the “Anne theme” is to see any additional development (or possibly even stabilisation of the numbers, though they do not mention that), then \textit{something} new must be provided so visitors do see a reason to return.\textsuperscript{210} A full 20 per cent of visitors to Anne attractions are children under the age of 18, and adults travelling with children are the most likely travelling parties to visit Anne attractions.\textsuperscript{211} People who visit Anne attractions tend to have a higher level of education than visitors who do not.\textsuperscript{212} This is consistent with the general educational trends of tourists interested in cultural attractions, as David Herbert’s research on Jane Austen and Dylan Thomas shows. About 10 to 15 per cent of L.M. Montgomery visitors on Prince Edward Island would currently qualify as literary pilgrims. These visitors tend to only visit Montgomery sites
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once, even if they make return visits to the Island. Although this thesis does not have access to visitor exit surveys that may have been done for the Leaskdale Manse, it probably has a higher proportion of literary pilgrims, due to Ontario’s relatively unknown associations with Montgomery except among readers who have some knowledge of Montgomery’s life. Literary pilgrims tend to seek highly specific landscape experiences of Montgomery that are not well fulfilled by much Montgomery tourism, excepting the Macneill homestead site. It is not just specific references that pilgrims seek, but symbolic cues that evoked deeply personal, often spiritual, emotional reactions to the fiction and life of the author. General cultural/heritage tourists make up the bulk of visitors to Montgomery sites on PEI, but they represent a spectrum of expectations for these sites, from educational to purely pleasurable. As a result, they will have different interpretive desires, but that does not mean that the landscape itself cannot meet both expectations.

The prior knowledge level of tourists and their expectations and motivations for visiting come with potential design implications. Should site guardians and landscape architects design, manage, and interpret for the 85-90 per cent of visitors who have a limited knowledge about the author or literary landscape in question? Would designing and managing for the 10-15 per cent of visitors who are literary pilgrims result in a more ‘authentic’ landscape experience, or would it only serve the literary pilgrim? If the general tourist seeks primarily authentically-nostalgic experiences from literary landscapes, while the literary pilgrim seeks both knowledge and profound emotional connection to place, then perhaps identifying the nostalgic gestures that are most true to the author’s work and life should be the target of good literary landscape design.

Moving forward in this research, then, requires a contemplation of author L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, both its real-life origins and its expression in fiction.
Chapter 3 Nostalgia and Home: Thematic and Narrative Approaches to Literary Landscapes

I went around and stood on the stone steps of the front door. The old “front orchard” and the grove beside it seemed more bowery and bosky than of yore… How lovely and lonely it all was, and yet how unreal. I seemed to be in a dream—and yet it seemed the only waking. Oh, as long as that moonlit magic worked the past was mine once more—the old past, before the last sad years I had spent in the old home. Oh, beloved old place, that half hour I spent with you last night was worth the coming from a far land. You were glad, I think, to have me back—me, who loved you so… Have not old homesteads souls that cling to them until they crumble to dust?²¹³

Having trouble writing, in the summer of 1923 LMM made a visit home to Prince Edward Island with her eleven- and seven-year-old sons. Montgomery anticipated her visits to the island with pleasure, and frequently returned to Ontario with new creative vigour. Despite the fact that the essentials of the visit were all there—the sea, the white stems of birch trees highlighted against dark copses of spruce, Lovers’ Lane and PE Island cats—home did not quite feel complete. “Maud realized sadly that the Prince Edward Island she loved was as much a time as a place.”²¹⁴ People she knew intimately and people she knew only as figures in the landscape had died, married, or moved away. The leafy bowers of her childhood had been cut for firewood, automobiles charged along the red dirt roads, while novels and magazines brought the salacious news of modernity to staid Protestant villages. Montgomery’s idea of home was proving to be far more susceptible to the effects of time than its foundation of red rock made it appear. Her sense that home might be a precarious place, hard won and easily lost, already a theme in her fiction, was reinforced with every visit. But there were fleeting moments of beauty, memory, and rightness that fed her hope. Montgomery’s nostalgia for home, a place where something timeless always remained, was and continues to permeate our modern and post-modern cultural consciousness. The loss of and subsequent search for home, whether through our personal

²¹³ Montgomery, Selected Journals, 2:169
²¹⁴ Rubio, Gift of Wings, 317.
experience or through engaging with the writings, art, or music of others, motivates our participation in activities such as nostalgic tourism. Reader-tourists of Montgomery are certainly aware of the importance the idea of home held in the author’s fiction and life. “Home” as a form of antimodernism or nostalgia implies a quality of timelessness. In Montgomery’s world, though, Home is always coupled with a journey of discovery or its loss, and that narrative explains the meaning of Home. Thus, Montgomery’s home landscapes are implicitly narrative landscapes, allowing them to exist as simultaneously thematic and story-telling spaces.

In the reconciliation scene of L.M. Montgomery’s adult romance The Blue Castle, Barney tells Valancy of the first moment he realized he had a home: “I knew that, the night I came home and saw my home light shining out from the island for the first time. And knew you were there waiting for me. After being homeless all my life it was beautiful to have a home.”\(^{215}\) Barney has owned the island cottage for years, but Valancy’s presence has transformed it for him, adding a deeper emotional layer to the place that has already provided him with sanctuary and creative inspiration. Later, despite assurances of love exchanged and the happily ever after secured, Valancy is still able to be distracted by her anticipation of change and homesickness as she and Barney leave the island where they lived: “she knew perfectly well that no spot or place or home in the world could ever possess the sorcery of her Blue Castle.”\(^{216}\) Although the plot of The Blue Castle is arguably about Valancy learning to live her own life, or of Valancy and Barney finding a life together, the real payoff of the novel is the fact that the protagonists have both found home, and that home is not just with each other, it is a place as well. Themes of home and homeland that appear in novels and poems and other texts are “profoundly geographical construction[s].”\(^{217}\) Rosemary Ross Johnston says home is “a concept of space and relationship,”\(^{218}\) while Potteiger and Purinton state “[h]ome is both the container and the content


\(^{216}\) Ibid., 272.

\(^{217}\) Crang, Cultural Geography, 47.

of the narratives of identity and continuity.” But home is more than space and relationship; change is inevitable but sometimes our idea of home does not alter with it. Home is a specific place, with established relationships (to place and possibly to others who occupy the same space), confirmed in its status by time and tradition. Home is also bound up in nostalgia and even tourism. Kong and Tay say that nostalgia is characterized by the interlocking nature of place and time, a yearning to transcend the constrictions of present place and time and to recapture a lost past, characterized by a lost place and a lost social world.” Nostalgia and landscape are therefore an ideal pairing, it seems, as Gillian Rose points out when she says that landscape’s essential “visuality” “is seen as looking back, if you like, and having an effect on itself.” The “looking back” of nostalgic thinking transforms the landscape being memorialized. Though nostalgic looking is concerned with memory, it always serves the purpose of the present. Memory can be a source of comfort in an uncertain world. Because memory is past, it often seems safer than the present, even if it was in actuality a time of great upheaval. Memories can be rewritten in a way that allows us to make sense of our past, making it more familiar than our own present. Memories, whether our own or the imagined memories of the author help us find continuity between the past and the present.

**PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY**

Throughout her life, L.M. Montgomery returned to various themes and ways of seeing that together composed her landscape aesthetic. Although Montgomery’s aesthetic was often recorded in the written word, it was not formal in the way that different schools of art or music have, taken together, followed formal aesthetic rules. Though it is possible to categorize and draw connections between Montgomery’s various landscape themes, this thesis does not make any claim of providing a definitive description of Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic. At the risk
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of starting down the dark, winding path of Truth in Art, we might tentatively suggest that: 1. consulting visitor motivation, and 2. trusting the general consensus of literary criticism to point out significant landscape themes, plus 3. studying the surviving evidence of an author’s lived landscape, should provide an acceptable enough standard by which landscape architects might design for literary landscapes. This chapter is an exploration of the second criteria in the previous sentence, the thematic approach to landscape aesthetics, and focuses on the linked threads between the themes of home, memory, and narrative. One of the earliest attempts to organize the research of this thesis employed mapping the connections between L.M. Montgomery’s landscape themes. Figure 8 represents one way of depicting this web of landscape themes. The themes listed were all identified through reading of Montgomery’s work and the work of Montgomery scholars. Even so, the categories and organization of these themes could be argued to be almost totally arbitrary. This may or may not present a problem for the scope of this research; in any case, the decision was made to aim for internal logic, rather than undisputable accuracy. This thesis is not the only landscape aesthetic-based research that has found the thematic approach to be both valuable and also difficult to categorize. Chenoweth and Gobster conducted a study that had subjects (university students) maintain diaries of their aesthetic experience. When reviewing the diaries, the authors noticed that the recorded experiences could be sorted into categories of theme and usually a landscape feature(s) that was a “causal agent” for that experience. However, knowing there was thematic information in the accounts did not help clarify how they should be interpreted: “While some themes were readily apparent, some were implied or understated. Some descriptions had several themes; others apparently had none. Despite the inherent subjectivity of this task, we felt there was some value and interest in analyzing the content of themes.” Like Chenoweth and Gobster, this thesis takes the position that there is value in a thematic approach to landscape aesthetics, and its connection with landscape experience makes it particularly suited to understanding an author’s aesthetic, and planning for visitor experience.
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L.M. Montgomery's Landscape Themes

- Beauty
  - interiory
  - "the fresh"
  - spirit
  - scale/focus

- Nature
  - enviro. awareness
  - portable landscapes

- Conscious seeing
- Home

- Memory
- Time
- Photography
- Anti-modernism/nostalgia

- Narrative landscape
  - metaphor
  - colour
  - character
  - emotion
The purpose of this chapter is to explore how a thematic understanding of an author’s landscape aesthetic could be a valid approach to designing for literary landscapes. Thematic approaches have the potential to be sensitive to the needs of visitors, site guardians, literary meaning, and the original source material (be it the real or imaginary landscape). Approaching literary landscapes thematically can free the landscape architect from some of the more inelegant aspects of straightforward “narrative landscape design,” while maintaining its sensitivity to visitor experience and historic accuracy. Home and memory were chosen as themes for this chapter for their connection to narrative in both Montgomery’s life and fiction, and also their continued cultural significance to general literary tourists and literary pilgrims. “Home” is seen in Figure 8 as one of the two central organizing landscape themes in Montgomery’s aesthetic. Home was also chosen for its relevance to one of the most popular and enduring types of literary place, the author’s home. The literature review discussed how existential authenticity is a primary goal of the tourist, and that nostalgia is one of the emotional experiences through which this authenticity can be achieved. This chapter argues that as well as being a theme that recurs in Montgomery’s life and fiction, Home is also a type of nostalgia and, as with other forms of antimodernism or nostalgia, L.M. Montgomery’s idea of Home has landscape implications.224

**Writer’s Houses**

Writers’ houses are mostly associated with the biographical aspects of the author’s life, but they have a significant imaginative component as well. This is because they are perceived as more than the physical location where the writing happened, or where family triumphs and tragedies took place—houses could also be a physical extension of the writer’s inner imagination. Thus, building architecture, gardens, and interior decoration (not to mention the accumulation of personal artifacts and collections) contributed to the writer’s expression of self that was both private and public. Beyond the curation of the physical attributes of a home, commemoration at writers’ houses is strongly influenced by collective memory and the interpretive approach. This is clearly evident in the history of Haworth, home of the Brontës, where the early mythology built up around the family (usually drawn from Elizabeth Gaskell’s
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1857 biography of Charlotte) have overwhelmed almost all other understandings of the Brontë’s home and family life for the last 150 years. Interpretive approaches at writer’s homes choose to focus on biographical details or literary details, conflate the author’s life with that of her characters’, make the work of writing visible or invisible, and can even minimize the author’s creativity and labour by telling a story of real-life borrowing instead of a story of authorial imagination.

In addition to the interpretive approach to writers’ homes, other considerations make the writer’s house a specific kind of literary place, separate from literary trails, regions, or significant landscape views, for instance. Writers’ houses have a building to be maintained; they have finite property boundaries, which often means that visitor impacts on the site are more concentrated and harder to hide. Operating costs differ from literary trails, monuments, and other forms of literary place; they are usually protected under heritage designations, or may be struggling to obtain designations that will protect the property. More modest writer’s homes can be easily affected by the land use just beyond the property boundaries. Consider, for instance, Appendix 2, which contrasts images that L.M. Montgomery took of Leaskdale’s landscape with contemporary scenes of the community. Although Leaskdale maintains the overall tone of Montgomery’s day—a small, rural Ontario community—the small scale of the site and its surroundings magnifies every change in the landscape. Finally, even if the writer’s house is a museum, they will often serve more than a documentary and educational purpose, for instance as tourism destinations they become places of consumption and leisure, or they may engage in non-curatorial activities in order to fund raise or serve the local community.

The case of L.M. Montgomery shows us how different narratives of home can influence the meaning of literary places, even those places where there is no “writer’s home” per se, but the idea of home still looms large. The Macneill Homestead, for instance, is the childhood home that Montgomery lost, a landscape of ruins and commemoration; Green Gables is the ideal home Montgomery blessed her character Anne with, embedding nostalgia and fiction into the real landscape in a way much tidier than the reality (and even the fictional place) ever was; Leaskdale is the true “writer’s house museum,” the home a displaced Maritimer made for herself when her heart and source of imagination were far away in Prince Edward Island, overlooked until the public discovered the ‘real’ Montgomery 40 years after her death. The network of Montgomery’s homes considered together represents a narrative of landscape and home, allowing even
presumably more peripheral Montgomery sites, such as the Campbell Farm at Park Corner, New London, to share in the literary meaning.\textsuperscript{225} Connecting these diverse literary places is a memory of home, Montgomery’s and our own, that influences how we perceive, experience, and manage the landscape.

\textbf{ANTIMODERNISM}

Antimodernism is nostalgia made concrete through cultural producers, popular culture, even political policy. Antimodernism has deep ties to consumption and the tourist gaze. It can be used as a form of nation-building and, therefore, through both tourism/leisure and identity-building, can be expressed in the landscape. Antimodernism is particularly relevant in the Maritime provinces, where it has a history of being used to reinvent a struggling economy of outmigration into a tourism playground inhabited by welcoming folk and (seemingly) premodern landscapes. In order to be able to observe the effects of these systemic antimodernisms on a landscape scale, it is useful to tease out the message being communicated by them. In the case of L.M. Montgomery and early twentieth century antimodernism on the whole, the concept of \textit{home} becomes a central principle, and is woven throughout her fiction and landscape descriptions. Shauna J. McCabe credits Montgomery’s “cultural practice” for being “central in the subsequent definition of the space of the Island as “home place.””\textsuperscript{226} As an author, Montgomery has a place in the antimodern literature of her time (historically and thematically speaking), while, as the subject of the tourist gaze, she and her beloved Prince Edward Island are an antimodern destination for many tourists, even for those who do not seek out Montgomery experiences but who nevertheless are on a search for Montgomery’s antimodern Island landscape. Antimodern landscapes are often associated with a sense of timelessness—usually a place suspended in time—and narrative—those specific ‘timeless’ places are celebrated because they have escaped

\textsuperscript{225} The Campbell Farm, home of Montgomery’s Aunt and cousins, is currently the Anne of Green Gables Museum, described in Fawcett and Cormack, “Guarding Authenticity,” 697-699.

the changes that have come to the rest of us. Narrative can occur at these timeless places—in fact, places-out-of-time practically beg for stories to be told about them—but they do not disturb the essential antimodern qualities of place.

**Antimodernism and Change**

One of the easiest mistakes to make when considering antimodernism is to assume that it is a rejection of modernity, cultural changes, technology, or simply “modern life” in its entirety. 227 “Although … the story is situated in a pre-modern world at the point when it is moving into a new, industrialized century, Montgomery does not indulge in nostalgia. It is inevitable that horse-power will give way to the steam engine,” Joy Alexander states, as though an acceptance of change precludes the presence of nostalgic thinking. 228 In fact, antimodernism is a negotiation with modernity and change, and Montgomery and her cultural contemporaries did not seek to stop the forces of progress, merely to find—often invent—a more comfortable way to live with them. David Lowenthal calls attention to the ambiguities of our relationship with the past, reminding us that “explicit avowals of admiration or disdain conceal their opposites; reverence for tradition underlies destructive iconoclasm; retrospective nostalgia coexists with impatient modernism.” 229 Antimodernism is a reaction against the present, but it is not a wholesale rejection, nor can it set up a separate system that can ever accurately represent what the past was. Indeed, forces of preservation can obscure what actually was; the ‘old ways’ are admired even as their remnants are bulldozed. Traditions are invented which have the appearance of historicity, but they serve the group or individual’s needs and desires in the present. Even Lucy Maud Montgomery’s most explicitly antimodernist novels can be read as

---

227 Literary critics discuss antimodernism primarily as a literary style, rather than the historic approach taken by this thesis, and are inclined to view antimodern literature as a direct opposite of modernist literature. Modernist writers themselves, such as Montgomery’s contemporary critics, viewed their works in this way, though both modernist and antimodernist writers were two sides of the same coin (this is the historical view).


229 Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 35.
modern, since her celebration of the olden days, and her skewering of changing values (I often think of May Binnie’s backless dress in *Mistress Pat* that scandalizes Judy Plum, the voice of the ‘old ways’), are a direct comment on how she thinks the present should be. The use of memory in antimodernism is another way to adapt to change. Memory is “bound to distinctive landscapes,” and is used not as an escape, but as suggestion for how to live in a changing world; rather than a rejection of the modern world, memory offers continuity. Antimodernism, particularly in Maritime fiction, reflects an awareness of “the necessity to bring diverse pasts to bear on the present.” Memory may have provided continuity to Montgomery, particularly when it was made visible in the landscape or in photographs, but it continues to serve a similar purpose to literary visitors. Through the experience of “imagined memories,” literary visitors actually stake a claim to continuity with the past of their choice, by borrowing the memories of the author or her characters.

*Detachment, and the Quest for “Home”*

If detachment and placelessness is a condition of modernity, then the search for home becomes an essential aspect of antimodernism. Potteiger and Purinton say nostalgia is based on “the desire to return, the journey home or “nostos,” forming the root of nostalgia.” Montgomery herself made numerous “pilgrimages” to her childhood home when she visited Prince Edward Island, and each time she told herself she would not visit again. Montgomery wrote of her 1918 pilgrimage: “On another twilight I crept across the fields to my old home. It was a sad sight. The old maple grove was gone and most of the old birches. How sorrowful, how forlorn the old house looked.” “These pilgrimages to shadow land are eerie things with an uncanny sweetness. I think I will make no more of them.” And yet, Montgomery did make more

---

pilgrimages, each time to find more trees cut down, the house in increasing disrepair and finally torn down by her uncle.

The loss of, yearning for, or pilgrimage to past home is central to Montgomery’s relationship with place, a hugely important theme in her fiction and journals, and also a motivating factor in visits to Montgomery’s literary landscapes. The feelings of displacement from home that appear in Montgomery’s writings and those of her contemporaries were only half a century old at the time, but they persist today as a condition of modernity. In Montgomery’s day, displacement was at the root of the regionalism, preservation, urban parks and City Beautiful movements.235 Even today, we are not as post-modern a society as we believe or, rather, the problem of dislocation has not disappeared with a new era. Modernity continues to be a present-day motivator for the creation and proliferation of symbols in place. “The more people move around, the more they are “dislocated” as it were from their original environment, the greater the necessity to invest new places with memory using the artificial means of symbols.”236 Displacement thus feeds the author’s own writing of symbols in the landscape, and the tourist’s willingness to seek out these fictional symbols in situ. This displacement today is also expressed outside of real-and-imagined literary places, in the creation of blog posts, fan sites, and travel stories on the internet, allowing us to make antimodern analysis of the proliferation of Anne and L.M. Montgomery-related online sources.237

Montgomery’s concept of home operates on two levels. On one level of meaning, the one described by Potteiger and Purinton, “inside and outside” defines the boundaries of a home community, both its physical environs and citizenry. The fictional community of Cavendish in Anne of Green Gables, for instance, is described through its shared boundaries with other communities, property lines, and physical features, while the community itself polices who can and cannot be considered a local citizen. In this idea of home, narrative plays an important role in reinforcing shared identity and boundaries. The second level of home is about the interplay between the interior (emotional and mental space) and exterior aspects of home. Landscapes

235 Potteiger and Purinton, Landscape Narratives, 241.
237 Ibid., 76.
where heroines feel a soul-deep sense of belonging are landscapes “stretched into past, present and future.” When Montgomery’s heroines make the decision to stay, “an interior decision is made within an external context and is given an epic dimension.” This emotional-psychological process of finding and making home is reflected, often instigated, by the character’s surroundings.

Displacement from the past, from home, or from simpler times is a common theme of nostalgic tourism. Some of the more successful “past landscapes” trade on this displacement by having tourists actually physically act out a voyage ‘back in time’ before they can enter the primary site. Colonial Williamsburg, which counts down the years in the path the tourist takes to the main site, as though they are literally walking into the past, is an excellent example of this. Fortress Louisbourg in Nova Scotia is another example, where tourists are shuttled up to the gates of the Fortress and are required to play-act being 18th century visitors in order to be admitted to the fortress. Even Green Gables employs this technique to an extent, since the visitors pass from a modern visitor centre, into a darkened theatre that runs an L.M. Montgomery orientation film, then emerge into a landscaped memorial area with a plaque dedicated to Montgomery, finally passing through a barn filled with historical references to Prince Edward Island agriculture, before emerging into the past-imagined ‘farmyard’ of Green Gables. Having the tourists themselves perform this time travel, whether it be via their own feet, a verbal performance, or through a succession of mood-setting areas, permits the tourist to find their own narrative and existential authenticity in their actions and experience.

“Home” as a Form of Nostalgia and Antimodernism

Perhaps the best way to describe the functioning of antimodernism in Montgomery’s day and in throughout the history of modern tourism in the Maritime provinces is to look at the seminal work on the issue, Quest of the Folk, by Ian McKay. McKay details how the pressures of modernisation, new forms of leisure travel, and the political ideologies of government and “cultural producers” created a comprehensive form of antimodernism in the province, called Innocence, that served political and economic purposes such as minimizing the significance of labour strife in the province and explaining away systemic inequalities as a matter of individual

choice. McKay calls the form of antimodernism that developed in Nova Scotia “Innocence.” Though Innocence was an expression of local cultural producers, it was finely honed to appeal to international audiences as well, especially the ever-lucrative American tourist. According to MacKay, it is not possible to successfully argue that there were two antimodernisms, one more authentic and less harmful, created by local producers, and the other a crass commodification of economically disadvantaged people and their home landscape for the purpose of tourism. Expressions of antimodernism, according to McKay, were created by the same people, and their antimodern images and invented traditions were the same (even though they appeared in different venues, for instance, novels instead of American trade shows), and because both local expert and casual tourist always seemed to come to the same shallow evaluations of the province and its meaning. Innocence was composed of three primary aspects: invented traditions, the simplification of the province’s population into simple archetypes, and the selection of symbolic landscapes that would confirm the antimodern ideal. Innocence was both an image, a post-card representation of the province, but it also had a material effect on the landscape, “in hotels and highway paving as much as in conceptions of beautiful landscapes and pastoral people.”

Traditionally, the antimodern landscape is rural and often agricultural. Any productive or industrialized use of the landscape is usually transformed by the veneer of consumption and pleasure that accompanies the tourist gaze. In the past, the people who populated antimodern landscapes were represented in tourism and fiction as stereotypically “of the land,” which could be used to disguise or naturalize the economic struggles and inequalities of rural life, as well as any environmental destruction. An alternative to the “Folk” motif is to emphasize the presence of tourists in the landscape rather than locals, or else draw links between the “welcoming culture” of a specific destination and the acts of people employed in the tourism/service sector. As well as reimagining the rural landscape, the association with leisure and recreation means that very concrete transformations may also take place—camp grounds, picnic grounds, heritage villages composed of collections of previously unassociated buildings, even golf courses that use the local milieu as inspiration —can all be a consequence of the antimodern gaze.

--


240 Ibid., 316.
The idea of home is inextricably linked with personal memory and sentiment, but it is also about identity and community. Nostalgia is, in its origins and at its heart, a sense of loss and displacement from home. Home exists on a personal scale as a form of nostalgia, but it also has regional and national implications. On a national scale, “home” is “not just a geography but a history, shared views of the world, shared codes of relationships, shared values and concerns.”

It’s cultural and nationalistic popularity over a long period of time, a theme that reoccurs in fiction, popular culture, and even patriotic or political discourse, means we can consider “home” its own form of antimodernism. In this and the proceeding chapters, Home will specifically refer to the antimodernist theme while the lower-case home stands for all other definitions. As a form of antimodernism, Home encourages us to indulge in the simplifications and omissions that makes it a more potent, shareable concept whether that be on a regional, national, or even cross-cultural scale: “Identity is hegemonic; it selects certain narratives and discourses over others. And these are made to seem natural.” This is the “cultural selection” of McKay’s process of antimodernism. Home is a privileged and contested place because it sets up categories of “self and other, inside and outside, center and not-center.” In some cases, for instance the idea of home shared by a community or a region, home is defined by “foundational narratives” such as history, community, and nature that together create a shared identity.

However, community narrative might not be enough in and of itself to define “home”; McCabe argues that internal narratives are insufficient to explain the creation and boundaries of “home” as geographic identity. Rather, home is defined through its relationship with entities and narratives outside the borders of home, rather than within it. This is a process of differentiation,

242 Shauna J. McCabe does an excellent job explaining and tempering Ian McKay’s condemnatory approach to cultural producers and especially Maritime literature, and her Chapter 4 provides an explanation of the concept of “home,” particularly as it relates to Montgomery’s landscapes, that is incredibly valuable to the arguments I make here about home and landscape. Shauna Joanne McCabe, “Representing Islandness.”
243 Potteiger and Purinton, Landscape Narratives, 252.
244 Ibid., 243.
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246 McCabe, “Representing Islandness,” 140.
similar to the tourist gaze, but where the tourist gaze seeks out different-ness to confirm authenticity and recreational potential, the different-ness of Home is about building permanent connections of community and place that can weather large-scale social and economic change. Even so, by defining Home based on difference, cultural producers and the members of these communities create a local or regional identity that is incredibly accommodating to the tourist gaze and commodification. Home persists today as a value of the Prince Edward Island landscape and identity, particularly with regard to tourism and summer residents. “Whether to "Come play on our Island," the Prince Edward Island tourism slogan, or to "Come stay on our Island," the values and meaning associated with the landscape have been central to its attraction as “home”. The continued relevance of Home to Prince Edward Island’s tourism industry and cultural landscape makes its antecedents, found (but not exclusively) in Montgomery’s writing, worth understanding. As the dominant antimodernist theme on the island, Home is continuously being sold and reinvented with the participation of “tourists, local workers, cultural producers, as well as residents, who seek individual meanings in landscape and in relation to the work of Lucy Maud Montgomery, though to various degrees.”

As an expression of antimodernism, Home shows us how to live more comfortably with change and displacement. Consider how Montgomery uses the same plot device—a sudden, irrevocable break from the past caused by the destruction of the object that represents it—in her most antimodern novels as well as her most modern, the books *Pat of Silver Bush* (1933) and *Mistress Pat* (1935). Rubio says *Mistress Pat*

…dwell, to the point of tedium, on the theme of hating change. But it is still a powerful book, perhaps because of Maud’s ability to embody the wrenching change undergone by the western world in the terrible alterations in the Gardiners’ private world. The most powerful symbol in the book is that of the Gardiner home catching fire—significantly, this happens while the family is at church. There is nothing they can do but to watch their home burn down. It ignites because May carelessly left a stove burning when they went to church. May, of course, feels no loss whatsoever now that she has

---
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destroyed Silver Bush, and she crassly looks forward to getting a new house in its place.249

It is only the destruction of Silver Bush that can free Pat from her almost disordered love for her home (which has already been poisoned with May Binnie’s brash, unsentimental modernity) and allow her to consider making a new home on the other side of the country. Montgomery’s writing suggests that connection to place can help relieve the uncertainty of a changing world. A Montgomery heroine accepts the changing times and is able to engage in contemporary concerns and activities “confidently and with discernment” “due to her rootedness in a place to which she belongs.”250 In other words, having a home, a sanctuary, makes navigating the uncertainties of modern life easier.

Antimodern Landscapes, Home Landscapes

Identity, Symbols, and Simplification

The power of antimodernism in the landscape is largely through its ability to harness the building blocks of the cultural landscape—the system of symbols that make up its significance—and present the story of the landscape as though it is a product of the antimodern narrative, rather than some other process(es) or cultural phenomenon. Whether the symbolism of the landscape is a positive or negative force on the landscape has to do with the sustainability of those symbols, as well as the cultural framework through which those symbols are created and reinforced. From a Marxist perspective such as Ian McKay’s, for instance, antimodernism reifies racial, ethnic, and class distinctions in the landscape itself. Shauna McCabe, on the other hand, perceives a more benign influence at work in the development of Prince Edward Island’s geographic identity. While there remains “a constant tension within Islandness of tradition and modernity, home and away,” “Symbolising home and its boundaries and identity becomes a way to negotiate change from a marginalised position, a conscious localising of identity and action.”251 The common angle in both of these positions is that the source of the symbols’ power is in the

249 Rubio, Gift of Wings, 439.
250 J. Alexander, “Anne With Two “G”s,” 53.
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use—which narrative, economy, political position, or cultural identity—the antimodern symbols are put to, not only the symbols themselves.

Antimodern landscapes are associated with the past, with fading traditions, and with displacement and loss, and find landscape symbols connected to the idea of Home strengthens the emotional authenticity of the landscape. Rowntree and Conkey call landscape symbols “information-regulating devices that control meanings enhancing environmental predictability, increase perceived control, and slow the effect of stressors.” Symbols of Home follow this model, using familiar landscape elements that signify to the perceiver a rural tradition in continuity with the past, and rewarding and comforting the perceiver. When Rowntree and Conkey call landscape symbols “information-regulating devices,” they explain that these symbols can be used not only to store and communicate information, “but also restrict its flow.” This is not only how landscape symbols create social and cultural boundaries, but they can be used to reinforce political meanings as well. Heritage conservation is an act of identification that proclaims that certain buildings, neighbourhoods, or landscapes have particular symbolic meaning and use, and at the same time breaks those places down into their symbolic components, identifying which particular landscape symbols communicate their significance. “Most environmental symbols are overtly nonpolitical in the sense that they do not originally evoke connotations of power relations. However, such overtly nonpolitical symbolic forms are far more likely to become dominant political symbols.” Through the restriction of information, landscape can be used to simplify or obscure past and present social, political, and environmental relationships in order to support other narratives. Simplification is not only restricted to antimodern or narrative landscapes. Straightforward re-use of landscapes, such as the transformation of an industrial site into a public park through the ‘restoration’ of the site to natural-esque state can result in “melancholic and nostalgic rather than critical engagement” with historic land use. Thus, the implications of industrial land use, its labour, economic, and
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environmental history, can be set aside or ignored when the landscape symbols employed at such a site emphasize the nostalgia of ruins or loss rather than the full context of the site.

Elements of the Antimodern and Home Landscape

A landscape of home does not by necessity need to be antimodern, but nostalgic versions of Home are particularly suited to take advantage of how home is already expressed physically on the landscape. Naming, boundaries, thresholds, and the gathering (and exclusion) of similar elements are used by individual people, communities, and nations to help define their landscapes of home. Antimodernist manipulations of a home landscape can reinforce exclusions and erasures of people and history. Places that have the appearance of the past become hubs of nostalgic tourism, such as the search for “Innocence” among “the Folk” in Nova Scotia, or the portrayal of Prince Edward Island as a timeless Garden of Eden, or as a universal “Home” for all, tourists included. Literary places that concentrate home-related nostalgia into one specific site, such as Hill Top, Beatrix Potter’s farm, or Green Gables, in PEI, become doubly important focuses of the tourist gaze. In Nova Scotia, the landscape symbols of antimodernism included fishing huts, wharves, and lighthouses, oxen, apple orchards, villages in picturesque and/or coastal locations. Visible signs of white ethnicity were important, and certainly contributed to the personification of the province’s landscape, but they are not expressly landscape symbols, e.g. tartans, bagpipes, Acadian-style spinning wheels, hooked rugs, etc. In Prince Edward Island, antimodernism was and is expressed almost solely through landscape representation:

The prevailing image of Prince Edward Island has been tied intimately to its insularity, as well as to its rural past and an associated sense of a pristine and pastoral environment—a symbolic landscape that has offered a powerful iconography. "The Island" as it is imagined by cultural producers as well as by visitors and promotional agencies has been powerfully identified with specific images of the highly visual landscape, images which have become heavily-marketed tourism icons such as the sea, rural landscape, red clay roads, sandy beaches, fishing villages, lighthouses, and "Green Gables," the

---

house representing the residence in Lucy Maud Montgomery's fiction *Anne of Green Gables*.  

Because antimodern landscapes are found to be ‘authentic’ based on the presence of the antimodern symbol and not the practical use of the symbol, it is possible for drastic economic, cultural, and even land use changes to take place without affecting the tourist’s impression of the landscape. When the landscape is viewed symbolically, as the tourist gaze tends to do, it allows meaning to be interpreted from landscape symbols that are not actually in effect in the landscape.

Consider the case of the agricultural landscapes of Prince Edward Island, for instance. Even literary pilgrims who are disappointed with the Cavendish landscape still proclaim themselves able to find L.M. Montgomery’s landscape elsewhere on the island, in the same type of fields, backed by spruces and spreading out to the sea, that inspired the author. But the reality of the pastoral landscape on Prince Edward Island, as MacDonald points out, is that are ten times fewer people engaged in farming on the Island today than there were 70 or 80 years ago, and eight times fewer farms (though the area of farmed land has only fallen 50 per cent).  

Because the symbol of agricultural fields persists, antimodernist interpretations of that symbol allow tourists to assume that the ‘traditional’ ways persist on Prince Edward Island. The “placid veneer of the pastoral landscape” is “perilously thin” on Prince Edward Island,

**A NOSTALGIA FOR HOME: AUTHOR’S HOUSES AND ANTIMODERNISM**

Authors’ homes are a significant draw for the literary tourist. For literary tourists, homes stand in for the author themselves. To be able to enter an author’s house is often seen as the ability to enter the mind of the author. Harald Hendrix says that homes can be “a product of a writer’s imagination or ambition,” “a source of inspiration in its own right,” or “a material frame necessary for the production of literature.”  

As the place where the author’s creativity became

---


258 MacDonald, “A Landscape…with Figures,” 84-5. From 55,500 people living on farms in 1931 to a drop of 5,300 living on farms in 2006, while there were about 14,000 farms on the Island at the turn of the twentieth century, and only 1,700 farms today, most of them corporately owned.

written text, the relationship of the writer to their home becomes a point of interest to the literary tourist. When authors’ homes become memorialized or turned into tourist sites, they often practice “self-referentiality,” a turning back in on themselves in which “earlier acts of remembrance are recalled along with their original objects.” In a similar vein, Watson calls writer’s house museums such as Haworth “back-formations,” “made into the likeness of the Brontës subsequently, and so betrays more explicitly what the culture wished to make of the sisters.” Hendrix also writes about how authors’ sites can educate us as much about the ideologies of the people who memorialize author’s houses as the authors themselves. Self-referencing and back-formation is a consideration in the case of L.M. Montgomery too. A portrait of the author can be found in the Leaskdale Manse foyer, for instance, and photographs of the church taken by Montgomery are displayed in the church itself. The practice of introducing self-referential objects and interpretation within writer’s houses can also be turned to the landscape, for instance if the site guardians of a writer’s house were to plant a garden with the author’s own favourite plant in the garden, without reference to whether it was historically accurate. The plaques of the Macneill Homestead, quoting from Montgomery’s own journals almost certainly qualify as self-referential site interpretations. Self-referential acts of site management and interpretation can reveal as much about the audience reception of literary places over time as they do about the author themselves.

The most successful writer’s house sites are able to meaningfully connect the writer’s house with his or her “creative labour.” Watson identifies just two types of writer’s houses, the birthplace and the writer’s home. Birthplace houses are only as successful as the birthplace is relevant to the author’s creative narrative. Watson calls author birthplace museums “textless tourism” because they are usually intended to be “an experience that pre-empts the necessity of texts.” The ideal birthplace and author home museums connect the author’s work to place without minimizing the effort that went into their creations or making the author merely the

---
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“embodiment of the genius loci.”

Despite Montgomery’s deep love of Prince Edward Island, for instance, her personal life has been too complicated for her to be considered the Island personified, unlike her character Anne, whose red hair is identified with the red soil, and whose optimism and love of nature is considered the personified equal of the island itself. Watson points out the impossibility of the Haworth Parsonage, which “insists that writing is always autobiographical and that it transforms nothing. It makes the labour of writing all but invisible…” making Haworth “both a writer’s house and not a writer’s house at all…”

The reception of the Brontë sisters’ work has accorded them mythic status akin to their own characters, and has hidden their creative labours. Consider in comparison the Leaskdale Manse, which serves as a pointed example of how the interiority of the author’s life may have very little to do with the author’s day-to-day life. Because the visitor is hard pressed to “see” Montgomery’s creative work in her daily life and home, our understanding of both is greatly enriched. One of the most visible evidences of connection between Montgomery’s creative life and daily life, in fact, would be her garden, a feature of the Leaskdale Manse that is currently not used to its best advantage. Montgomery herself never seemed to anticipate that there might one day be a house maintained in her memory; she deplored tourists’ visits to the Macneill Homestead and half-forgave her uncle for tearing it down; she saw tourist visits to Myrtle Webb’s house (Green Gables) in a purely practical sense of bringing money in to the family. Montgomery wrote and rewrote her journals, intending for them to represent the legacy of her inner life, and did not seem to ever anticipate a writer’s house museum in her honour.

Author’s homes can be a “medium of expression” while the author is alive but once they die, the house becomes a medium of remembrance, becoming part of “collective and cultural memory.” Visitors to authors’ houses hope to make a personal connection with the author: “the act of viewing the house is an imaginative effort to bring the dead author once more to life, to meet the writer as posthumous host or friend.” Hendrix’s concept of the author’s house privileges men, who historically have been far more able to dispose of their own space. For this
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reason, when considering woman authors’ homes, there are complicating factors in understanding and interpreting that house for the public. Consider, for instance, the constraints that Montgomery faced living first in a home owned by male relatives and then, for over two decades in manse houses owned by her husband’s congregations, where even her interior decorating choices would be judged according to how well they adhered, not to expectations for “L.M. Montgomery, author” but for “Mrs. MacDonald, Reverend’s wife.” How free was Montgomery to have her homes reflect “[her] aspirations regarding [her] own artistic and private persona”? Montgomery undoubtedly enjoyed the improvements she made to the front garden of the Leaskdale Manse, but as the minister’s wife, and a woman who lived her life by the question “what will people say?”, it is worth questioning whether she felt the same freedom to modify her front garden as the Reverends who followed after Montgomery and her husband. The first Reverend after Montgomery’s husband turned the front garden into a miniature golf course, while the next one ploughed the course under and planted the whole yard up with potatoes (pre Victory Garden days).

**Finding Home in the Landscape**

The shack built by Aldo Leopold, where he wrote *A Sand County Almanac*, is the locus of commemoration for his work and life. It “has become an icon, a place of pilgrimage for environmentalists,” Anne Whiston Spirn declares: “How ironic is it that the shack, the simple human shelter, is taken as the symbol and not the landscape itself, the focus of his efforts: the soil, water, plants, and animals.” Sometimes, the writer’s house (or shack) is a distraction from the actual focus of the writer’s inspiration, the landscape in which the author found his or her own home in nature. This is the case with L.M. Montgomery, whose own intense longing for home and the fictional homes she created are only part of the significance of the L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site. Like Leopold’s shack, Green Gables is treated as the symbol of Montgomery’s fiction, but it is actually the house *in the landscape* that is the

———

real home of Anne, and more reflective of Montgomery’s idea of home. In the novel *Anne of Green Gables*, Anne’s most transcendent moments come from contemplation of the world outside her gable room, and many conversations and meetings take place not in Green Gables itself, but on the threshold between the house and the world outside, or at the gate of Green Gables, threshold to the world beyond, or in the landscape of pastures, lanes, and woods that surround the house. In *Anne*, interior rooms and exterior grounds are described with loving care, and yet it is not even clear from the novel if the house itself is whitewashed or if the shingles are left to naturally weather to grey.\(^{272}\) Rosemary Ross Johnston says, “Montgomery’s houses are always figuratively significant. Houses have thresholds and doors that keep out and keep in, but Montgomery’s houses spill over the thresholds into a phenomenology of landscape where home and place become one.”\(^ {273}\) Epperly says that Montgomery’s landscapes “include houses in their settings and with their interior dreaming spaces.”\(^ {274}\) Houses cannot be separated from their landscapes. Anne’s forever-home is not the house itself but the house in its landscape setting.

**Making Home in the Landscape**

Mary Rubio identifies a “new theme” in Montgomery’s journalings as she finished her year teaching school in Belmont and prepared to leave, with “a belief that she was cursed to be a rootless wanderer, never permanent, always forced to move on.”\(^ {275}\) At the same time that Montgomery was convinced that she could only ever be a pilgrim to home in her journals, her fiction and her daily life, which included gardening, decorating, housekeeping, cooking, and other home-making activities, was a testament to our ability to make home. *Anne*’s life at Green Gables is so attractive to readers even today because it “mythologizes the homeless and

---
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unhooked figure who manages to participate in homing herself.”

And yet, around the same time that Montgomery started to become convinced of her wandering curse, she carefully staged and photographed her favourite rooms in her grandparent’s house, her “dear den” and the tree-filtered light of the parlour, and her favourite scenes of home: the house among its apple trees, the sights of Lovers’ Lane, the bluff with its keyhole rock down on the shore. Montgomery curated her space and recorded it for future dreaming.

Speaking to what other scholars have said about the role that the writer’s home can occupy in their own work, and highlighting how the privilege of male writers’ ownership of their creative space was far less often achievable for the woman writer, Ross Johnston writes that Montgomery

…above all craved the disposition of her own space. This is much more than a room of one’s own; it is much more than space for the artist. Montgomery’s life circumstances meant that she was always, until the purchase of ‘Journey’s End’, dependent for the space of her living on others (grandmother, stepmother briefly, the parishes of Leaskdale and Norval)... Montgomery never until the very end had the power to dispose of her own space.\textsuperscript{277}

Included in the ability to dispose of her own space was a desire for privacy which living in a church manse could not provide. While the Leaskdale Manse had a fence that divided the front yard from the back, this served more as a way to define public and private space rather than providing any actual privacy for the family. Montgomery’s journals show that even in the back yard, the family was on display for their neighbours. Remarking on the community’s interest in her family, Montgomery wrote, “They even count the mats that we hang out on the backyard fence on sweeping day—count them and tell their neighbors about them. They know the exact moment our washing is hung out, the number of pieces, and everything else that is done in our
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back yard. As to what goes on indoors, where they can’t see, I fear their agony of curiosity about it will shorten their lives.”

Though Montgomery was deeply troubled by her mental and physical health in her last years, she was still able to appreciate finally owning a home of her own. She wrote to her friend George B. MacMillan about her newfound enjoyment in homeownership:

And it is very delightful to own one’s home and feel free to do just as one pleases in and about it. In a manse, no matter how nice it may be, you never feel this. Next month—next year—you may be leaving it and going elsewhere. One never has a sense of permanency. And our house being new is very convenient. We have two fireplaces, three bathrooms and all kinds of electrical “plugs” for sweeping, ironing and washing etc. Housework is really a pleasure.

In a rather literal expression of Montgomery’s desire to ‘find her home in nature,’ she focused not just on the house itself, but its surroundings, writing about how she would put up the blinds in her bedroom window at night so she could watch the wind in the pines and the moon and the lights from the lakeshore. Like so many other middle-class Canadians, the new suburban lifestyle held great appeal as well, a mix of convenience, appropriately groomed residential yards, and situated right on the edge of nature: “Around us are nice homes with nice gardens and lots of breathing space and behind us is a deep ravine of pines and oaks. In summer the ravine is carpeted with bracken ferns and all kinds of dainty wild flowers grow there.” Montgomery made herself at home in her own garden as well. Within the year she had a rock garden built in the yard. This garden gained special significance with the death of her most loyal feline companion “Good Luck” in January 1937. He was buried “on the edge of the rock garden by a little pine tree.” Montgomery told her penpal MacMillan the story of a stone she had moved
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from her dear old homestead—a stone with important memories of home and childhood—to Toronto just the month before Lucky’s death. “I had meant to put it somewhere in my rock garden. Well, I put it on Lucky’s grave. It seemed fitting. He was a P.E. Island cat and it became him to have a “stone” from the old sod.” Lucky’s grave was an act of gardening, memory, and eventually commemoration, the stone one of those “tangible evidences of the past” that both home-makers and literary tourists appreciate.

_A Home in Nature_

While Montgomery spent most of her adult life hoping for a permanent home that she could claim as her own, she also found some comfort in her belief that home—our first home, as humans—could be found in nature, particularly in the woods. While the nature tradition in much of Canadian literature has reflected a wilderness motif that is impersonal, even hostile, to human interests, Montgomery, like many of her fellow Maritime authors, approached the landscape with a sincere topophilia, a “romantic love of place:” “humans-versus-environment conflict is virtually absent in the idyllic rural communities created by Montgomery and her contemporaries.” In fact, Montgomery’s idea of nature draws strongly on the idea that through aesthetic experience we can temporarily recapture our prelapsarian (before the ‘fall of Man’) relationship to Nature. Potteiger and Purinton acknowledge that “repeated comparison with an idyllic or arcadian landscape evokes a narrative of return not only to the historic past but to a past relationship to nature.” For Montgomery, putting nature into words reinforced our renewed relationship to the environment. Fiamengo calls this “the longing for a prelapsarian world of perfect concord between language and nature,” in other words, a return to Eden where humanity is in as much harmony with language and nature as it was (in the original creation story) with God.
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William Cronon states that “calling a place home inevitably means that we will use the nature we find in it,” and that also declares this a cautionary statement, since the use of nature has historically involved alterations and destruction.\textsuperscript{288} For Cronon, acknowledging “the autonomy and otherness of the things and creatures around us” will cause us to question the uses we make of wild things and wild places, and play out in our altered actions. It is this autonomy of being that Montgomery seems to recognize when she goes into the woods to commune with the trees:

Best of all is the close wood… this is where the immortal heart of the wood will beat against ours and its subtle life will steal into our veins and make us its own forever, so that no matter where we go or how wide we wander in the noisy ways of cities or over lone paths of the sea, we shall yet be drawn back to the forest to find our most enduring kinship.\textsuperscript{289}

This claim for an “enduring kinship” with nature is less well known than the term “kindred spirits” that Montgomery popularized, but it is probably not an accident that Montgomery chose words with a shared etymology to describe relationships to nature as well as friendship. Montgomery did not only feel this kinship with nature in the woods, however. Gardening, as well as being a pleasurable activity (or at the very least, an activity with pleasurable outcomes), could turn Montgomery’s thoughts toward the cycles of life. She could exult in the joyous growth of spring at the same time that her thoughts turned morbid. Facing her first pregnancy in her late thirties, Montgomery planted her garden in Leaskdale, and “wondered if she would be lying “beneath the sod” when the next spring came around.”\textsuperscript{290} Nature might be an expression of the eternal, but our home in a fallen world is ultimately one of ends as well as beginnings.
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THE NARRATIVE LANDSCAPE APPROACH

The narrative approach to landscape does not actually originate from a desire to understand and design for literary landscapes; neither is it a given that the narrative approach is the ‘best’ approach for them. Rather, landscape narratives can be understood “not just as literal stories or texts to be read but as integral to the processes that shape landscapes in the first place.”\(^{291}\) The narrative content of an author’s life and writing become one of those processes or meanings that shape landscapes.\(^{292}\) The literary landscape approach emphasizes landscape-as-text, but usually in a direct sense of comparison between a text and what in that text is ‘real’ and what is ‘not real’ (e.g. the novel-landscape and its real-world counterpart). The body of theory and research regarding narrative landscape in the landscape architecture field is larger than that of literary landscapes, but still small. Generally, though, it has been used as a way to understand landscape and what it means to the people who inhabit them; as a design process; or as a design language or toolkit. None of these uses of landscape restrict themselves to literary landscapes; in fact, they have been more inclined to view literary landscapes as strict one-to-one, fiction-to-real design dilemmas, with little significance beyond the confines of their site, rather than as the unique landscape theory and design opportunity they are considered in this thesis.

The extent to which we allow landscapes to ‘mean’ determines the manner of our approach to narrative landscapes. If we are hesitant to declare that landscapes can have meaning in the formal, cognitive fashion of Jane Gillette, we may be inclined to accept narrative landscapes as a design process, but not as a source of landscape meaning. If we embrace reception theory, literary critique, and audience-based approaches to landscape meaning, we may be more comfortable with an approach that favours landscape interpretation as a part of meaning. If we consider the sociology- and environmental psychology-based investigations into existential authenticity or landscape experience accurate descriptions of how people find meaning in the landscape, we might adopt experiential design, but make little attempt to try and imbue the landscape with meaning or guide the visitor to that meaning. The historical approach

\(^{291}\) Potteiger and Purinton, *Landscape Narratives*, x.

acknowledges the existence of narrative in the landscape whether or not it is perceived or widely known.

The first two chapters of this thesis proposed that a defining characteristic of literary landscapes is its experiential nature. A key element of narrative landscapes is not whether visitors can ‘read’ the story in the landscape, but whether they are able to experience the story in the landscape. Though this thesis has not explored the cultural landscape theorists who propose analyzing the landscape as though it were a theatre, the idea of performance and projection is a very intriguing area of inquiry. If we see visitors, both literary pilgrims and general visitors, as people seeking to project themselves into a fictional landscape, then the landscape becomes a place in which visitors play-act the narrative of the stories, or else create their own narrative of landscape interaction.

*The Critical Approach to Landscape Narrative*

A desire to enrich narrative landscape possibilities has led to the promotion of various literary, narrative, and linguistic approaches adapted from their respective academic fields. The critical narrative landscape approach tends to set aside the question “can landscapes mean?” and asks instead, “what are the elements of the narrative landscape?” The theorists who assume narrative landscapes can and do exist attempt to offer constructive ways of integrating narrative theory with landscape, while being conscious of criticisms that narrative is either not applicable to landscape, or that it is a stumbling block to deeper meaning in landscape. Potteiger and Purinton’s approach, for instance, identifies the literary and narrative devices that can be adapted to landscape, while Anne Whiston Spirn’s exploration of landscape as a language—in fact, as our “first human texts,” and “our native language”—proposes a landscape grammar that has scale, tense and context, subject, verb, and object. Spirn’s landscape poetics are included in Table 3 alongside Potteiger and Purinton’s landscape narrative framework, and Catherine Dee’s “form and fabric” approach, discussed shortly.

---

### Table 3 Narrative Landscape Analysis Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Fabric (context/models)</th>
<th>C. Dee, <em>Form and Fabric</em></th>
<th>E. Spirn, landscape poetics in <em>Language of Landscape</em></th>
<th>Potteiger &amp; Purinton, <em>Landscape Narratives</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spaces</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paths</td>
<td>Climax &amp; Anticlimax</td>
<td>Revealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edges</td>
<td>Anomaly</td>
<td>Concealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foci</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td>Gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresholds</td>
<td>Paradox &amp; Irony</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Tropes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressive Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphony</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cacophony</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Synecdoche</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>Irony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Realms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Story Realm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Contextual/Intertextual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Discourse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even if we skip over the question “can landscapes mean?” however, questions about narrative’s pertinence to landscape design remains. For instance, these narrative frameworks and concepts have varying levels of accessibility even before their adaptation to a landscape architectural purpose. What sort of education about literary concepts such as synecdoche and metonymy would landscape architects need in order to understand and apply the landscape architectural equivalent? Would the burden of education be too great to allow the narrative landscape approach to be adaptable beyond a small self-selected group of professional academics? The issue of landscape meaning can be sidestepped to a certain degree through a focus on landscape narrative as either a form of landscape analysis or as a design process. Even so, adapting a design process and design elements from a theoretical (narrative landscape) framework is an ongoing challenge. And is it reasonable to give up the hope of transmitting narrative through landscape, when stories are such a vivid aspect of cultural expression? Ultimately, a workable, repeatable process and design pattern for narrative landscape should also clear the hurdle of being able to be understood in some manner by landscape users. Narrative landscape is essentially about storytelling, so the communication of landscape meaning is integral to the entire attempt.

Some of the landscape architects proposing more esoteric starting points for narrative landscape have done so out of a conviction that the current narrative devices available to the designer are clumsy and obvious. Alon-Mozes says that in a class created to introduce the narrative landscape approach to students (and to test its validity to landscape architecture education), students “found it difficult to create fresh interpretations for overused themes and ended up recycling clichés in their works.” Potteiger and Purinton observe that “landscape narratives tend to be conceived primarily in terms of literal storytelling. So many projects rely on signs, icons, and other explicit references to add a veneer of stories to the landscape.” These references are “one-liners” and are too shallow to connect with the deeper narratives already

---
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implicit “in the materials, experiences, and processes of landscapes.” Potteiger and Purinton’s use of the term “one-liner” comes from Jane Gillette, who writes, “all too frequently a rhetorical device in landscape is a one-liner. Like a joke, a one-liner can point to a much larger issue, but it cannot express complicated ideas.”

Reclaiming Literal Reference

The critical approach is meant to direct the discussion toward an understanding of narrative landscapes as the story of how narrative is communicated in the landscape, but it has interesting implications for literary landscapes. Literary landscapes are largely composed of “signs, icons, and other explicit references,” but according to Potteiger and Purinton we are to see these as merely superficial trappings. The opportunity provided by literary landscapes — an audience of visitors already prepared and predisposed to perceive the meaning of a landscape, and a collection of signs, symbols, and narrative available for the designer to make use of — is actually a weakness too often indulged in, if the criticism is correct. For the purposes of this thesis, we shall take the starting point that landscape metaphors, even “one-liners,” may add value and depth to the narrative landscape. There are two reasons for this: first, the word “literal” does not need to be a dirty word, but simply expresses that a reference is being made to a narrative or a field of thought. All narrative landscapes are literal, in that they refer to something. When we take the stigma away from “literal” we can discuss its modifiers: abstract and concrete, metaphorical or explicit. It is not in the literal reference that narrative landscape is clunky, but the expression of that narrative. Literal storytelling does not imply that the narrative devices used are clumsy and obvious; it merely indicates that there is a specific story being referred to in the landscape by the designer or visitor. That story is ‘read’ not by asking, “what species of shrub is used in this planting?” but “what does this place mean, and what story does it refer to?” To elaborate on the example of the shrub, however, what is the problem if it is a concrete expression of a literary metaphor? Or a concrete expression of an explicit reference? As designers we might be wary of the obvious one-liner, but is the public similarly disposed? It is difficult to think of an unaware member of the public feeling repelled by a shrub that to them has no specific meaning, nor a literary pilgrim, who comes searching for those connections between real and fiction.

297 Gillette, “Can Landscapes Mean?” 145.
When it comes to literary landscapes, especially those of L.M. Montgomery, there is really little choice about whether to seriously consider landscape metaphors in this research. As a storyteller, Montgomery experienced the landscape not only as a purely aesthetic or environmental phenomenon but as the setting for her own life narrative, and the narratives of her characters. To this end, specific settings, landscape elements, visual motifs, colours, and even flora took on metaphoric and emotional meaning both in her memory and in her fiction. The primary narrative of home in Montgomery’s life and her fiction is a search for home. Montgomery’s literary landscape is chock full of metaphor and allusion, and would be one of the key design tools for a landscape architect working within her landscapes. When we examine the physical and textual inspiration for literary landscapes, I suggest we should always be asking ourselves about the nature of the reference. Is the landscape used as a literal reference to a concrete thing? A literal reference to an abstract idea? An abstract reference to a concrete place? And so on. For instance, in the context of L.M. Montgomery, the author made many literal (literary) references to concrete things (sunsets, flowers, etc.) by including quotations from her favourite poets and authors. Montgomery used different combinations of literal, abstract, and concrete references to build a multi-layered landscape of meaning, image, and embodied experience.

A less critical (that is, less negative) approach to landscape metaphor gives us time to discover the connections between L.M. Montgomery’s landscape metaphors, the narrative landscape frameworks proposed by Potteiger and Purinton and Catherine Dee, and the research on landscape preferences. With literary landscapes, the designer’s job is not to invent narrative, but to negotiate between the real and imagined as well as make design decisions about what in the author’s work will be represented concretely and what will be abstracted. The literal-ness is a given; the choices to be made are about whether that reference will be to the themes or concepts of the work or to the narrative of the work, and whether that will be expressed abstractly or concretely. Alon-Mozes describes these interpretive choices as “an abstraction of its ideas or as a concrete description of the site and its happenings.”

The narrative landscape references to the novel or the writer’s life that the landscape architect may choose to highlight, enhance, or create, do not need to be perfect, because ultimately, any literary landscape will turn the reader back to
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the text. However, it could be argued that if turning the reader back to the text is the goal, it would be better to do it gently rather than with a giant parking lot or a strip mall.

**Types of Narrative study approaches**

How to depict or describe landscape architecture’s form and process is an issue of critical importance to the field itself. Both verbal (written, or spoken) communication and visual communication are used. Both compliment the narrative approach.

**Critical visual studies**

Catherine Dee advocates for “critical visual studies” to be applied both to research and the communication of research.\(^{299}\) Dee argues that written-only communication privileges other aspects of research and landscape—for instance, narrative—over the forms of enrichment that can be gained from visual forms of communication. Dee identifies this situation as being the impasse between landscape architectural theory and landscape architecture design and practice.\(^{300}\) Dee argues that “making images is a means of seeking and interpreting the meaning of landscapes,” and that visual study enables better spatial understanding of and physical connection to landscapes.\(^{301}\) She identifies five types of critical visual study: 1) art as enquiry, 2) dialogic drawing, 3) hypothetical design, 4) mappings, and 5) visual narratives.\(^{302}\) The purpose of visual narratives, according to Dee, is to “explore time, process, fictive and ‘human dramatic’ aspects of landscape.”\(^{303}\) Of all the types of critical visual study, visual narratives are best able to negotiate the distance between text and image, and with effort, they might be invoked in order to depict movement and the “experience of time” in landscapes.\(^{304}\) The idea of a visual narrative is
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not, after all, unusual, as the continuing popularity of graphic novels, comics, and even children’s picture books show us. Dee argues that this method embraces, rather than fears, ambiguity and multiple meanings, because they indicate there has been a “convergence between intent and reception,” and because images are already “culturally and critically dynamic and dialogic.”

The images and notations in Dee’s critical visual study approach are meant to “communicate not only landscape morphology but also the experience of this morphology.” By centering the experience of the designer or visitor in visual landscape studies, Dee is advocating for the power of images to evoke an imagined experience, and for that experience to play a central role in designing and analyzing landscapes. This approach (though not within the scope of the current thesis) could be of use in approaching literary landscapes, helping to capture key landscape characteristics of both the imagined landscape and the existing landscape.

**Descriptive/Written Studies**

There is still value in narrative landscape studies of a written nature, however. The tradition of verbally describing landscape gardens instead of illustrating them has historically been useful when the goal was to reflect the experience of the garden rather than the formal design interventions. To designers and visitors and authors of guidebooks during the great Picturesque landscape revolution, words were an excellent medium for conveying the meaning of the landscape. In fact, Hunt claims that a “basic strategy” of the Picturesque garden was a combination of word and image that would “enlarge and enhance the full visual and sensual appeal of a garden for its visitors.” In particular, Hunt notes that the written word is particularly useful for describing “motion and process” in the landscape. Calling this *Ekphrasis*, which is to say, a written depiction of a visual art, Hunt argues that this form of communication is highly suited to conveying the essence of the experience of landscape (the “temporality, activity, motion and emotion,”) as well as the intentionally-designed visual aspects of landscape.
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In contrast to Catherine Dee, therefore, Hunt argues that words can actually enrich visitor experience reception, rather than limit their immersion in the landscape. If we accept that landscape description such as the kind L.M. Montgomery wrote can be influential, evoke aesthetic reactions, create in us “imagined memories” of place, then by extension, descriptive writings on actual gardens can have similar effect and useful applications.

It would be counter-productive to choose to emphasize the visual experience over an imaginative, verbal experience of literary landscapes, since both ways of seeing and understanding are essential to being fully immersed in the literary landscape. It is the visual aspects of the landscape that help the visitor fully realize for perhaps the first time the sensory realness of a previously only imagined landscape. On the other hand, it is only through the words of the author and subsequently the words of the visitor that the physical landscape takes on meaning from its literary source.

Tourism Approach to Narrative

The field of tourism development does not fret about applying narrative approaches at cultural landscape sites the same way landscape architects do. Narrative is recognized as an important element of the literary place or literary trail. Narrative “frames the experience for the visitor, allowing them to engage more deeply with a sense of place.” Stories and narrative are seen as necessary because heritage and cultural tourism are already chock full of “old buildings…museums…[and] evidence of historical or prehistoric occupation…” that have little interest for the come-from-away tourist. “Weaving a story around a place, a tangible asset, or an intangible asset instills that asset with some meaning, bringing it to life and making it relevant.” The pleasure that tourists find in a story well told increases their interest in the information to be found at a site. This greater “engagement with place” includes the “educational, entertainment, aesthetic and escapist elements” of visiting literary sites.
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McKercher and du Cros list the five steps that must be taken in order to “transform a cultural heritage asset into a cultural tourism product:

1. Tell a story
2. Make the asset come alive
3. Make the experience participatory
4. Make the experience relevant to the tourist
5. Focus on quality and authenticity.  

Enviromental and Landscape History

Environmental and Landscape Historians, likewise, have minimal difficulty with the assumption that narrative and landscape are integrally connected. Landscape history helps us to understand landscapes as palimpsests, showing our physical and cultural relationship to the land—how landscapes came to be, and their significance.

Landscape history can offer spatial and visual readings of a number of human-made environments...In turn, environmental historians can offer landscape historians (and practitioners) macro-histories and narratives that reveal the changes in large-scale phenomena...as well as histories focusing on the non-human environment and based on scientific data.

Environmental history, which so frequently describes how we have used nature and the effects of our actions, is often a very forward-looking form of history, where our past relationships with the environment can be used as a call to action. Both landscape history and environmental history help us to understand the cultural and environmental context of an author’s aesthetic—for instance, research on deforestation on Prince Edward Island can reveal a critical aspect of Montgomery’s childhood landscapes that may not explicitly show up in her journals, but are revealed thematically and metaphorically. Lastly, when we consider literary landscapes a type of heritage landscape, we accept that historical narratives guide the recognition, conservation, and interpretation of literary sites, especially those with heritage designations.

On the other hand, the physical landscapes can help with the apprehension of historical narrative. L. Tyler Swanson draws out the similarities between designed landscape narratives and
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history: “Design requires a narrative and the formalization of this narrative is much like the writing of history. Designs, like histories, are inherently selective though they can be more or less so. Designs, like histories, are created from a perspective or perspectives and are intended to be received by others who are often undetermined and unknown. Designs and histories are creative acts that extract critical components and actions from situations or events.”

Ultimately, though, Swanson finds the comparison lacking (preferring to make a comparison to theatre instead of history), Swanson maintains that “the formalization of narratives on a site may still allow us to more fully engage with traces of the past on a site.” Site histories are particularly successful when they make use of “natural forces,” because they transmit information and meaning across cultural boundaries—and, indeed, temporal boundaries as well. Duempelmann suggests that an additional benefit of the “detailed representations” of history that “micro-landscape histories” offer are the ability for people to connect more readily to the larger trends of history.

**Narrative and Memory in L.M. Montgomery’s Landscapes**

Narrative was one of the primary ways that L.M. Montgomery perceived the world. She wrote narrative into all aspects of her life, not just her novels, but into her journals and natural observations as well, thereby unconsciously and sometimes consciously shaping the story of her life for her own purposes, present and future. While Montgomery’s journals have the appearance of “a seamless, continuous narrative of a life,” the work to make them seem so has been hidden from us, purposely. “Real life is untidy, unshaped, with loose ends. Her journals have no loose ends, no pointless stories, no catalogues of the boring effluvia of life, no people of importance to
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her narrative who have not been introduced. Each descriptive or narrative unity always becomes part of a unified whole. Montgomery had a practically eidetic memory, enhanced by her practice of journaling, but it was complicated by her own revisiting and literal re-writing of those memories, most often while coping with troubling events in her life. This allowed Montgomery to write a narrative into her life that made her latest retelling of memory always the authoritative version of how things were. In a similar way, Montgomery’s landscapes have very few loose ends. The fictional landscape is small, but entire, detailed at the center and fuzzy at the margins, with no extraneous details.

Rosemary Ross Johnston argues that the landscape setting is a critical element on Montgomery’s narrative writing: “Montgomery is a wonderful storyteller, and a wonderful creator of character, but stories and characters cannot with integrity be divorced from their symbiotic relationships with landscape.” This section seeks to explore the ways that Montgomery’s perception of memory, time, and narrative shaped her relationship to space and landscape. The practical value of this analysis in an applied approach would be to identify potential themes, interpretive measures, and of course design elements—extant landscape features, circulation patterns, etc., that could be emphasized by site design, management, and interpretation. It also helps us understand narrative ways of experiencing the landscape, and perhaps even anticipate the expectations of literary pilgrims.

**The Participatory Landscape Narrative**

Montgomery’s narratives are participatory. When she read novels, Montgomery claimed her imaginative projections of the story were practically tangible: “When I read a story I see everything, exactly as if I were looking at an actual scene. I hear the sounds and smell the odors…” It is no surprise then that potential for visitor engagement with narrative landscapes, making them simultaneously observer of and participant in the story, is also reproduced by the characters in Montgomery’s novels. In the “Haunted Wood” episode in *Anne of Green Gables*,
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Anne and her friends make up a number of ghost stories about phantoms that live in the wood. These stories are inspired by the character of the wood itself, a stand of aging second-growth spruce and fir, typical of the Maritime provinces, with a very limited understory, close-growing trees, and dense canopy that lets very little light through from above. The experience of these woods can be disorienting and mysterious. Coming through the woods at dusk, the slightest touch from the dead, skeletal lower branches of the trees evokes the creepy sensation of being stroked by a ghost. The race to leave the woods becomes a hero’s journey; emerging from the woods safely, aware of how their storytelling has caused them to act out their very own ghost stories, Anne and her friend(s) have solidified the Haunted Wood as a narrative landscape.

Narrative is also embodied in the landscape through play-acting, though Montgomery often takes literal, concrete allusions that, rather than transforming the land with new meaning, are in fact transformed themselves by their interaction with place and character. Anne’s enactment of the Tennyson poem “Lancelot and Elaine,” in which the dead lily maid’s body is floated on a barge down a river, brings to mind the theatre-and-audience concept of landscape experience mentioned by Swanson (and some cultural geographers).\(^{323}\) Ostensibly, Anne’s decision to impose a Romantic tragedy upon the modest pond of Avonlea is a “one-liner” as vulnerable to criticism as any Georgian England temple folly. The failure to properly act out the poem, however, due to the vagaries of geography (pond current) and infrastructure (the stake at the landing that pierced a hole in her boat) transforms the story into a new, place-specific narrative. A story about romantic tragedy becomes one about common sense and living a life appropriate to your surroundings. Anne herself sums up her real-life recreation as being a cure for overblown romanticism. “I have come to the conclusion that it is no use trying to be romantic in Avonlea…romance is not appreciated now.”\(^{324}\) It is not that Anne has sworn off romance—just that she has learned to accept home for what it is. Into the established Picturesque and Romantic landscape metaphors, Montgomery inserts humour, common sense, and everyday life, illustrating how “metaphor may hold contradictions in dialogue, enriching the tension of realism versus romance, or fact versus fancy.”\(^{325}\)

---

323 L. Tyler Swanson, “Directed Landscapes.” Cosgrove has also written numerous times about landscape as theatre, as has Daniels.


reaffirmed, while the real-life experience of that literature is tempered by humour and disappointment. Montgomery shows us that when we encounter—or perform—metaphor in the landscape, we alter it in a way that makes it personal and revealing of that specific landscape.

_Tangible and Intangible Artifacts of Memory and Landscape_

Part of Montgomery’s preoccupation with memory involved a consciousness of time that allowed her to experience transcendentally spiritual and aesthetic moments that were anchored in space-time. Her ability to relive memories as though they were tangible artifacts of time and space could, conversely, create feelings of displacement in her present. Montgomery connected her powers of memory to her equally strong emotions: “One lives when one feels like that. Its illumination casts a glow over life backward and forward and transfigures drab days and darkened paths” while memories of her childhood were “something that is of eternity, not of time.”

Montgomery’s highly detailed memories were like transparent overlays at some moments, and in other moments like time machines, as she experienced memory-filled landscapes in their transformed guise. She used memories the same way she used her ‘trick of the eyes’ to make wallpaper patterns appear to float in front of her eyes. Memories, like wallpaper patterns, were superimposed at a distance from the real object, for purposes of finding solace, clarity, feeding creative activities, or simply for fun. Montgomery’s memories, accessed in this manner, were used in the same way tangible artifacts are used by observers who are engaged in an exercise of historical seeing, allowing them to access imagined memories.

Lowenthal says of artifacts, “Because artifacts are at once past and present, their historical and modern roles interact. … Landscapes commingling old with new reinforce feelings of temporal coexistence.”

Historical seeing inspired by extant landscape objects reminds us that certain circumstances of the past might still be part of our present. The result of Montgomery embedding her memories in landscape was often to fill her with the oppressive sensation that landscapes were haunted by the past, but they could also be a way to revive great joy and inspiration during difficult times. The frequent use of nostalgia and antimodernism in Montgomery’s fiction and journals are almost always connected to a specific moment of space-time memory, and were

326 Montgomery, _Selected Journals_, 4:80.
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used as narrative devices that added poignancy to Montgomery’s descriptions of landscape and place.

Of course, more traditionally tangible artifacts added to the “temporal coexistence” that marked Montgomery’s life in addition to her tangible-intangible use of memories. Her photography was the most obvious connection, particularly her use of photos to inspire daydreaming sessions. Family relics also served a purpose, but these relics, such as the jug that inspired the novel *A Tangled Web*, were interior objects. Montgomery gardened with plants that reminded her of Prince Edward Island, and on at least one occasion even had a memorable rock shipped from the Macneill Homestead to her new home in Toronto (the one that became a grave marker for Good Luck the cat). She even encouraged other people to make changes in the landscape that suited her memories and landscape tastes. As children, Keith and Anita Webb planted birch trees near the Green Gables house on the recommendation of Montgomery.\(^ {328}\) Today, visitors can still view the stone “dykes” at the Macneill Homestead and descendants of the apple orchard and the balsam poplars that grew near the house (in Cavendish, what Montgomery calls “dykes” were long piles of stones gathered while clearing the land that served as yard and field boundaries, similar to a stacked drystone wall). At Leaskdale, it is very easy to locate the corner of the yard where “Daffy” the cat was buried, see the holes in the porch posts where Montgomery’s husband’s hammock might have swung, and the old concrete walk from the road to the front door. The house at Green Gables Heritage Place is more problematic as a tangible artifact—since it is readily understood to be a “real” artifact of a fictional building—but it serves as an artifact nonetheless. Herrington argues that the ability to experience designed landscapes over seasons and years make them tangible in ways that books are not: “The duration of time that can be spent experiencing a garden makes available meaning through memory. This is a process that can lead to a garden having great significance…”\(^ {329}\) This observation is certainly true of Montgomery’s experience of her home landscapes, but it is also an argument for seriously considering the landscape design of Montgomery sites, especially tangible traces of her landscape aesthetic, in tandem with securing repeat visitors to these sites.

\(^{328}\) Alexandra Heilbron, *Remembering Lucy Maud Montgomery* (Toronto: The Dundurn Group, 2001), 41.

\(^{329}\) Herrington, “Gardens Can Mean,” 199.
Analysis of L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is made easier for the landscape architect, site manager, or scholar thanks to the author’s interest in and use of photography to document important scenes and memories. The public embrace of photography in the 19th century transformed how people remembered the past. From its earliest days, David Lowenthal argues, photographs were seen as the record of a disappearing world.330 Because photography froze moments in time, allowing people to “‘see’ the past,” it changed our relationship to memory and history, in some cases replacing it entirely.331 Elizabeth Epperly has argued that by considering Montgomery’s landscape descriptions with Montgomery’s photography, it is possible to build an idea of how Montgomery “perceives, recalls, and recreates ‘memory pictures’ layered with meanings” that shift and gain depth with repetition.332 Epperly, like Matt Dallos, refers to photographers who acknowledge the autobiographical aspects of their work. For Dallos, the autobiographical element is what raises a landscape image from a two-dimensional record of space into a meaningful expression of the full complexity of landscape, while for Epperly, memory is the strongest autobiographical element in the ‘writer-photographer’s’ choice to compose and capture a photo.333

As well as capturing the author’s visual imagination, and reminding her of time spent with family and close friends, Montgomery’s photographs also held meaning from childhood. When Montgomery pasted photos of Cavendish into her journals, more than once she annotated the photo with an “x” marking the present or former location of a favourite tree. The August 1905 photo of the wave-pierced rock bluff at Cape Leforce is a typical Montgomery composition, but it also reminded her of the time as a child she climbed through the newly-forming hole and became stuck (an event she later mines for a character in A Tangled Web).334

330 Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country, 257.
331 Ibid.
332 Epperly, Visual Imagination, 6.
Also Epperly, Visual Imagination, 62.
Photographs aided Montgomery, and continue to aid us today, in our perception that landscape is a palimpsest, a place where land use, cultural meaning, histories, and personal memories are laid over one another. Montgomery’s photography is not so much about capturing a single moment in time, but about the narrative of that moment. Waterston argues that rather than viewing Montgomery’s photography as the single image, we should view it as a single frame of a larger composition, part of a series of slightly altered images “so that the shapes and colours move and change in the reader’s inner eye…a narrative method resembling the “moving pictures” of cinematography.” The movement suggested by Montgomery’s photography is reflected in the movement of the characters through the landscape, the changing of the seasons, the descriptions that move back and forth between ‘wide-angle’ scenes and macro focus.

**Memory, Time, and Space**

Memory, time and nostalgia are inextricably linked in L. M. Montgomery’s landscapes of home. Memories occupy space but because they exist in the past, they cast a pall of loss and nostalgia over the space they once occupied, in perpetuity. Memory is tied so easily to place because spatial awareness and temporal awareness function very similarly, according to Kevin Lynch. At a surface level, we often use space to imply time, and time to imply space, for instance when we give distance as a measure of time. Space and time are thus used “to measure and symbolize each other.” Our ways of perceiving time and perceiving space share the same limitations. We focus on the things most immediately perceptible to us, group together similar or contrasting events or objects in order to make sense of them, and can focus on only a limited number of “stimuli” at a given time. As Johnston describes it, the awareness of landscape

[335] Elizabeth Waterston, *Kindling Spirit: L.M. Montgomery’s Anne of Green Gables* (Toronto: ECW Press, 1993), 55-6. Elizabeth Epperly, on the other hand, suggests that while narrative is implied in Montgomery’s photography, it is more about the use of photographs “to arouse and to sustain the feeling of suspended time (thus infinite time) through specific place.” (Epperly *Visual Imagination*, 61) While this is an apt observation, because of the performative and recreative aspects of Montgomery’s use of memory and photography, I consider both the narrative and “suspended time” interpretation to be equally relevant to her landscape aesthetic.


stimuli result in “the intense realisation of an everyday moment, a specific moment of time in an ongoing space.” These stimuli can be conscious or unconsciously selected. In the case of Montgomery, conscious, intentional seeing—a focus of the next chapter—made the author keenly aware of past and present time in a given space.

For L.M. Montgomery, memory, especially memories of childhood and home, was a way to re-experience the rapture and perfection of specific moments in time and space. Montgomery’s approach to memory, especially how she felt it could be applied to help understand a cohesive life narrative, appears to have been strongly influenced by her reading of the Romantics. David Lowenthal writes that society inherited from the Romantics a vision of “their childhood selves forming their adult reality, and hence to view life as an interconnected narrative… the relation of the sense of the past to personal memory became part of the mental equipment and expectations at least of the educated.” Though she rejected the theological predestination of her Presbyterian upbringing, Montgomery repeatedly mentioned in her journals her conviction that moments in her childhood foreshadowed the events of her adult life, and her sense that new trials she faced were always part of a long-established narrative destiny.

Montgomery’s daydreams often involved her “memory pictures”: “All her life she was able to overlay a current scene with an image of how it looked days or years before. She could hold the images simultaneously and could also sustain both nostalgia and the thrill of recall.” With her daily practices of memory recall, and her purposeful layering of the past over her present-day experiences, Montgomery practiced Lynch’s own suggestion of ‘borrowing’ time “to enlarge a present,” in the same way an architect would “…‘borrow’ a large exterior space to enlarge a small room,” or perhaps the same way a landscape architect would borrow a view to expand a garden. To be clear, Montgomery’s acts of daydreaming and remembrance were never just memory and time interacting, but memory, time, and space interacting. Space and place always figured in these “memory pictures.” Even when it was just projected, imagined space, the fact

339 Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country, 199.
341 Lynch, What Time is This Place?, 173.
that there was also a tangible version of that place (however altered), there was a dimension to the memories that made them a scene Montgomery could move through. Visitors to Montgomery’s landscapes today borrow “imagined memories,” as they consciously choose the landscape stimuli that will provide the best evidence of literary place and landscape narrative.

**Aesthetic Experience and Time in the Landscape**

Montgomery may have made a habit of living too much in the past, or of fusing past and future, or of living too much in fictional worlds, but she also cherished occasional moments of intense present-ness, so beautiful and otherworldly that the memory of it could cast a glow across a dreary day. Montgomery’s capacity for aesthetic response, which she gifted to her Emily character in the form of “The Flash,” highlights the importance of the aesthetic response available to everyone. The aesthetic response that Montgomery describes repeatedly in her journals and fiction is more commonly called a “peak experience,” as described by Abraham H. Maslow. Montgomery’s aesthetic responses also entailed what Maslow calls the “plateau” and “high plateau” experience. The plateau experience engages thinking processes to a greater degree than peak experiences, “which can be purely and exclusively emotional,” and can furthermore be willed into being, while the peak experience remains a spontaneous phenomenon. Where “the flash” or the peak experience is transcendent, exhilarating, and spiritual, the plateau experience “becomes a witnessing, an appreciating, what one might call a serene, cognitive blissfulness.”

In a 1937 article on aesthetics Hevner opens her discussion of aesthetic experience with a tentative definition of “any moment when an individual is moved to say or to feel, “How beautiful that is!” Aesthetic experience is a spontaneous awareness of beauty that borrows from all types of experience (“sensation, ideation, perception, emotion”) but stands out from
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these experiences by its unselfconscious uniting of mental, emotional, and physical response.\(^{346}\) The aesthetic experience cannot be sustained beyond the moment because we cannot consciously maintain the “intensely active state of mind and body” without either losing the balance between body and mind, or become too passive to be moved.\(^{347}\) Hevner and Maslow both agree that the aesthetic experience is fully embodied, and exists for its own sake; meaning may come after the moment has passed, but not while fully engaged. Hevner’s concept of aesthetics also acknowledges the role of memory in the aesthetic experience; “Even the review of past successes, the repetition and rehearsal of the old discoveries often affords keen satisfaction. So long as the last least bit of it can catch our wayward attention we shall still find the object beautiful and take from it an aesthetic pleasure.”\(^{348}\) Montgomery made frequent use of her memories of peak experience to inspire and comfort her.

When we are engaged in “aesthetic apprehension,” as Donald Worster describes it, we “look beyond the level of isolated details and perceive their underlying cohesion.”\(^{349}\) Our attention is directed so that personal considerations fall away, but we cannot look too hard or else we are likely to pull ourselves out of the experience. Aesthetic experiences give the impression of a moment out of the ordinary flow of time. Johnston writes that “The acuity of perception” in Montgomery’s nature descriptions “works to slow down the linearity of narration into a type of loving close-up,” but we might also claim the same effect for the person in the middle of a peak experience.\(^{350}\) Irene Gammel says that Anne’s physically responsive and transcendent experience of nature, exemplified by her rapture over the White Way of Delight, is an immersion in non-linear time, “the continuous flow of time as perceived through the body and lived space.”\(^{351}\) These experiences of nature, where time, memory, and physical experience merge, are

\(^{346}\) Ibid., 246, 247, and 248 respectively.

\(^{347}\) Ibid., 248.

\(^{348}\) Ibid., 253.


\(^{350}\) Johnston, “Landscape as palimpsest,” 19.

a key aspect of Montgomery’s way of being in the landscape, and according to Gammel, are essential moments in “embodied consciousness.” Montgomery claimed these sorts of experiences not just for her characters, but herself as well. A simple walk among her favourite hill of pines in Norval Ontario, for instance, was “an exquisite space that was only half an hour by the clock but which seemed a sort of lifetime by some other computation.” And yet, despite the present-ness of these experiences, the aesthetic is also a gateway to memory. On a trip home to Prince Edward Island in 1918, Montgomery’s wrote about the view from the “Watch Tower,” the highest dune along the Cavendish shore:

…The view from it is, I believe, the most beautiful and satisfying—at least to me—that I have ever beheld. I gazed at it, not only with physical eyes, seeing material beauty, but with the eyes of memory which saw all that in the past had filled it with charm for me. I could see from it almost everything in Cavendish that I ever loved…

Finally, aesthetic apprehension of the non-transcendent version is marked by keen observation of both space and time. Montgomery was a keen observer of the subtle and obvious markers of time, as likely to make note of a short-lived moment of green sky at the end of a sunset as she was to note (sometimes with dread) the continuing progress of the seasons. Montgomery’s practices of nature observation, gardening, and journal-keeping meant that she kept careful track of time markers and could compare moments that occurred years apart. Montgomery was never one of the those authors who obliviously write in flowers blooming out of season or out of order, and some of the bloom times that might seem odd to readers from the Eastern Seaboard or even Ontario, such as daffodils blooming in late May, are perfectly consistent with PEI’s cool, late springs.

*Time and Designed Landscapes*

While time is an essential component of the aesthetic experience, it also sets real-world literary landscapes apart from their fictional counterparts. While Johnston may argue that
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“literary landscape is not only spatial; it is temporal,”\textsuperscript{355} the real-world landscape is measurable in ways that time within a novel is not. The fictional landscape is a recording of time, not the thing itself. Or, as Lynch describes it, “internal time is the time celebrated in literature, which opposes itself to the logical notion of abstract time.”\textsuperscript{356} On the other hand, “gardens and designed landscapes are literally the time and the changes they express. Because of their living materials and their dependence on and exposure to climate they are in and of themselves markers and makers of time.”\textsuperscript{357} However, narrative also expresses both time/change and through its organization of characters, relationships, patterns of meaning, it does have the ability to affect our perception of space in the real world.\textsuperscript{358} As physical spaces acted upon by time, literary landscapes make the spatial and temporal aspects of narrative more tangible, but at the same time reveal the more disordered, uncontrollable aspects of the real world in comparison to the patterns revealed in fiction.

Landscape reveals and changes with the passage of time, and even causes us to experience and perceive time in different ways. For instance, designed landscapes “transcend the distinction that is often made between objective and subjective time” by being simultaneously at the mercy of objective time—weather, seasons, physical decay—and at the same time places that can organize or bend our own impression of time.\textsuperscript{359} Among those impressions are how we may perceive time as “divided, or measured time” or as a “seamless continuum” of “flow and development.”\textsuperscript{360} Since landscapes reveal the passage of time, a logical corollary is that our experience of time can be purposely integrated into designed landscapes. The landscape architect or site designer works with these different types of time, considering both past, present (including the user’s experience of time), and future of the landscape, both metaphorically—the impression of the site, the meaning of the design, cultural and historic artifacts—and practically—the geology, flora, and materials used. Even the transformation of a landscape’s use
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challenges our idea of time and can alter or confirm—erroneously—our impression of the past. In “Plotting Time in Landscape Architecture,” Duempelmann and Herrington describe former industrial sites where “landscapes of labor based upon public (work) time” have been transformed “into landscapes of recreation, i.e. landscapes of private time,” sometimes at the price of the feeding nostalgic antimodernism rather than “critical engagement” with the site’s history.361 Tourism landscapes, in particular rural agricultural landscapes, transform the labour (time) of local inhabitants into the leisure time of tourists.362

Understanding the relationship between time and the landscape can be the starting point for designing from a narrative landscape approach. “As creators of space,” landscape architects “anticipate the perception of their designs, and the movement through them. In short, designing means to envision the future and the ‘afterlife of gardens’ and designed landscapes.”363 Potteiger and Purinton borrow categories of visual narrative and propose they can be applied to understanding and designing landscape narratives. The “single point in time,” “linear narrative” (sequentially linked events), and “continuous narrative”—which Potteiger and Purinton argue is most relevant to how we already experience landscape—where events all take place within one space, unordered, but still with some organizing principles of hierarchy, depth, distance, and so on.364 Potteiger and Purinton say that not only are these narrative understandings of landscape, but they have temporal dimensions as well. These landscape narratives are composed of landscape elements that themselves represent temporal events—old buildings, evidence of past weather events, the growth and decay of plants and trees, even down to the “deep time” indicated by geological features.

Duempelmann and Herrington state that landscape architects have always designed with time, in a number of ways. Landscape architects employ two ideas of time simultaneously (linear and cyclical), and also use time metaphorically, with the landscape and its elements as

361 *Ibid.*, 7
362 In a similar fashion, Montgomery’s fictional landscapes turned agricultural landscapes dominated in reality by men’s ownership and labour into landscapes of self discovery and dreaming, occupied by heroines who had no legal rights to the land, sometimes not even any family attachments.
“metaphors or symbols of time,” and use “their knowledge of time and process to create space in the first place…” “Designing for both, change and continuity, for seasonal and life cycles requires an understanding of landscapes as time.” Kevin Lynch suggests an approach to designing for time in his work, *What Time is this Place?*

By temporal collage, we visibly accumulate the rich traces of past time. By episodic design, we can create contrasting states that resound against our personal memories and expectations and help us organize time into discontinuous, recurrent patterns. By the direct display of environmental change, we dramatize continuous modifications in the present, and by exploiting the observer’s motion we gain the same effects even in an unchanging environment.

Literary landscapes that reveal changes—whether they be changes of season, time of day, land use or cultural transformation—are landscapes that will more easily engage the literary visitor, first in their embodied, aesthetic experience of the site, second in their ability to project the imagined memories of the author or character, and finally in their ability to derive existential meaning from their visit. Lynch values the concept of time over the concept of heritage for heritage’s sake, arguing that “a sense of the stream of time is more valuable and more poignant and engaging than a formal knowledge of remote periods.”

Negotiating between perceptions of the past, present, and imagined landscapes is a common concern at literary landscapes, and the landscape architectural theory regarding designing with time could be useful. Consider, for instance, a hypothetical writer’s house that sits adjacent to a gas station or fast food outlet. The contrast in time periods—what Kevin Lynch calls “temporal collage,” though an unintentional one—already reveals to the visitor that there is a story that would explain the changes that have taken place in order for this juxtaposition to come about; if they are at all sentimental or motivated by antimodernism, they will probably tell the story to themselves as they view it. The landscape architect could recommend erecting a high fence to screen as much of this gas station or restaurant as possible, but it would be ineffective and cut the site off from the surrounding geography. The landscape architect could do nothing,
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knowing that literary pilgrims will make of it what they will and the intrusion on their experience will merely confirm the integrity of the novel’s landscape to them. Or, the landscape architect could recommend a hedge of roses (or another plant significant to this hypothetical author) planted on one side of the fence, where their beauty and scent and meaning (roses—romance—heirloom—care) will intentionally highlight the contrast, allowing the visitor to ‘read’ the story of change more clearly, and perhaps inject a wry note of irony into this visible example of change over time in the landscape.

**Metaphor**

Seeing metaphorically is very much part of the “real and imagined” way of seeing that is a feature of literary landscape experience. “Metaphor offers a continuing dialogue between two different states,” Epperly observes: “what is present before the eye and what is suggested beyond it.”

Laurie Olin, landscape architect, provides a real-world correlative to the landscape metaphor found in fiction. For Olin, “If works of design can be considered to refer to things that are not present and can do so while establishing a particular mood or feeling, then those devices that are used to suggest, persuade, or lead an audience to the desired conclusion are what has been called rhetoric.” The listener/visitor ‘answers’ the rhetorical question with the obvious (intended) response (or meaning). From this we might presume that perceiving metaphor in the landscape is merely an elaboration of the ways humans already experience landscape.

Metaphor is one of the most important ways that Montgomery communicates her landscape aesthetic to readers. Metaphor is not merely a literary device but a way of seeing. Consider how landscape works at both a literal and metaphorical level, as Anne contemplates the ‘bend in the road’ at the end of the first *Anne* book. This is an example of how a Montgomery character’s “literal locale gives way to a more honestly realized metaphorical place.” The reader is able to understand the description of “checkered light and shadows… new landscapes… curves and hills and valleys further on” both literally and metaphorically, as a depiction of both
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368 Epperly, *Visual Imagination*, 178. This dialogue between what we can know and what might be beyond it also describes the landscape preference category of “mystery,” one of the subjects of the next chapter.
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place and narrative. 371 Joy Alexander observes: “with place so heavily imprinted in Montgomery’s imagination, it is not surprising that geography easily merges into metaphor: “where the brook and river meet,” “the bend in the road,” life as a path,” 372 while Fiamengo says that Montgomery has a “tendency to find natural correlatives for human emotions,” for example, the substitution of “sunshine” for “happiness.” 373 There is a mutability to the metaphors that Montgomery constructs out of objects in the landscape. Wild cherry trees are marble halls, but then a few minutes later they evoke brides and veils. 374 The metaphors also express the value Montgomery places on nature, and how she conceives of our ideal relationship to nature. “Woods become temples; homes become sacred spaces; the vernacular connecting the architecture of images indoors and outdoors turns the glimpses of beauty into spiritual and inspirational moments.” 375 Nature is not cheap, coarse, or common. Our relationship to it is not as consumers but as congregants. There are also levels of meaning in these metaphors. If trees are cathedrals, this is not only a comment on similarities of form and atmosphere, but the cathedral itself is also a metaphor for the idea that Nature is the home of the divine.

Although this thesis takes a more ambivalent position towards landscape metaphor, it is important to acknowledge how the literal/metaphorical aspects of landscape can contribute both to a greater understanding or a simplifying and erasing of the more problematic aspects of our past. For instance, Lefebvre cautions against a literal reading of Avonlea, even one motivated by nostalgia and antimodern sentiment, in favour of an allegorical-metaphorical reading. While allegorical readings of Montgomery’s literary world might idealize values and narratives, literal readings, ones that assume Avonlea is based on a real time and place, would ‘implicitly’ idealize “the longing for a white settler community with explicit values of racial purity and xenophobia,
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one that avoids racial, economic, religious, linguistic, and sexual diversities.” It could therefore be argued that a too-literal take on Montgomery’s literary landscapes, one that attempts to make the imagined more real, would in fact reinforce the ethnic and class divisions of the 19th century in the 21st century, presented, furthermore, as a harmless bit of nostalgic fun. This caution could be extended to encompass almost any literary landscape whose design and interpretation too literally (metaphorically) expresses a novel that idealizes or hides the inequalities contemporary to its writing. Landscape architects should not be cautious about literal expressions of fictional landscapes because of the quality of the design, but because of the potential to communicate social and cultural values in the landscape without any sort of critical engagement with those values.

**TWO LANDSCAPE NARRATIVES**

*Childhood at Home in Nature*

There are different theories about how children form landscape preferences, including biological-evolutionary and cultural theories. Adevi and Grahn argue that the best way to describe landscape preferences developed in childhood is “nature attachment.” Nature attachment is a combination of “innate reflexes that respond to certain elements of the natural environment” (typically, bio-evolutionary preferences) as well as “bonds to place.” Place attachment is primarily attributed to aspects such as culture, social, and emotional and memory associations, and so on. Children’s landscape preferences are shaped early on, and they are “multi-sensory, emotional and cognitive” attachments to specific places and landscape elements.
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that will persist throughout their lives.\textsuperscript{379} Nature attachment is integrated into our sense of self and sense of home, and this “ecological self” can facilitate a more general understanding of our “existential self.”\textsuperscript{380} Attachment to landscape types and landscape elements formed early in childhood become a part of our identity throughout our life, influencing where we choose to live (or at the very least, prefer to live) and even having an impact on our very sense of identity and fulfillment.

Lucy Maud Montgomery is a perfect example of the strength of childhood impressions of landscape, and the effect these impressions can have on our psyche. For Montgomery, the ability to run practically free from April to December alongside the local children and the children of family who were visiting for the summer had a stabilizing, healthy effect on the sensitive, reactive, and occasionally anxious child that she was.\textsuperscript{381} From very early on, being outside in nature had a restorative effect on her spirits and her health, as adults around her anticipated her health would be fragile like her mother’s. Though Montgomery had a strong emotional attachment to her environment, her ability to influence that landscape—particularly to preserve her favourite trees and paths—was limited. Storytelling and memories made the landscape hers in a way that adults could not destroy: “The impulse to shape narratives about herself and her environment provided enormous comfort to this sensitive and needy child. It gave her a sense of having some control over her own environment and destiny.”\textsuperscript{382}

Children transform their environment both physically and imaginatively. Idlewild is the name given to a wood owned by a neighbour where Anne and Diana stake a claim in \textit{Anne of Green Gables}. Montgomery probably found inspiration for Idlewild in her childhood haunts, particularly her “playhouse,” (Figure 9) and the perhaps also the “school woods.” (Figure 10) This is an “in-between space” literally, as it separates the Cuthbert and Barry farm but is owned by neither family, and figuratively, as it becomes a “liminal or threshold space” when it becomes invested with the imaginings of the child Anne and Diana, and also for its role as a place where
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they can transition from childhood into adolescence. The imagining that takes place in Idlewild makes it a “subversive space,” because it is a place where the girls are at liberty to cultivate a female friendship free from the influences of the world at large, and where they can imagine alternate, more independent futures than society would have them embrace. The destruction of the wood by its owner further emphasizes the fragile, ephemeral nature of the childhood landscape, since it cannot be protected from adult intrusion. A similar example is found in Emily of New Moon, where “Lofty John’s Bush,” a stand of trees where Emily and her friends play, is destined to come under the axe in retaliation for a scolding given to Lofty John.

Figure 9 View of old playhouse, ca. 1890s, Cavendish PEI. Montgomery’s description in her journals of playing in this group of trees resembles the childhood play described in Anne of Green Gables and Emily of New Moon. L.M. Montgomery Photo Collection, XZ1 MS A097005.

384 Ibid.
by Emily’s incensed Aunt Elizabeth. Emily, unlike Anne, is able to save the Bush from destruction by appealing to a higher power (literally and figuratively—Presbyterian Emily charms Lofty John’s Catholic priest, and Lofty John relents as a consequence of her actions). Years later, with earnings from her writing, Emily is even able to purchase Lofty John’s Bush, making its salvation more permanent.

![Glade in school woods, ca. 1890s, Cavendish PEI. Montgomery writes in her journal about playing in the school woods, and bemoans the travesty of its destruction, which she witnesses on a trip back to PEI. L.M. Montgomery Photo Collection, XZ1 MS A097005.](image)

Though the trend in children’s literature is to represent a growing awareness of time and linearity as indicative of a young protagonist’s development, the timeless character of childrens’ experience of nature also features in Montgomery’s writing. *Anne of Green Gables* starts “with the converse movement of Anne finding herself in mythic space. Anne leaves the train and enters a world benignly governed by space, place, and nature.”\(^{385}\) The linearity of the novel appears in
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Anne’s character progression, and the awareness of time is made explicit through constant reference to season and time of day, but nature and Prince Edward Island themselves are cyclical representations of this mythic space.

Considering Montgomery’s landscapes draw so heavily on childhood memories of beauty and play, there are not many—if any—landscape features that appear to be designed to capture the imagination of the child visitor at Montgomery sites. In 1994, Shelagh Squire observed that literary tourism was “a fundamentally adult concept.” 386 Despite the fact that Beatrix Potter’s books are strongly associated with childhood, for instance, the literary and tourism landscape associated with Potter at the time of Squire’s study had very little ‘there’ for children to connect with. The connection of Beatrix Potter with childhood was actually more related to the nostalgia that adults attached to childhood rather than how children actually experienced it in the landscape. 387 Lowenthal describes this adult version of childhood thusly: “Most of us know the past was not really like that. Life back then seems brighter not because things were better but because we lived more vividly when young; even the adult world of yesteryear reflects the perspective of childhood. Now unable to experience so intensely, we mourn a lost immediacy that makes the past unmatchable.” 388

The Narrative of Loss in the Landscape

Where “place” was comfort and inspiration, as Montgomery aged, place had an increasingly unsettled relationship with time: “Whereas specificity of ‘place’, Prince Edward Island, is for Montgomery an enabling dynamic - an immanence (deeply within) and a transcendence (profoundly without) - the passing of ‘time’ becomes an increasing constraint. This is why the special moment is to be treasured.” 389 People who feel dispossessed from time and space can develop adverse reactions to time that cause them to “withdraw into the narrow present,” to retreat into memory and daydreams, or to obsesses about past and future as a
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reaction to their loss.\footnote{Lynch, \textit{What Time is This Place?}, 132-3.} For Montgomery, time brought changes to place that fed her life’s narrative of loss and her commitment to memory, where landscapes need not change. Consider Montgomery’s discovery that the schoolhouse woods had been cut down:

> On the evening I arrived in Cavendish I got a blow in the face. All the old “school woods” had been cut down. That once wide green beautiful hill of plummy spruce and fir was now an abomination of desolation of stumps. The schoolhouse sat on its crest wantonly, indecently naked. The whole sight was obscene. If I had had the power I would have spitted the author of the outrage on a bayonet without fear and without remorse. He had the soul of a Hun.

> Seriously, it hurt me horribly. A thousand pitiful little ghosts were robbed of their haunt by the felling of those trees. Scores of tender memories were outraged and banished. Why, my first sweetheart had said “I love you” to me under those trees. And now such a desecration!\footnote{Montgomery to MacMillan, February 26, 1919, Bolger, 88.}

These changes were constant reminders that men did not always live in balance with nature. The gendered pronoun is particularly important here, because it is difficult to find anywhere in Montgomery’s fiction or journals an occasion where a woman cuts down a tree. Women may maintain fussy, well-ordered gardens, like Rachel Lynde or even Marilla’s impeccably clean yard, but women also create incredibly harmonious garden-nature spaces. Men, on the other hand, are almost always the hand of destruction, wielding the axe to fell purpose.

There is an element of “do no harm” in Montgomery’s approach to nature that contributes to the argument that there are the seeds of an ecological aesthetic in Montgomery’s landscapes. Take, for instance “John Foster” in \textit{The Blue Castle} and his breathless comment not to disturb the sacredness of wildflowers, or Emily’s determination to save Lofty John’s Bush from destruction in \textit{Emily of New Moon}. In her own life, Montgomery’s helplessness at being able to do anything about what she perceived as wanton destruction required a slightly more philosophical approach. When her hostile Uncle John started cutting down trees on the old homestead site, Montgomery had to take comfort that at least they continued on in memory. Of her favourite birch tree, Montgomery wrote: “It went to my heart that “The Lady” should be cut down. And yet I think I would rather that than know it was here after I had gone, neglected and
unloved, growing old and ragged and unshapely. In my memory it will live as long as I do,
young and fair and maiden like….”

**SUMMARY**

This chapter used two of the most prominent themes in L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, home and memory, as the starting point for a discussion of thematic and narrative approaches to literary landscapes. Both home and memory are essential aspects of nostalgia and antimodernism, which are themselves motivating elements of modern tourism. Montgomery’s conceptions of home and memory both had spatial dimension, which were communicated through her fiction and journals, and inspire many of the pilgrimages made to Montgomery sites. This chapter describes the connections between Montgomery and her landscape themes to today’s tourists with their motivations and expectations of nostalgia and authenticity. These themes and connections are often expressed most explicitly at writer’s houses. The underlying argument of this chapter is that contextual and analytical approaches to an author’s landscape aesthetic—thematic and narrative approaches that consider themes and stories within their spatial and temporal settings—adds value to the literary landscape.

The introduction to narrative approaches provided in this thesis was primarily provided to show that such approaches do exist, and to encourage further research that would explore how these approaches might work for literary landscapes. It introduced two concepts of narrative landscapes, one, as a design process, and two, as a source of landscape meaning. Ultimately, however, this chapter argued that the more important aspect of narrative landscape is its essentially experiential nature. That is to say, neither narrative process or narrative meaning can exist without considering the experiential aspect of landscape before considering form, visual affect, and so on.

The third section of this chapter explored memory and narrative specifically from the perspective of L.M. Montgomery’s writing, photos, and lived landscapes. The purpose of this section was, once again, to draw connections, this time between the experiential nature of narrative landscape, and Montgomery’s own experiences of story, memory, and time, and their landscape dimensions. It ended with two examples of Montgomery’s landscape narratives, which
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demonstrated how these thematic/narrative approaches could be turned to the analysis and design of literary landscapes. For instance, the “childhood at home in nature” narrative showed that, considering how influential time spent in nature can be to a child’s development, literary landscapes fail to capitalize on these narratives, and seldom provide landscape experience that is truly engaging for children. The “loss in the landscape” narrative hinted at the development of Montgomery’s ecological consciousness, which could be used as a theme that would provide overarching context and meaning to certain Montgomery sites, for instance the trail system of Green Gables Heritage Place.
In a 1913 letter to her Scottish penpal George Boyd MacMillan, Lucy Maud Montgomery attempted to locate the source of her own aesthetic response to the Prince Edward Island landscape, a response that she always felt more intensely on the island than anywhere else she lived or visited:

We had such beautiful drives over the Island roads. There are no such roads in Ontario. We have beautiful roads here—and beautiful landscapes. But they want the indefinable charm that haunts—and is the very soul—of the P.E.I. roads and scenes. I have often tried to define the difference but I can never think I have succeeded. It is too elusive—too subtle. Is it the touch of austerity in the Island landscapes that gives it its distinctive beauty? And whence comes this austerity? Is it from the fir and spruce? Or the glimpses of the sea? Or does it go deeper, to the very soil of the land? For lands have personalities, as have human beings.\(^{393}\)

Montgomery never did decide on a final answer, but then, she did not have to, because the true pleasure in Prince Edward Island’s landscape was in experiencing it in person or in memory. Prince Edward Island dominates Montgomery’s ideal landscapes; most of her observations about a landscape that is not in PEI are often implicitly, if not explicitly, made in comparison with the Island. If Montgomery had difficulty defining her preference for the landscapes of Prince Edward Island, she compensated by devoting a striking amount of words describing both the place-specific and more generically natural charms of her Island ideal. This chapter argues that L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic can be described in this way: Aesthetic experiences in the landscape feed creativity and improve physical and mental wellbeing, and intimate, purposeful immersion in everyday landscapes cultivates environmental awareness and prepares people for transformative, embodied aesthetic experiences that exist for their own sake as well as the benefits just mentioned. The ability to recognize visual forms and cultural metaphors in our everyday landscapes, and then to describe them, heightens our powers of observation and

\(^{393}\) Montgomery to MacMillan, September 13, 1913, Bolger 68-69.
consequently strengthens our potential for aesthetic reaction to nature and landscape. As a practice of landscape architecture, this chapter suggests ways to conceive of the author’s landscape aesthetic and related landscape architectural theory and practice. The goal is to show where we can find harmonization between fiction and the writer’s aesthetic and landscape architectural theory and practice. Continuing on with the thematic approach of the previous chapter, in this chapter we examine the various landscape themes of Montgomery that are likely to be familiar with literary pilgrim visitors, and which also have the potential for more literal application in the landscape of L.M. Montgomery sites. Whereas the themes dealt with in the previous chapter had much to do with visitor expectations and the cultural attitudes that shape landscape experience, the themes in this chapter tend to have more readily applicable landscape applications, or be more specifically applicable to L.M. Montgomery’s literary landscape sites.

**THE EXPERIENCE OF THE LANDSCAPE AESTHETIC**

Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic rests in the space between aesthetic experience as a physical, unbidden phenomenon, and aesthetic experience as mediated by formal systems of knowledge such as philosophy or art. In the article “The Shared Landscape: what does aesthetics have to do with ecology?” Gobster, Nassauer, Daniel and Fry admit that they, as well as the larger field of landscape ecology and landscape aesthetics, continue to study a subject that has no widely accepted definition of aesthetic experience. It would be beneficial to have a general consensus on the definition of landscape aesthetics. However, we can at least draw from the ongoing dialogue of landscape aesthetics an important consideration for analyzing an author’s landscape aesthetics, which is, the likelihood that both formal and embodied versions of aesthetics had an effect on the author’s entire landscape aesthetic. While we cannot recapture the actual embodied aesthetic experience of the author, through analyzing and perhaps designing/managing literary landscapes to reflect those more formal aesthetic expressions, we increase the possibility that visitors might be able to experience similar aesthetic moments for themselves. Consequently, this chapter adopts Catherine Dee’s definition of aesthetics discussed in Chapter One, which considers aesthetic judgment (e.g. formalized aesthetics and pleasant landscape experiences) and aesthetic experience (e.g. embodied aesthetics, spontaneous and spiritual) as two parts of a whole. Montgomery’s own aesthetic reflects this interpretation, a
combination of culturally inherited formal values, personal meanings, and embodied peak experiences. Montgomery herself keenly felt that both types of aesthetic experience were valid and useful, and often followed on the heels of one another. Montgomery’s writing, photography, gardening, travel and physical exercise (she was a keen walker) are pertinent to building an understanding of her landscape aesthetic. They make it possible to describe her landscape preferences, the plants that she favoured, the literary and artistic sources that inspired her, the meaning that she found in the landscape—in short, to describe an entire aesthetic of L.M. Montgomery. This sort of approach assumes that aesthetic experience can occur along a spectrum, and that landscape experience does not have to reach the threshold of “peak” or “flow” experience in order for it to be legitimately “aesthetic,” neither must it be a purely biological/evolutionary physical response to the correct landscape stimulus, but can have cognitive as well as affective constituents.

Rosemary Ross Johnston describes Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic as “not only the way the condition of land is seen and perceived, and the philosophical lens through which this is portrayed; it may also, in a sort of mirroring and replicating, become a reflection of the interiority of the perceiver.” The “interiority of the perceiver” is insight into the author’s life and mind that is typically sought by literary tourists in the author’s house, but for Montgomery, can just as easily be sought in the landscape. Indeed, Montgomery’s landscapes are so easily internalized by her readers—perhaps because she speaks to a universal landscape aesthetic—that knowledge of what Montgomery perceived in the landscape back then can in fact be just as important as what viewers make of the landscape today. The source of Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, whether it be geography, ecology, philosophy, literature, or embodied aesthetic experiences, remains relevant to the cognitive and affective responses of visitors to her literary landscapes.

Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is a web of interconnected themes. It is possible to break up her aesthetic into three main categories: the formal aspect, the embodied or phenomenological aspect, and the ecological aspect. It is also possible to identify key ‘umbrella’ themes or values under which the other values interact. Figure 8, shown in the previous chapter, organized Montgomery’s aesthetic based on their thematic content. Alternately Figure 11

represents Montgomery’s aesthetic in terms of type of aesthetic experience, which will be expanded upon over the course of this chapter. The high degree of interconnectivity and overlap makes it extremely difficult to discuss these themes separately or hierarchically as an organizing principle for this chapter. An attempt has been made to prioritize Montgomery’s landscape values and choose the ones to be discussed based on their importance to the author, their relevance to visitor experience, and their potential to inform the landscape design process of the author’s literary landscapes. While the previous chapter focused more on generalities and similarities between Montgomery and literary visitors, this chapter deals with Montgomery’s landscapes with a narrower focus, though it does not go so far as to develop design guidelines.

Figure 3 Pyramid of L.M. Montgomery’s aesthetic experience
The primary goal of this chapter is to show that it is possible to research and define an author’s landscape aesthetic, and as a result, the meaningful essence of their literary landscapes, in a way that is compatible with the theory and design practices of landscape architecture. The chapter begins with the premise that Lucy Maud Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic starts with the practice of conscious seeing. One of the enduring reasons people continue to read and cherish Lucy Maud Montgomery’s books is because of the appeal of conscious seeing, which involves intentional engagement with nature, “as opposed to passive looking and the habit of reading metaphorically.” Conscious seeing is embedded in Montgomery’s work, her very own ‘way of seeing’ through which she perceived beauty, meaning, and her own individual place in the environment. When it is as clearly communicated as Montgomery’s, the author’s way of seeing can profoundly influence the way visitors experience literary landscapes, making it an important consideration for the design, interpretation, and management of literary sites. Conscious seeing includes Montgomery’s perception of beauty, especially in the everyday world, and relates to how knowledge can influence our affective response to nature, an ongoing conversation within the field of landscape architecture. The “portability” of Montgomery’s landscapes is also relevant to Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, especially in the ways it makes visiting her literary sites both completely unnecessary, and yet with the potential to be highly rewarding for the literary pilgrim. Part of Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic was based in the belief that conscious seeing could mediate our experience of the beauty of the everyday landscape; this is also covered in this chapter. Finally, as a storyteller, Montgomery experienced the landscape not only as a purely aesthetic or environmental phenomenon but as the setting for her own life narrative, and the narratives of her characters. To this end, specific settings, landscape elements, visual motifs, colours, and even flora took on metaphoric and emotional meaning both in her memory and in her fiction. These very specific landscape representations are arguably the ones most sought after by visitors to Montgomery’s literary landscapes, who anticipate that the sight of these very specific places and elements of Montgomery’s writing will in turn enable them to have the landscape experiences described by Montgomery and experienced by the author herself. Some of these specific landscape elements (both real and metaphorical) are the focus of the final section of this chapter.

395 Epperly, Through Lover’s Lane, 9.
ATTRIBUTES OF THE LANDSCAPE AESTHETIC

It is one thing to say Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is comprised of various landscape values, but what are the extents and expressions of these values? Research on landscape preference is highly relevant to Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, because it helps position Montgomery’s aesthetic in terms of universal landscape preference, easily understood across many cultures, and specific landscape attributes, influenced by Montgomery’s childhood on Prince Edward Island and her personal aesthetic experiences. Chenoweth and Gobster identify five “landscape preference attributes” that are useful for considering the specific characteristics of Montgomery’s landscapes:396

1. Physical landscape attributes “such as vegetation and topography”,
2. Formal or artistic attributes “such as line, form, colour, and texture”, and
3. Psychological attributes “such as mystery and legibility.”

To these three categories Chenoweth and Gobster acknowledge potential additions from cultural geography, and although the authors do not consider them relevant to their research, they are particularly relevant to L.M. Montgomery’s aesthetic:

4. Landscape symbolism and
5. Past associations

Because Chenoweth and Gobster’s list is about landscape attributes, it does not encompass the experiential aesthetic of landscape. As well as the attributes above, Montgomery’s landscape encompassed embodied aesthetic experiences. The embodied aesthetic encompasses the full sensory experience of a landscape, not just its visual attributes, and though it has a psychological effect, it is a psychological effect prompted first and foremost through the physical experience of place.

Conscious seeing, as the term indicates, is a deliberate practice, but for Montgomery it was far from tedious. When her emotional state and daily schedule permitted it, Montgomery would schedule time in her day to engage in minutes, sometimes hours, of daydream. Sometimes this involved walks in nature; if the weather was very inclement, and following her move to Ontario, she more often walked in nature solely through powers of memory. Photographs, her favourite views from certain windows, or powerful image metaphors would be the starting point for these daydreams.397 When Montgomery was observing nature or recalling memories of specific places (generally natural landscapes or gardens), she used visual motifs as guideposts to deeper layers of beauty, landscape experience, and meaning. These motifs – arches, keyholes, and bends in the road – were identified and enjoyed by Montgomery in her lived landscape, and were incorporated into her narrative structure (for instance, the final chapter of Anne of Green Gables is titled “The Bend in the Road”).398 Montgomery’s conscious seeing involved “escaping daily burdens to pursue what she thought of as gateways to enchantment.”399 The key to opening a gateway to enchantment was a practice of pleasurable daydreaming where Montgomery purposely sought out beauty in her surroundings, that inspired other creative and memorial associations.

Conscious seeing, of course, is not the sole purview of L.M. Montgomery. While Montgomery’s idea of conscious seeing was inspired by her reading of writers—such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Nathaniel Hawthorne, John Ruskin, and her favourite Romantic poets such as Wordsworth—and an innate sensitivity to nature and beauty, many other writers, philosophers, landscape designers, psychologists, and so on, have engaged with the human perception of landscape. One of the most pertinent aspects of Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic to this thesis, or indeed the aesthetic of any author to their audience, is how the author’s aesthetic contributes to the reader or designer’s own aesthetic sensitivity. While the most physically engaged aesthetic experiences cannot be forced, it is possible to ‘practice’ having them enough—to develop an
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aesthetic ‘instrument’—that makes slipping into aesthetic experiences easier: “In art even more than in science the novice must have an instrument which enlarges all his powers of observation and understanding. This instrument is his developed habits of perception and without these habits the beauties of the objective world can make no impression upon him.” Hevner suggests that we can employ deliberate exercises meant to train an observer to appreciate aesthetic objects better. The exercises may be tedious, but they help to make the observer so familiar with the form of art (or in this case nature), that appreciation of art/nature become instinctual, making the observer open to the full range of sensations associated with the aesthetic experience. These exercise of conscious seeing are aimed at

…the building up of habits of observation, the awakening of the senses and the training of the perception so that the apprehension of the details will be ready and nimble. For if the skill in perception is slow and awkward, if the mere task of comprehending the form demands all the attention, there will be no time or energy left for the enjoyment of it.

Training up our skills of aesthetic judgement, in other words, makes it more likely for us to have an aesthetic (peak) response to landscape or art, since the cognitive exercises of pattern recognition have become second nature to us. Hevner was a psychiatrist; Susan Herrington, a landscape architect, borrows the term “design seeing” from philosopher Dominic Lopes to describe how we learn how to see something as more than its surface image: “cultivating this regard is precisely the way we guide students of landscape architecture to read landscapes.”

There is a cycle of reinforcement between cultivating our historical, cultural, and design knowledge of landscape and the act of conscious seeing becoming a habit, rather than a practice. As Herrington sums up, “by strengthening our abilities to read landscapes it makes us pay closer attention.”

Like Herrington, Matt Dallos also offers a landscape architectural understanding of conscious seeing. He identifies three categories of ‘looking’—geography, autobiography, and metaphor—that combine to help us reconcile the objectively physical and the projected
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cultural/imagined nature of landscape. We ‘look’ at landscape all the time, but when we can perceive in a landscape (designed or natural) these three categories, then we are truly ‘seeing’ landscape. Dallos describes his experience of landscape seeing in terms of his observation of a mountain:

When I look at that mountain and see the complex interplay of the three categories—the form of the mountain and the process of its formation, my personal experiences on and within sight of that mountain, the metaphors that are evoked from the sight of a mountain—I’m beginning to see a complexity of space and time that remains bound to truth in form; the landscape is activated, even animated, in my mind, accruing layers that provide fodder for continued exploration. This complexity, I believe, is what defines the act of seeing.

The ‘way of seeing’ described by Dallos can be seen as yet another synonym to describe the aesthetic experience of landscape. In some ways, the three categories provided serve a similar purpose to the landscape preference attributes described above. However, rather than helping us analyze the landscape itself, they help us analyze our own response to the landscape. For instance, the intentional works of design that “activate” conscious seeing and prompts us to ‘see’ rather than ‘look’, originate with artists, writers, and designers of landscapes. In addition, the terms Dallos uses to describe this eye-and-mind-opening interaction is reminiscent of aesthetic or peak experiences: “activated,” “animated,” an “ascension” into extra-ordinary perceptions, “uniquely rooted in spatial and temporal experience,” “catalytic.”

The difference between Montgomery’s conscious seeing and the seeing proposed by Dallos is that Montgomery’s is individualistic, a relationship between the outer world of nature and our inner world of thoughts and dreaming. ‘Seeing’ in an applied landscape situation emphasizes the aspect of mediation between us and nature, where we ‘translate’ the intentional acts of the designer or author and thereby find our own way of seeing. Because we can all ‘see’ in three categories, Dallos
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suggests, the designer’s own perception, when enacted in the landscape, is not understood literally and specifically, but is sensed and ‘translated’ by the visitor like an artwork, through their own unique perceptions.\textsuperscript{408} This form of landscape seeing appears to sidestep the question of whether or not meaning can be communicated through landscape by emphasizing the “point of translation,” what Hunt might call the reception, of the landscape. However, the more well-developed the visitor’s personal point of view, the more meaning and value they will be able to get out of the landscape. So, in a point of similarity with Montgomery, both conscious seeing and Hevner, Herrington and Dallos’ concept of seeing are intended to inform and elevate the audience’s ability to perceive meaning or gain personal benefit from all of their landscape experiences. The act of ‘translation’ encourages not only analysis but design as well. Autobiography becomes a tool and inspiration for the designer, while for the visitor, it appears as geography or metaphor, a prompt on their own path to discerning landscape meaning.\textsuperscript{409}

\textbf{The Embodied Landscape Aesthetic}

Conscious seeing as Elizabeth Epperly describes it is primarily a visual experience of the world. Rosemary Ross Johnston supports a visual interpretation of Montgomery’s landscapes as well, comparing them to genre painting by Dutch artists for the intimate, everyday content.\textsuperscript{410} And these two are not alone: much of the scholarship treats Montgomery’s visual imagination as the “primary entry point into [her] representation of nature,” and emphasizes Montgomery’s embrace of Romantic and painterly ways of seeing the landscape, summarizing the author’s landscape values as traditional and visual.\textsuperscript{411} Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is more than the visual aesthetic implied by the term conscious seeing, however. Her writings describe visceral, yet imaginative, multi-sensory experiences of nature and landscape, the focus of Irene Gammel’s article “Embodied Landscape Aesthetics in \textit{Anne of Green Gables}.” Though Epperly says Montgomery’s visual way of seeing and describing landscape opens ‘gateways to enchantment’ (implying an imaginative-creative association), Gammel argues they also serve as windows into

\textsuperscript{408} Ibid., 148
\textsuperscript{409} Ibid.s, 150.
\textsuperscript{410} Johnston, “Landscape as palimpsest,” 21-2.
\textsuperscript{411} Gammel, “Embodied Landscape Aesthetics,” 229, 230.
sensory (“somatic”) experiences that have the potential to challenge conventional ways of being, not just in the landscape, but in life as well. An embodied landscape aesthetic “…endows the heroine and the reader with sensory valuation and agency.” Time spent in nature while being open to aesthetic experiences, inspires individual growth. These aesthetic experiences require us to move beyond the role of distant observer and accept “an invitation to let go and become involved in an ecological relationship that is aesthetic, dynamic, and multi-sensuous,” and to move beyond “simply looking at nature with distanced aesthetic appreciation.” Meyer argues that landscape beauty and aesthetics play an important role in ecological awareness and design: “the act of experiencing designed landscapes poly-sensually, over time, through and with the body, is not simply an act of pleasure, but possibly, one of transformation.” These transformative aesthetic experiences are, crucially, embodied experiences.

This idea of an embodied aesthetic, though it describes Montgomery’s way of seeing particularly well, is not unique to her alone, though Montgomery did tailor it to her own home landscape. The relationship between the embodied experience and cognitive understanding is variously promoted or dismissed by landscape designers and scholars, based on their own philosophical preferences. Herrington says that “somatic markers” “form the basis of human consciousness,” serving as the mediator between external stimuli and our cognitive understanding of those stimuli. No matter how much culture or formal art forms emphasize the visual, our ability to sense the external world remains multi-dimensional, and therefore “sensual experiences are an important source for our conceptual knowledge and the foundations of meaning.” Hevner says the “bodily and visceral responses” are the essential foundations of the aesthetic experience, that “seem to give it poignancy, importance, brilliance, emphasis.” Even the idea that individual transformation, insight, and growth is possible through the experience of embodied aesthetic moments are not unique to Montgomery. In identifying the “mind-body dualism” adhered to by landscape meaning detractors, Herrington argues that “non-cognitive
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contents of gardens,” that is the range of somatic sensations available to the visitor, add to the meaning of that place, since “sensorial experiences contribute to cognitive interpretations.” Both fully engaged peak experiences and the less transcendent but still sensory stimulated moments can help engage our affective and cognitive responses to place. Where Montgomery engages readers and potentially literary visitors is in her belief that putting these embodied landscape experiences into words will help us preserve and relive those moments, and possibly find personal meaning in them as well.

**Creativity and the Relational Landscape**

For Montgomery, landscape is always relational. There is a give and take between our selves and nature that encourages thoughtfulness, care, and a rather intangible exchange of good will between conscious seers and nature that verges on the spiritual. In Montgomery’s nature description, we see “action and perception dancing together,” and “the external world as being continuously responsive to our actions.” The effects of action and perception together shape our relationship with the land, especially through our choices of how to consume and manipulate nature, and the adjustments we make to dwell in nature. In addition to the concrete outcomes of this relationship, there are less tangible ones that may, nonetheless, influence our ways of being in nature. Montgomery’s heroines demonstrate to us how we might also develop a relationship with landscape through the act of seeing. For heroines such as Anne and Emily, as in Montgomery’s own life, seeing does not stop at the eyes or in the moment of an embodied landscape experience. The complete action of conscious seeing requires a relational exchange with landscape, and an act of creation. This is almost always accomplished through the “active weighing of creative words” — the decision of heroines to put what they are seeing into terms of landscape description, and through this, “[make] the perceiving real.” For Montgomery, the conscious contemplation of landscape brings into being both place and beauty, but even as we “half-create,” beauty through perceiving it, nature will always be the larger force, impossible to
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comprehend in totality. Montgomery’s own neighbours observed how she made a practice of seeing and calling into being beauty. In a 1965 retrospective pamphlet on Montgomery, the authors wrote, “She had a way of walking – head up and glancing right and left as though those dreamy eyes behind the glasses must miss nothing, for there was beauty everywhere. She had that beauty within herself which transformed all she saw.”421 Even later in life, when Montgomery appeared to alter her opinions about the power of nature to inspire (“Nature reflects, rather than guides or shapes, the human spirit… what we get, the book’s way of seeing suggests, is ultimately what we bring”422), it was not the existence of our relationship with landscape that was in doubt, but which entity, the perceiver or Nature, had more influence over our perception of beauty.423

Montgomery attested to transcendent experiences of nature, what we would identify as the “peak” experiences described in the previous chapter, and she gifted this ability to her heroines, but she did not reserve the pleasures of conscious seeing for herself alone. Montgomery intended that her writing would influence her readers; the descriptions of nature and “memory pictures” were “meant to stimulate readers into creating vivid, arresting, personal images of their own.” In this project Montgomery’s nature descriptions served the same goal as Thoreau: “they awaken the reader, sharpen the power to see and hear, to become a “seer,” a divining rod that finds and releases deep springs in the world and the self.”424 Conscious seeing, though it is a skill that can be learned, is still meant as a practice to make ourselves more receptive, day-to-day, to experiences that we are already capable of having. Its purpose is not to teach us how to generate peak experiences, because the sort of spontaneous aesthetic experiences described by Montgomery and environmental psychologists cannot be willed into being. Montgomery felt literature could not teach us how to be elevated and inspired by nature, but only expose us to the possibilities. Writing to a fan, Montgomery wrote: “I am very glad my books
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have helped you to appreciate our world. But I guess the power of appreciation was there, though perhaps not awakened, or my books could not have put it into you.”

**LANDSCAPE PREFERENCE AND PERCEPTION**

This talk of conscious seeing and embodied landscape aesthetics taps into the issue of environmental preference and what Kaplan calls the “cognition/affect relationship,” in other words, the relationship between landscape experience, information processing, and emotional response. While literary critics focus on the meaning and reader acceptance of Montgomery’s motifs, and their formal, cultural antecedents, research on landscape preference reveals the possibility for more basic universal landscape values, ones that have already been used within the landscape architecture. An author’s landscape aesthetic is built of preferences that are adapted into motifs, landscape narratives, and ways of being in nature. When it comes to literary landscapes, the scholarship on landscape preference can be used to understand an author’s landscape aesthetic, which can then be translated into a ‘design language’ for the landscape architect’s use.

One of the primary concerns in the study of landscape preference is the role of the cognitive and affective responses to landscape. The cognitive response, generally described as our thinking and processing abilities, and the affective response—our emotions—can both play a role in landscape preference (the physical stimulus aspect of landscape experience is what provides the information for the cognitive and affective responses). While cognitive functions are generally assumed to be consciously experienced, cognitive processing can also occur without consciousness on the part of the observer. Kaplan observed that not all experiences of landscape are “cognitively mediated,” but that “preference” (essentially the experience of landscape and the value placed on that landscape by the observer) can be established “without the intervention of any cognition whatsoever.” This suggests a spectrum of landscape experience, mediated by “input” (landscape stimulus), affect, and cognition. The observation that landscape preferences
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can be formed without conscious cognition adds to the case made by landscape architects such as Herrington that landscape meaning need not be deliberately, consciously cognited in order for it to exist, but that it incorporates a range of affective, cognitive, and sensory inputs. Even when both affective and cognitive experience of landscape is unconsciously mediated, it feeds our desire to seek out further landscape experience, and more environmental knowledge.\textsuperscript{428}

Incorporating landscape preference into our understanding of landscape aesthetics can increase the enjoyment and value of landscape experience even further. As Gustavsson states, “when the notion of aesthetics incorporates the art of living, things and places around us can be interpreted in ways that will uncover layers of contextual and existential meaning, both in our practical existence and in our imaginations.”\textsuperscript{429}

**Finding the Author’s Aesthetic in Landscape Preference**

In 1987 Stephen Kaplan proposed a matrix to explain landscape preference and experience which is still referred to in the field of landscape architecture. Kaplan describes landscape characteristics that can be used to predict the likelihood of an observer’s preference for different environments. The “framework for predictors of preference” matrix included characteristics of coherence, complexity, legibility, and mystery, which are arranged based on whether their overarching meaning was understanding or exploration, and immediate or inferred/predicted.\textsuperscript{430} The matrix proposes that we evaluate landscapes based on how much ‘information’ is contained within a landscape scene, and whether that information is immediately accessible, or causes us to react to it predictively, i.e., to make a cognitive judgment about what might come next in the landscape should we proceed through it.\textsuperscript{431} Kaplan et al.’s research indicated that landscape preferences are “remarkably stable and repeatable” across a diverse swatch of the population, suggesting cross-cultural consistency, and a biological/evolutionary source.\textsuperscript{432}
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Despite its apparent distance from the landscape architectural theory that focuses on meaning or narrative, Kaplan’s landscape preference matrix can still be a useful way to analyze an author’s landscape aesthetic, particularly in the context of the “real” setting of their lives or their fiction. Specifically to this thesis, Kaplan’s landscape preference matrix offers striking parallels to L.M. Montgomery’s visual motifs. In Kaplan’s own early work, he and his fellow researchers describe scenes with a strong rating of mystery thusly: “they either contained a trail that disappeared around a bend or they depicted a brightly lit clearing partially obscured from view by intervening foliage,” and mentioned later on, mystery can also be indicated by “visually impenetrable foliage, but with a hint of a gap which one could pass through.”

The experiential quality conveyed to the viewer of these scenes was “to promise that more information could be gained by moving deeper into the depicted setting.” Unlike legibility, which implies to the observer that they can accurately predict the landscape as they move through it, mystery suggests the possibility of new information the may be revealed. Kaplan leaves the unpopularity of “legibility” and the popularity of “mystery” unresolved in his 1987 article, proposing that because legibility relies on “spatial definition,” the still photos used in the research may be insufficient to reflect its true appeal as a landscape preference. If true, this implies that mystery, experienced in person, may be more of a stationary experience of landscape, while legibility can only be experienced in movement.

The relationship of this mystery/legibility work can be seen in Montgomery’s “bend in the road,” “arches,” and “keyholes of light” photographs. Montgomery drew meaning from these images personally and in her fiction, most significantly when Anne muses about the bend in the road, and being convinced that something delightful is just beyond it. Analyzing Montgomery’s motifs for their landscape aesthetic, it is immediately apparent that Montgomery was drawn strongly towards a preference for mystery in her landscapes. Landscape preference studies have had a challenge in accommodating the importance of in-person experience of scenes high in the values of mystery or legibility, because they rely on the experience of being in the
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space and able to move around it. For Montgomery, spending time pondering these images, or depicting them in her writing, and for readers then projecting themselves into the scenes as they read, there is a complex imaginative rendering of the two-dimensional into three-dimensional space. This practice draws on powers of memory, imagination, and emotion—excellent training for the eventual being-there of Montgomery and her readers. It is also a reminder that though we can conceive of and study landscape preferences such as mystery visually, they actually exist experientially, with the visual indicator standing in as symbolic of that particular experience. Discovery and challenge, furthermore, are a key aspect of “flow,” heightened moments of creative experience.437

Prospect-refuge is another example of how landscape preferences appear as setting and narrative landscape elements in L.M. Montgomery’s writing. Prospect-refuge is a popular understanding of landscape preference, which proposes that humans like to be able to view a wide swath of the landscape from a hidden place, thus offering a favourable balance between vision and protection. Kaplan describes “Primary Prospect” and “Primary Refuge” as views that fulfil this urge (prospect refers to an expansive view, while refuge refers to a view from cover), while “Secondary Prospect” and “Secondary Refuge” are both views of places that might fulfil the prospect-refuge desire.438 In the studies Kaplan draws his definitions from, “Primary Refuge,” a view seen through some amount of foliage, rated lower in preference than expected: “apparently the problem with a hiding place in the woods is that one is in the woods.”439 The analysis of the preference results related to prospect-refuge indicated that a forest edge was the preferred location for individuals, since “neither being out in the open nor being in the woods is favored.”440 The terms “liminal space” or “threshold” are also commonly used to describe space and spatial relationships in L.M. Montgomery’s writing, and I argue it can be considered a literary parallel to prospect-refuge. Montgomery heroines are frequently described observing the landscape from windows. Anne in Anne of Green Gables, Emily in the Emily of New Moon
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trilogy, Gay in *A Tangled Web*, and so on—all have moments where their interior gaze and their exterior gaze are in harmony or ironic discord.\(^{441}\) Anne and Diana’s playhouse “Idlewild” in a grove of birch trees in *Anne of Green Gables* is “an in-between space” both literally, as it is a wooded piece of land belonging to Mr. William Bell that separates the Cuthbert farm from the Barry farm (open agricultural spaces), and figuratively, as it is a “liminal or threshold space” for Anne and Diana, blending “childhood and adolescence, fantasy and reality, domestic and pagan.”\(^{442}\) The function that it serves to Anne and Diana’s self-development, furthermore, makes it “a subversive space.”\(^{443}\) All this from a classic “prospect refuge” location. Emily, Teddy, and Ilse in *Emily of New Moon* make similar use of Lofty John’s Bush. Gammel even argues that nature itself is a “liminal space” in Montgomery’s writing. Nature’s very fragility, composed of natural spaces that can easily be destroyed by (male-gendered) axe or plough, means that it “carries the imprint of social conventions as well as the potential for transcending them.”\(^{444}\)

**EVERYDAY BEAUTY**

Montgomery offers readers ways to see, recall, pursue, and value beauty. Her way of creating images that tell stories suggests that beauty and home as accessible and reproducible. One metaphor that underlies all her work could be ‘seeing beauty is finding home’ or more simply still, ‘beauty is home.’\(^{445}\)

While L.M. Montgomery enjoyed reading about the great beauty spots of the world, she primarily experienced beauty in the everyday landscapes of home. “Everyday beauty” indicates the location of Montgomery’s aesthetic experiences, but it is a misnomer of sorts, as Montgomery’s experience of “the flash” always seemed to elevate her to a higher, almost heavenly, plane of existence. The intensity of aesthetic response to nature was not reliant on being in the presence of the most exceptional landscapes, however, but only the awareness of exquisite nature. In Montgomery’s writing, beauty is “a permanent force, but one that must be

\(^{441}\) See Johnston, “Landscape as palimpsest,” 21, 24-25.
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Montgomery cultivated and encouraged others to cultivate an ability to experience the sublime in everyday landscapes. The landscapes required to evoke peak experiences have long been understood to be represented by “those vast, powerful landscapes where one could not help feeling insignificant and being reminded on one’s own mortality…on the mountaintop, in the chasm, in the waterfall, in the thundercloud, in the rainbow, in the sunset.” Montgomery, inspired by the philosophy of Thoreau and Emerson and her own innate sense of beauty, tuned in to the beauty that could be found right outside her door. Montgomery’s celebration of everyday beauty sits in the “middle ground” identified by William Cronon, eschewing the “wilderness dualism”—the concept of nature as pristine and wild, whose inevitable consequence is to devalue nature that is not sufficiently untouched—for the ability to see “the sacred in nature” closer to home. It is not that sublime nature cannot be celebrated—Montgomery loved the ocean, for instance, simultaneously moved and intimidated by its impersonal immensity—but that those sublime landscapes can “remind us of the wildness in our own backyards, of the nature that is all around us if only we have eyes to see it.” Chenoweth and Gobster’s study of aesthetic landscape response indicated that while aesthetic experiences were moments set apart from normal experiences of time, a high frequency of these moments were actually occurring as the study subjects were going about their daily life, in familiar settings. Most aesthetic experiences of environment do occur in everyday, familiar places, rather than the unusual and the set apart.

In addition to rejecting the wilderness dualism and cultivating aesthetic response to the landscapes of home, Montgomery’s idea of everyday beauty can be characterized in other ways. For instance, as a stylistic and thematic choice, everyday beauty is an example of how Montgomery maintained her own style of narrative and writing in the face of literary modernism, by continuing to feature the “taken-for-granted, ‘seen but unnoticed’ aspects of everyday life that
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modernism excluded as unimportant or as other.” One of the criticisms leveled at Montgomery by her contemporaries and her more current detractors was that by her happy endings and her long descriptive passages, Montgomery was indulging in syrupy sentimentality. Montgomery argued privately in her journals that it was important to distinguish between sentimentality and sentiment, and that there should be no shame in celebrating the beautiful, the uplifting, and the positive parts of life, since the ugly (like the poor) would always be with us. In support of Montgomery’s own arguments, Elizabeth Waterston makes the canny observation that Montgomery often bookended her transcendent nature descriptions with humour, a device meant to redirect the viewer (character or reader) back to the everyday. This humour might have reasserted our need to live with practicality in the world despite our indulgence in flights of fancy, but it also served to show that transcendent aesthetic experiences were not incompatible with daily life. Montgomery also uses what Waterston calls “diminuendo” in her nature description, for instance when the brilliant light of a sunset is reflected in softened form in the waters of a pond, like an echo that dies away. This diminuendo slowly brings us back from the transcendence of nature into ourselves. Whether we return from the aesthetic experience with an ironic thump or a gentle release, the effect of that experience is usually the same; a revived spirit, a plan of action, a creative idea. Finally, these experiences of everyday beauty feature what Johnston calls ‘qualities of sameness and difference,’ where familiarity is offset by time: Aesthetic experiences are had among “similar scenes… seen every day, but each location is
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distinctive, personal, exquisitely precise and tuned by that temporal moment - particularities of time and space loaded together, just so.”

The Scale and Focus of the Everyday Landscape

The scale of the landscape in Montgomery’s books is always small, even for Prince Edward Island. Emily is able to walk home from the town where she attends high school to her home in one long night, but no more than that. Alexander notes that the geography of Anne of Green Gables is “small-scale and confined…there are brooks and streams rather than rivers, and groves and woods rather than forests. This is nature close-up and intimate rather than sublime and awe-inspiring.” Elizabeth Waterston makes a similar observation, when she points out that during the time Montgomery was writing the first Anne, “she was leading a lonely, intense life, her sensibilities concentrated, like Henry David Thoreau’s in his time at Walden Pond, on the minutiae of nature.”

Even human-scale landscapes are blessed with details that require conscious effort to observe. Montgomery uses a precise and focused attention to detail to direct the reader’s attention even more intensely to the world around them. These details are carefully controlled by Montgomery, right down to the “ladies’ eardrops” flowers (fuschia) that Montgomery inserted as a revision into Rachel Lynde’s garden. Rosemary Ross Johnston ascribes ‘thisness’ to Montgomery’s landscapes and descriptions of everyday life: “‘Thisness’ is a principle of individuation, a celebration of the exquisite particularity of small things, of both their common unity and their formal distinctiveness.”

Perceiving and Revealing Everyday Beauty

By natural inclination and through developing her aesthetic aptitude, Montgomery was able to appreciate landscapes and ecosystems that were not typically understood to be attractive or productive. The case of forest management in the newly-designated Maritime National Parks
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shows how Montgomery’s ability to see beauty in her everyday, scrubby spruce woods of disturbed Acadian Forest was not necessarily shared by her contemporaries. The early National Park managers out East certainly had difficulties doing so. Environmental historian Alan MacEachern notes that even—perhaps especially—the park managers with forestry backgrounds were unable to see the appeal of the woods of the Maritime national parks, so much so that they frequently recommended and carried out forestry practices that were contrary to park policy. In the first few decades of the Maritime National Parks, employees thinned spruce and balsam stands, planted hardwoods where the public would see them, and cleared viewplanes, all for the purpose of taming the “ugly” “impenetrable jungle or thicket growth” of spruce and balsam fir. In Cape Breton, it was even recommended that balsam fir be “eliminated entirely from an area” because it was thought to out-compete the more aesthetically pleasing hardwood (in fact, hardwood out-competes softwood in the Acadian forest).461 As foresters, these park managers continued to see trees in a productive, utilitarian capacity, with the understanding that since these forests were not ‘pristine’ but in fact already highly disturbed, it was no loss of forest integrity to further manage them. Furthermore, they had a “regional prejudice against the scrubby, coniferous look of Maritime forests,” a prejudice not shared by L.M. Montgomery.462 Consider Montgomery’s description of field spruce seen by twilight, for instance:

As I came home in the after light I saw a sight that filled me with rapture. To my right was a cluster of tall, gently waving spruces. Seen in daylight, those spruces are old and uncomely—dead almost to the tops, with withered branches. But seen in that enchanted light, against a sky that began by being rosy saffron, and continued to be silver green, and ended finally in crystal blue, they were like dark, slender witch-maidens weaving their spells of magic in a rune of elder days. How I longed to share in their gramarye—to have fellowship in their twilight sorceries.463

The typical, unromantic view of the spruce trees in broad daylight did not detract from Montgomery’s ability to perceive beauty in them. The key was that the mind, body, and spirit were prepared to perceive those everyday objects at a serendipitous moment, be it changing light or certain atmospheric conditions. This is but one example of the many times Montgomery found
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beauty and inspiration in the very same landscapes that National Parks managers considered unappealing and off-putting to tourists.

**The Relationship of Beauty and Knowledge**

Knowledge is a key component of landscape preference and ecological aesthetics. It was also part of L.M. Montgomery’s own enjoyment of landscape. Kaplan notes that “both the acquisition of new information and its comprehension turn out to be central themes underlying the preference process.”

Maslow, likewise, observed the presence of knowledge in the aesthetic response, though he felt it important to point out that the knowledge effect was not necessarily a consciously cognitive process, but “more a shift in attention, in the organization of perception, in noticing or realizing, that occurs.”

Montgomery’s knowledge of nature enhanced her appreciation of it and her desire to protect it, and she participated in this ongoing knowledge project until the final years of her life. Despite the distressing events in her personal life during the 1930s, Montgomery participated in a Nature Study Club and attended lectures about native flora and fauna. She even forgave Grey Owl his deception because she was convinced that his appreciation of Canada’s environment, at least, was true. Montgomery believed that seeing beauty was innate, but that passive or active ‘instruction’ could awaken us to its possibilities. She thought that young people needed a broader education than they were getting, one less focused on test scores and more focused on the “basic realities of life.” Education, she argued, “should be a key to unlock the beauties of the past, the possibilities of the present, the problems of the future.” In Montgomery’s opinion, beauty was not only an aesthetic experience, but a way of life, a moral code: “I would like to see them taught the importance of beauty in everything…in character, in relationships, in material surroundings. I would like to see them taught that there is no place like the country for a real home.”
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The Ecological Aesthetic and Knowledge

Researchers concerned with the issue of landscape ecology point out that the perception of naturalness is a cultural value that has no direct correlation with actual ecological integrity and function. In some cases, for instance with forest management, aesthetic, scenic preferences can be in direct conflict with best ecological practices. An aversion to “messy” forests or the idea that smaller, spaced out clearcuts are more attractive can result in forestry practices that endanger forest diversity, health, and integrity. The challenge for landscape architects seeking to apply an ecological landscape aesthetic to their designs is that what is ecologically sensible is not always aesthetically legible to the general population. In adopting Aldo Leopold’s work to build a definition of ecological aesthetic, Gobster compares the scenic approach with the ecological; scenic landscape perception is about pleasure, and does not require ecological knowledge. With an ecological aesthetic, the viewer questions his assumptions about what he is seeing and his relationship to the landscape. One of the key departures of the ecological aesthetic from the scenic aesthetic is its ability to move beyond visual, picturesque expectations and increase our pleasure in everyday, ordinary forest scenes, an orientation that Gobster says has the potential to be more inclusive. This requires “deep exploration” of ordinary places, re-orienting our perception of the landscape away from the purely visual, and towards a greater awareness of the natural processes of change in the landscape. “In ecological aesthetics pleasure is derived from knowing how the parts of the landscape relate to the whole”: knowledge about natural phenomena, geological features, plant and animal species, and how they fit in to the ecosystem “imbue the forest landscape with deep, symbolic meaning” in contrast to conventional landscape seeing which is “often appreciated only at face value.”
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benefit from the ecological aesthetic, we find that “the person-landscape interactions” cause us to have “extended dialogues with nature” which are more subjective and engaging than the scenic approach, and have more profound and sustained psychological and behavioural consequences.\footnote{Ibid.} Though knowledge is an essential, sustaining aspect of the ecological aesthetic, ultimately it is experience that will ‘hook’ the public: experience will encourage people to “use their minds and emotions to understand, appreciate, and ultimately act on the environment in a purposeful way.”\footnote{Ibid.}

\textit{Hypernature}

In her argument that beauty has an important role to play in the design of sustainable landscapes and in stimulating environmental awareness, Elizabeth K. Meyer suggests a number of design principles, including “hypernature,” “an exaggerated version of constructed nature.”\footnote{Meyer, “Sustaining Beauty,” 17.} In landscape design, hypernature can be achieved through “exaggeration, amplification, distillation, condensation, juxtaposition, or transposition/displacement.”\footnote{Ibid.} Though literary critics have described Montgomery’s landscape descriptions as idealized versions of a real thing, I suggest that her depictions are actually hypernature, the ‘real’ interpreted through an experience of beauty and narrative, giving it added meaning, but making it no less true a depiction, just because its characteristics have been intensified and edited. Meyer believes there is a restorative effect to be found in landscapes designed along the principles of hypernature, using eco-revelatory approaches, and embracing as a goal the embodied aesthetic response of site users.\footnote{Ibid., 17, 18.} Furthermore, because it is so vital to the development of environmental consciousness, Meyer says we should incorporate experience into our design efforts, because even designed landscapes can evoke some of the same experiences as natural landscapes “when the abundance, the excessiveness, and the tenacious persistence of plants, wildlife, and water are uncovered in the most unexpected places: city drainage ways, urban plazas and gardens, above and below elevated...
rail lines and highways.”

It is this same abundance and tenaciousness that appealed to Montgomery, allowing her to see beauty even in the pioneering spruce trees growing in abandoned fields, for her characters to look past the hideous advertisement and see a sunset instead, and to feel real joy and even mystery in contemplating the ferns, grasses and sedges on the edge of a trickle of a stream next to a cow path. These qualities of nature (even designed nature) are the essence of experiencing beauty in the everyday. The benefits are personal and, potentially, cultural and environmental. It is difficult to imagine Montgomery objecting to Meyer’s observation that “a beautiful landscape works on our psyche, affording the chance to ponder on a world outside ourselves. Through this experience, we are de-centered, restored, renewed and reconnected to the biophysical world. The haptic, somatic experience of beauty can inculcate environmental values.”

Finally, it would be remiss not to point out the similarities between the relationship of aesthetic experience to knowledge, and existential authenticity to knowledge, addressed in Chapter Two. In the same way that there can exist a feedback response between aesthetic experience and a desire for knowledge about these landscapes (and in turn more engagement with sustainable ideals), there can be a similar effect between authentic tourism experiences and the desire for knowledge about these experiences. This effect is present at literary sites connected with writers such as Henry David Thoreau or Aldo Leopold, but could be justifiably found as well at sites associated with L.M. Montgomery.

**The Portable Landscape**

Janice Fiamengo says that while it may be true that Montgomery’s nature description “has immortalized Prince Edward Island,” her representations of the island’s geography are not in return the cause of Montgomery’s appeal as an author. In fact, critics say, though the island is captured in these descriptions, it is the “transregional magic” of the nature descriptions that have the most power. Conscious seeing, with its emphasis on observing, lends itself to a type
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of landscape that literary critics of Montgomery’s work call the “portable landscape.” In the same way that we have the ability to half-create beauty wherever we look, the portable landscape is another manifestation of conscious seeing. The portable landscape is the transformation of the observable and lived landscape into a landscape of fiction, further interpreted by readers into a form that they can experience, not only on Prince Edward Island, but in their own home landscapes. This two-fold creation of the portable landscape is accomplished in a number of ways. First, Fiamengo says that Montgomery’s “emphasis on the ecstatic response of the sympathetic viewer” places the primary agency of the landscape into the observer, not the environment itself. In a similar vein, Irene Gammel suggests that Montgomery’s multi-sensory descriptions broaden the cross-cultural appeal of the author’s landscapes, particularly in cultures that do not “privilege the eye” as much as Western cultures are wont to do. Benjamin Lefebvre also claims that the ability to read Montgomery’s narratives and landscapes as allegories helps to explain her cross-cultural appeal in countries such as Poland and Japan. “…At the same time that Montgomery’s landscape has “transregional magic”, it also has transcultural portability when read as metaphorical or allegorical.” In addition, because Avonlea is “a simulacrum, a selective representation of reality, a copy of an original that does not exist,” Montgomery was able to tailor her fictional landscape to appeal to a broad audience, even to those readers who were entirely unfamiliar with Prince Edward Island. Fiamengo also explains the portable landscape this way, calling Avonlea a “detachable landscape,” depicted in a way that was comparable to contemporary tourist destinations, “both the one place and no place at all,” “a green world of comfort and reassurance whose placid surface belies the tensions of contested territory.” Finally, Elizabeth Epperly argues that when Montgomery distilled her visual landscape aesthetic into a series of repeatable, discoverable motifs, she created a way of seeing landscape that was “infinitely individualizable” for herself and her readers.
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Despite the very geographic specificity of Montgomery’s novels, her landscape aesthetic is read as “highly portable” by her readers. This portability is rooted in the fact that nature, not geography, was always Montgomery’s first landscape inspiration.\textsuperscript{487} But this “portable nature” has the ability to disguise just how specific Montgomery was in the depiction of her favourite landscapes. Even Montgomery experts have mistaken their own idea of nature with Montgomery’s environment of reference. L.M. Montgomery biographer Mary Rubio has extensive knowledge of Montgomery’s writings and decades of academic research, and has undoubtedly visited Prince Edward Island on multiple occasions. In The Gift of Wings, Rubio quotes from Montgomery, writing about how scarce and isolated pine trees were in Cavendish when she was growing up. Nevertheless, Rubio’s description of the woodland haunts of Montgomery’s youth, especially her beloved Lover’s Lane, includes the scent of “aromatic cedars and pines.”\textsuperscript{488} Montgomery herself says there were only a handful of isolated pines in Cavendish during her upbringing. Rubio, however, calls the “Haunted Wood” “a forest of dense pine trees,” which is completely erroneous.\textsuperscript{489} White cedar, while it does occur in the New Brunswick Acadian forest, is rare in Prince Edward Island today, and restricted to the west side of the island.\textsuperscript{490} It is unlikely that Montgomery came across many (possibly any) cedars in her home environment. Mistaking the PEI forest for an Ontario one is even more ironic when considering Montgomery’s own opinion of cedar (\textit{Thuja}) trees, calling them “scrubby,” “wretched imitation[s] of spruce,” “shabby and faded and draggled,” and “a tree I despise.”\textsuperscript{491} Rubio’s description evocative enough to indicate it is someone’s memory of a forest, possibly her own. It is not, however, Montgomery’s memory.

Television productions of Montgomery’s work have only emphasized the portability of her landscapes even more, especially for viewers who have not read Montgomery’s novels. Regarding the television productions of Montgomery’s work, Lefebvre suggests the producers
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and directors are careful to use only “national images that are recognizable to more than one nation.”\textsuperscript{492} Because the Kevin Sullivan series are coproductions between Canadian and American companies (CBC, Telefilm and Disney Channel), specificity gives way to portability, the result being that Road to Avonlea had cross-national appeal “because it created stories and settings that would be familiar domestically and internationally without being bound to a specific geography and history.”\textsuperscript{493} Certainly the fact that a narrative set in Prince Edward Island was filmed primarily in Uxbridge, Ontario (with other Southern Ontario locations as well) would have added to its everywhere-ness.

\textit{The Specific Landscape}

No. 3. “Your favorite object in Nature?” Rather an obscure question. Many of the noted people aforesaid answered “the sea” and I am half inclined to also. But it seems incongruous to call that blue lone entity an “object in nature”. After all, I think my answer to that must be “A Prince Edward Island wood of fir and maple, where the ground is carpeted thick with ferns”. Specifically, my favorite object in Nature is Lover’s Lane.\textsuperscript{494}

The portable landscape and landscape preferences might explain the cross-cultural appeal of Montgomery’s written landscapes, but they do not explain the reason that tourists choose to visit Montgomery’s literary landscapes. The flaw in the “portable landscape” approach is that it is impossible to experience a portable place, because “place”—space and time together—can only be experienced individually, subjectively, and specifically. Montgomery’s nature description was based in memory, and Montgomery’s memory was specific and detailed. Montgomery did not describe “a” path in the woods, she described Lover’s Lane. Her “arches” motif was not just “any” wood where the trees resemble a cathedral, it was a specific wood where she had made that observation. However portable her idea of nature was, Montgomery did not shy away from describing place-specific landscapes that only occur in the Canadian Maritimes and perhaps the coast of Maine. The specific tree and perennial species named by Montgomery, plus the effects of sunlight, cloud, and ocean weather, suggest to a reader familiar
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with this region very specific landscapes and moments in time. In Montgomery’s writing, spruce trees and fir trees were not interchangeable; she knew which was which, and used them to set the appropriate scene. A list compiled of the species of tree Montgomery mentions reveals a very specific list of disturbed, second or third-growth Acadian forest. These are not the trees a reader in England or the Southern United States would recognize as “transregional,” provided that reader actually knew something about forest species around the continent. In fact, I would argue that Montgomery’s landscapes were bound to be most “transregional” not to the rural dweller, but to the urban dweller, whose experience with farmland and forest was mostly the idea of those landscapes, rather than life-long interactions with the same. That reader would easily be able to substitute their knowledge of a pine forest or a cedar-dominated forest with the white spruce described by Montgomery, since it was the idea of the forest that was most important.

It is an odd balance that Montgomery walks between the portable and the specific landscape. Her “Seasons in the Woods” articles for *Canadian Magazine* are largely dominated by a portable image of nature, particularly figuring the woods as either cathedral-type places, the home of nymphs or elves, or else personified and given agency. Still, sprinkled among this imagery are very specific descriptions of the best places to find mayflowers—on a west-facing slope, among coniferous trees and on poor soil, particularly sandy, when the mayflower leaves are still brown and leathery, and “before the forests have fairly begun to wake up and preen themselves,” and Montgomery knows that if you return to this same hill in summer you will find blueberries.495 This spring article, in particular, is as fanciful as any nature description Montgomery could write, and yet the level of precise detail about the sequence of spring events, one unfurling bud and another, and always in the right order for a Maritime spring, shows this was not just an idealized nature tossed together, but real observations put to paper.

Similarly, despite her talk of ancient woods and eternal beauty, she is also aware of the evidence of man-made change on the land, such as “the purple pomp of the fireweed,” which grows up on land “which axe has scarred and flame scorched.”496 Ironically, considering the state of birch trees along the “Haunted Wood” path at the Green Gables site, Montgomery also points


out the hand of man on a birch tree, “whence some vandal hand has torn away the white-skin wrapper in several places.”\textsuperscript{497} Elizabeth K. Meyer says that sustainable beauty is “particular, not generic:”\textsuperscript{498} “It will be recognized as site-specific design, emerging out of its context but differentiated from it.”\textsuperscript{499} This is one way of thinking about Montgomery’s portable landscapes and their relationship to the landscape design of her literary landscapes: The context of her landscapes might be familiar, portable, transferable, but the sites themselves must always be specific, and knowledge about how landscapes function, and what circumstances have led to their creation, allows us to see beauty in them (and subsequently to value them, and steward them properly), no matter the level of human intervention visible in them.

If L.M. Montgomery’s landscapes were \textit{only} portable, the people associated with literary landscapes — site managers, planning and tourism entities, etc. — would be in a serious quandary. If readers could experience an L.M. Montgomery literary landscape anywhere in the world, what need would there be to visit, conserve, or recognize the place that first inspired the landscape (or what need would there be to maintain the grounds of the authors home, if it was only the building itself that had any value)? Of course, people do continue to visit these sites, both avid readers and general tourists alike. The continued popularity of Montgomery’s literary places suggests that the portable landscape, however powerful it is at inspiring readers’ relationship with nature, does not tell the whole story of how readers interpret the meaning of Montgomery’s landscapes. The argument that the portable landscape is the primary reader takeaway from Montgomery’s work suits the field of literary criticism, but cannot be the whole picture for fields of research that deal with the actual landscape, not just the fictional one.

**SELECTED ELEMENTS OF L.M. MONTGOMERY’S LANDSCAPE AESTHETIC**

This section explores the form and fabric of L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic. This is the least theoretical of the approaches discussed in this thesis, and also the least developed. It seeks merely to be a starting point, to spur additional research that would determine the best methodology to use with this type of approach. Because of its informal nature, only a

\textsuperscript{497} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{498} Meyer, “Sustaining Beauty,” 19.

\textsuperscript{499} \textit{Ibid.}
few features have been selected. The primary purpose of this section is to show how even specific landscape elements and/or landscape fabric can be considered thematically based on an author’s landscape aesthetic in order to help direct the goals, design, interpretation, and ongoing management of literary sites. It helps to create a literary typology of landscape elements that could be particularly useful at literary sites that have more flexibility to express an author’s landscape aesthetic, e.g. literary landscapes that do not fall under heritage designations, literary trails, or even sites with heritage designation where there are a small number of heritage elements on the site that must be protected, in comparison to its overall size.

Although further research is needed, there is potential for adapting the visual narrative approach suggested by Dee (and discussed in Chapter 3) to literary landscapes. For instance, the categories of landscape elements she suggests—Landscape fabric, spaces, paths, edges, foci, thresholds, and detail—could be used to characterize an author’s own use of these elements in his or her landscapes. For Montgomery, “paths” might be characterized as “bending paths,” “foci” could be identified as either trees or visual motifs, “thresholds” would become “gardens as threshold,” and so on. Research that adapts these categories (or similar schematic) for literary landscapes might allow us to identify the elements most significant to the literary landscape experience. For instance, edges and thresholds, especially between the site and its surroundings, might be the most neglected, or contribute the most, to the literary landscape experience. Alternately, typical conservation approaches could also be used, so the landscape elements used to identify and conserve the cultural landscape in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada—that is: land use, traditional land practices, land patterns, spatial organization, visual relationships, circulation, ecological features, vegetation, landforms, water features, and built features as components of the cultural landscape—could be applied to the literary landscape. The drawback of this approach is that it encourages a direct one-for-one approach from imagined landscape to real landscape, and would require some alterations so it could incorporate thematic and metaphorical information about landscape elements in a clear fashion.

How I love trees! Often and often, when I am alone in the woods I will put
my arms tenderly about some old, gray-lichened trunk and press my face to
it, feeling its life and balm flowing through every vein in my body as if it and
I were one. There are some trees down home that I love so well that I would
almost as soon have one of my fingers cut off as see one of them cut
down…

Trees, singular, and groups of trees—forests and woods—played a number of roles in
Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic. They were variously objects of the natural landscape and of
beauty, touchstones of memory, and imbued with narrative significance. On top of this,
Montgomery incorporated trees into her idea of home and family (think of Montgomery’s
cherished photograph of her cousin Frede among the copse of birch at Park Corner), and trees
were very often the focus of Montgomery’s exercises in conscious seeing. In short, trees touch
on practically every major theme identified in Chapter Three as making up Montgomery’s
landscape aesthetic.

Montgomery’s treatment of trees are further evidence of the relational nature of her
landscapes. Montgomery had a habit of naming trees and entire woods, reinforcing the relational
aspect of her landscape aesthetics. Naming trees is not just a claiming of the environment, it is
the sign that a relationship has been established, not unlike naming a stray animal before making
it a pet. Epperly says that Anne gains sympathy for the trees at the orphanage she lives at before
Green Gables after attributing a narrative or a metaphor to them. Because Anne assigns this
metaphor to them, or for Montgomery, by the act of naming the tree outside her bedroom
window, an empathic relationship to the tree (or trees) is formed. The nature of the attitude we
take towards trees can reveal a great deal about our ideas of nature, and define our use of it.
William Cronon writes:

In the wilderness, we need no reminder that a tree has its own reasons for
being, quite apart from us. The same is less true in the gardens we plant and
tend ourselves: there it is far easier to forget the otherness of the tree... The
tree in the garden could easily have sprung from the same seed as the tree in

501 Montgomery, Selected Journals 1:185.
502 Epperly, Visual Imagination, 38.
the forest, and we can claim only its location and perhaps its form as our own. Both trees stand apart from us; both share our common world.⁵⁰³

It says something about Montgomery’s relationship to nature—just what, it would take more time to explore than I currently have—that she treated the trees in the forest and the trees in her garden equally; with the same empathy, and with the same ability to perceive the tree’s existence in and of itself, separate from her relationship to it.

Figure 4 Trees as focal points. Montgomery's images of single trees is more than a visual impression, it indicates a personal relationship with the tree itself. These trees are from Norval, ON, Park Corner, PEI, and Cavendish, PEI, taken over a period of about 30 years. L.M. Montgomery Photo Collection, XZ1 MS A097052, XZ1 MS A097043, XZ1 MS A097041.

Tree Aesthetics

In an aesthetic sense, Christopher Alexander says that trees are one of the most significant aspects of our observed environment: “…Trees, along with houses and other people, constitute one of the three most basic parts of the human environment… The mere fact that trees are considered as full of meaning, as houses and people, is, alone, a very powerful indication of

⁵⁰³ Cronon, The Trouble With Wilderness.
Their importance. Paul Gobster says that the three primary influences on our aesthetic preferences for forests are “an attraction to a dramatic, idealized nature; an orientation to a static, visual mode of landscape experience, and an aversion to the death of trees and the “messiness” resulting from disruption and change.” These are cultural defined aesthetic values, however, and as a result can be challenged through greater levels of knowledge about forest ecosystems. Alternately, they can be challenged by embracing different aesthetic values, regardless of the knowledge level of the perceiver. Alexander says that well-situated trees “create social places.” The “tree places” he identifies are essentially experiential landscape motifs that can be created with trees: “an umbrella—where a single, low-sprawling tree like an oak defines an outdoor room; a pair—where two trees form a gateway; a grove—where several trees cluster together; a square—where they enclose an open space; and an avenue—where a double row of trees, their crowns touching, line a path or street.” In *Form and Fabric*, Catherine Dee represents the variety of ways that trees perform in the landscape to define spaces and boundaries, act as focal points, and add their character—open and arching, dark and brooding, close and imposing, etc—to the paths, glades, foci, and views they are a part of.

*Orchards*

Christopher Alexander calls fruit orchards a “half way kind of garden,” too beautiful and too useful to be either farm or garden, a characteristic that Montgomery seemed to revel in, as it confirmed her idea that humans should aim to in the threshold between nature and garden, not to mention the formal connections of orchards with the Garden of Eden. Orchards add multi-sensual beauty to the landscape. Their seasonality keeps us tuned in to the passage of time, and their bounty inspires community-building. The tending required to keep them productive can be

---

504 Christopher Alexander et al., *A Pattern Language: Towns—Buildings—Construction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 798. Obviously, in environments where trees do not dominate, there may be different essential landscape elements, but in the case of Montgomery and the Eastern-North-American cultural milieu, it is particularly apt.


symbolic of our stewardship of nature.\textsuperscript{508} Orchards figure very prominently in Montgomery’s landscapes. They are crucially important places of memory and signifiers of Home to Montgomery, both personally and in her fiction. Houses that are not homes do not have orchards (for instance the Tansy Patch, Teddy’s house in \textit{Emily of New Moon}, occupied by he and his mentally and physically scarred mother); houses that will become home always have beautiful orchards, sometimes right out in front of the house, proclaiming a welcome to the protagonist. Important things happen in orchards, like in \textit{Kilmeny of the Orchard} when the heroine finds her voice, or when Gilbert finds Anne in the orchard of Patty’s Place to make his unsuccessful marriage proposal. The Macneill Homestead site has a handful of descendants of the original apple orchards from Montgomery’s day, and the remnants of this orchard today helps make the experience of literary pilgrims at the site significantly poignant.

\textsuperscript{508} \textit{Ibid.}

\textbf{Figure 5} L.M. Montgomery orchard images. Top, the back orchard of the Macneill Homestead. Below, the Park Corner orchard. L.M. Montgomery Photo Collection, XZ1 MS A097002 and XZ1 MS A097043
It is the greatest pleasure my days bring me to go out to my garden every morning and see what new blossoms have opened overnight. At such moments my heart fairly bursts with its gladness. Oh, what a wise old myth it was that placed the creation of life in a garden.\footnote{July 30, 1905. \textit{Selected Journals} 1:307.}

L.M. Montgomery was a keen gardener. Her own gardening activities, coupled with the description and use of gardens in her fiction, represent gardens as a sort of return to Eden:

What wonder that wise old Eden story placed the beginning of life in a garden? A garden fitly belongs to the youth of the world and the youth of the race, for it never grows old. The years, which steal so much from everything else, bring added loveliness and sweetness to it, enriching it with memories but never blighting its immortal freshness. It is foolishness to speak as we do of “old” gardens: gardens are perennially young, the haunt of flowers and children. And Grandmother’s garden was always full of both.\footnote{L. M. Montgomery, “A Garden of Old Delights,” First published in \textit{The Canadian Magazine}, 1910, republished in \textit{Gardening Life}, Vol. 1 No. 2 (Fall 1996): 95.}

The comparisons to Eden are not unusual given Montgomery grew up in the highly bible-literate, community of Cavendish, but also because Prince Edward Island, even before Montgomery’s birth, had long been considered a sort of “garden island.”\footnote{Though this is a common observation, for a specific example see McCabe, “Representing Islandness,” 135.} And of course, the idea that we interact with the idea of Eden when we has a very long history in Western cultural traditions, one that has been frequently used to communicate something about our place in the natural world; Anne Whiston Spirn observes that in the bible, a garden was the first “home.”\footnote{Spirn, \textit{The Language of Landscape}, 70.}

As far her gardening habits, Montgomery was not immune to modern garden trends; her Leaskdale home featured four circular beds every year that she would plant up with annuals, though the addition of cosmos and baby’s breath added a certain amount of informality to a formal Victorian bedding style planting. In Toronto, Montgomery had a rock garden installed, a fashionable garden trend, which must have appealed to her interest in “deep time” as well as

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Gardens and Thresholds}
\end{flushright}
being a place to feature stones from Prince Edward Island. She even made a point to stop at the Royal Botanical Garden in Hamilton one day to view its rock garden.\textsuperscript{513} Montgomery had favourite gardening books as well, very often books about making gardens. She re-read Elizabeth Von Arnim’s \textit{Elizabeth and Her German Garden} (1898) on a number of occasions;\textsuperscript{514} her penpal George B. MacMillan sent her Flora Klickmann’s Flower Patch series, which included nature description and gardening tales. Montgomery professed a particular love—and envy—for \textit{Our Sentimental Garden} by Agnes Castle and Egerton Castle, which expressed “all the charm and loveliness of old-fashioned gardens” and was about “the garden I have always wanted and can never have.”\textsuperscript{515} Montgomery also exchanged gardening news and tips with her penpals. She once wrote a rather detailed description of daffodil care, from when to cut foliage, where to plant the bulbs (they look attractive in a lawn but the foliage is cut too soon), how to winter mulch them for best blooming potential (not necessary, but if so, leaves or boughs, well-rotted cow manure best), to how rich the soil should be.\textsuperscript{516} Gardens could even be an indicator of character in her fiction. When unlikeable characters in Montgomery’s novels were also gardeners—for instance, the bossy Rachel Lynde in \textit{Anne}, it was often an indication that they were not “bad,” just difficult.

Gardens also mediate and define social space. In Prince Edward Island, vegetable gardens were sited for productivity, not appearances, and ornamental gardens occupied pride of place around the house. Their visibility did not dictate garden style, however, and the yards surrounding homes could be as manicured or wild as the inhabitants willed. The social life represented in Montgomery’s garden at Leaskdale (Figure 14) is one of public and private landscapes, where the public landscape—the front yard—reflects an awareness of contemporary garden trends and the type of landscape appropriate for a pillar of the community. The back yard, accessed through a lattice fence with archway, was a gateway into a productive landscape that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{513} Rubio, \textit{A Gift of Wings}, 559.
\item \textsuperscript{514} Of this book, Montgomery wrote, “My “twin soul” must live in \textit{Elizabeth}—at least, as far as gardening is concerned. She has said a hundred things that I always meant to say when I had thought them out sufficiently. I shan’t have to say them now—\textit{Elizabeth} has done it so well.” May 20, 1905 in \textit{Selected Journals} 1:307.
\item \textsuperscript{515} May 2, 1928, \textit{Selected Journals} 3:367 and June 18, 1929 3:397.
\item \textsuperscript{516} Montgomery to MacMillan, May 21, 1909, in Bolger, 42-3.
\end{itemize}
was interspersed with the riotous, old-fashioned flowers that Montgomery captured in her photos of Cavendish front yards. At Norval, Montgomery found a like-minded community of gardeners, where neighbours took active interest and enjoyment in each other’s gardening efforts.

Montgomery’s gardens were threshold spaces that mediated between domestic inner life and the outer world of nature and beauty, or as Johnston puts it when she describes Montgomery’s home-in-its-landscape, a “phenomenology of landscape where home and place become one.”\(^{517}\) The front garden of Green Gables Heritage Place is a perfect example of this garden-as-threshold concept, which could be ‘played up’ even more through the landscape choices made just outside the fence. The garden as a threshold between natural world and domesticated world is also seen in the plants in Montgomery’s fictional gardens, which often combine old heirloom plants with native plants from the woods. While some have argued there are colonialist/antimodern implications to this type of garden—Brooke Collins-Gearing has identified the Barry Garden’s blend of British heirloom plants with native plants “a cultivated, constructed, colonial garden — not the natural landscape”\(^{518}\)—one could argue that as well as these implications, Montgomery is also showing that with very little tending or

---

\(^{517}\) Johnston, “Landscape as palimpsest, 21.

encouragement, European (British) garden species can blend harmoniously with native Prince Edward Island species to create a new type of garden place. This is no less ‘colonizing,’ perhaps, but it does show that this new occupation does not have to run roughshod over native ecology. In this light, especially considering the gendered nature of gardens in Montgomery’s aesthetic, makes her whole-hearted embrace of half-wild, half-cultivated gardens, especially their representation as a woman’s space, could be argued to represent a call for a more balanced way of living in nature.

The specific plants of a garden were not merely beautiful, with a sort of agency of their own (consider Anne’s admonition to enjoy the flowers in place, rather than pick them), but they were also tokens of memory that prompted the remembrance of stories—or the telling of them. Consider the “Scotch roses” Montgomery describes in her magazine article “A Garden of Old Delights.” As well as their fragrance, delicate beauty, thorns, and the “faint pink shell-pink of their hearts,” the roses were notably romantic because of a family story associated with the roses “Grandmother’s old servant Jean had brought the rose-bush with her all the way from an old Scottish garden when she was a “slip of a lassie.’” The story appears to be fictional but the roses were grown in Cavendish in actuality.

**Fictional Gardens as Designed Gardens**

Finally, fictional gardens in Montgomery’s novels can be seen as designed gardens that can reveal a great deal of information about Montgomery’s garden designer’s eye. The Alma Macneill garden, which Gammel identifies as the inspiration for the Barry Garden in *Anne of Green Gables*, is also the subject of one of Montgomery’s garden photos.\(^{520}\) (Figure 15) Montgomery states that this garden has renewed her appreciation for “old-timey” gardens, and then lists the “essentials” of this type of garden. First, “like the poet it must be born not made—the outgrowth and flowering of long years of dedication and care. The least flavor of newness or modernity spoils it.”\(^{521}\) Montgomery lists certain essentials:

\[
\text{It must be secluded and shut away from the world—a “garden enclosed”—preferably by willows—or apple trees—or firs. It must have some trim walks}
\]

---

\(^{519}\) *Ibid.*

\(^{520}\) Gammel, “Embodied Landscape Aesthetics,” 236.

\(^{521}\) August 28, 1901, *Selected Journals* 1:263.
bordered by clam-shells, or edged with “ribbon grass”, and there must be in it the flowers that belong to old-fashioned gardens and are seldom found in the catalogues of today.\textsuperscript{522}

Montgomery then gives a long list of old-fashioned plants, “all growing in orderly confusion,” that she largely reuses in her description of the Barry Garden. The difference in her fictional description, however, is that rather than merely list the plants, Montgomery describes them in relationship to each other, so she composes in words a designed garden, one with perspective and balance of light and dark and composed so as to show everything to its best advantage. As to structure, the garden was a mix of well-maintained but modest paths, belied by the rambunctious

\textsuperscript{522} Ibid.
plantings; it had “prim, right-angled paths, neatly bordered with clam-shells, intersected…like moist red ribbons and in the beds between old-fashioned flowers ran riot,” reminiscent of cottage-style gardening, possibly before Montgomery had ever even heard of it (she first described this garden in her journals in 1901). In the Barry Garden, Montgomery revealed her eye for the effect of plants used in contrasting or harmonizing ways by describing the flowers against a backdrop of dark solid conifer and shifting, sweeping willows… the spreading plants such as mint and ribbon grass are planted together to intermingle, while showy, exuberant plants such as Maltese Cross (“scarlet lightning”) are planted to emphasize and challenge the plants (such as white musk-flower *Malva moschata*) that she considers “prim.” It is a fully sensory garden experience, too. A number of the plants are selected as much for their aroma as their own attractiveness, for instance the Scotch roses, sweet clover, and musk-flower. Finally, the entire garden is a place “where sunshine lingered and bees hummed, and winds, beguiled into loitering, purred and rustled”525. The garden has been composed so artlessly that it actually has a transformative effect on nature, familiarizing and personifying the very atmosphere of the garden.

The above is not even a fraction of what can be said about Montgomery’s fictional and real gardens. The main point of what has been said, however, is to show how Montgomery’s own observations of nature and gardens and her way of ordering space caused her to view gardens as a sort of threshold between wild nature and cultivated domestic life, between inside and outside spaces, and between the prelapsarian world that aesthetic experience can reveal to us, and the fallen earth we usually live in. This can be expressed in the landscape through the ordering of spaces, and the thoughtful expression of edges and boundaries in fences, mown and unmown turf, gardened space and wild, and adopting a looser, more rambunctious garden style, at least at Prince Edward Island landscape sites.

524 Ibid., 111. Verbatim, “scarlet lightning that shot its fiery lances over prim white musk-flowers”
525 Ibid.
Since this thesis has previously introduced the concept of Montgomery’s visual motifs in terms of conscious seeing and landscape metaphor, they will not be addressed at length here. Nevertheless, Montgomery’s visual motifs are worth exploring from the purely practical sense of landscape form. To reiterate, the primary visual motifs identified by Epperly in *Montgomery’s Visual Imagination* are: “(1) arches, often formed by branches of trees, and found in woods and around homes; (2) circles or keyholes of light that draw the eye to or through a distant point; (3) curving lines and bends in roads that suggest surprises beyond.”

(See Figure 16) Epperly argues that all these motifs can be found first and foremost in Montgomery’s photographs of Lover’s Lane. Montgomery’s use of these visual motifs were intentionally meant to be experiential, both for herself and her reader: “…She purposely and purposefully reused images and shapes, hoping to create what Bachelard calls meaningful reverberations in the soul.”

Although in photographs the motifs are two-dimensional, in the landscape we must make a different sense of them. What are the landscape components of Montgomery’s visual motifs?

---

527 Ibid., 163.
Using Dee’s categories, Montgomery’s visual motifs—in particular those represented in Lover’s Lane—are paths, but they are also vegetation spaces. Because the motifs direct the eye, they can serve as a visual frame to foci. In Montgomery’s aesthetic, the frame may be more important than the image in the frame—but then again, that may only be because her camera could not expose both the path and the opening at the same time. Dee calls these frames and windows “visual thresholds.” 528 Visual thresholds “mediate the experience of landscape in providing ‘prospect-refuge’ experiences and also a landscape sequence and narrative associated with movement through the landscape.” 529 These may be framed by built form, for example the trellis fence with the wood arch that separated the front yard from the back at the Leaskdale Manse, or they may be vegetation, for instance the entrances to Lover’s Lane that Montgomery photographed. Dee explains in landscape architectural dialect the same effect that Epperly notes in Montgomery’s writing: “The complex and soft texture of foliage and branches ‘locks’ sky and distance into the immediate ‘space’ of the viewer, thus bringing them closer, mediating and giving scale to distant forms.” 530

There is no reason to think that Epperly’s motifs are the only ones to be identified in Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic, particularly when analyzed from the position of landscape architecture, and from a spatial rather than visual perspective. The value of considering motifs lies in its connection to Montgomery’s activity of conscious seeing, and in its ability to direct the literary visitor’s eye (and body) around the landscape.

**Colour**

Montgomery’s observations of colour read on the surface as straightforward examples of the visually dominated Picturesque tradition, but colour held deep psychological meaning for herself and her characters. Montgomery was an expert at depicting colour in words. Montgomery does not usually meditate on one single colour, but on two or more colours that either contrast each other, or else blend harmoniously. For instance, when Montgomery describes the visual effect of the coastal cliffs on Prince Edward Island, she writes that they “are bright red, which

528 Dee, *Form and Fabric*, 175.
529 Ibid.
530 Ibid., 181.
gives a very vivid appearance in contrast to the blue sea and silvery white sand.”531 Sometimes the colour is implicit rather than explicit. When Montgomery writes to a friend about her autumn garden, she only names one of the colours in a scene, leaving the other colours to the imagination, as she writes; “my aster beds are resplendent now and make a deep glorious note of colour amid the mellow greens of the lawn.”532 It is the most striking colour in the scene that has been left to the mind’s eye to imagine.

Colour in Montgomery’s landscape is not merely a stimulus to the eyes, but to the entire embodied experience of landscape. Frank Mahnke’s study of colour attests to Montgomery’s own use and experience of colour; “The human reaction to a color, a color combination, and to the environment is always initially a psychological one, but it can also result in a physiological reaction.”533 This physiological reaction is what Montgomery describes when she elevates colour to an aesthetic practice:

Color is to me what music is to some. Everybody likes colour; with me it is a passion. I revel in it. Last fall in town, attending a vaudeville performance I saw what was called a “Rainbow Dance”—a combination of colored lights thrown on a white-clad girl dancing. I never saw or imagined anything so utterly beautiful and satisfying. My emotions were exactly what you describe yours as being when listening to music. Everything you say of music I can say of color. Hence I understand what music means to you. On my table is a color effect of yellow California poppies that makes me dizzy with delight every time I look at it.534

Gammel says that the emotional and physical reactions to colour that Montgomery and her characters experienced were not necessarily consciously mediated, but that the observations were more intuitive than perceived.535 Montgomery’s use of colour was more than a formal aesthetic observation, but also a somatic experience that could produce emotional and physical response, and for the Anne character, these observations are more intuitive than perceived. Mahnke would

532 Montgomery to MacMillan, September 13, 1913, Bolger, 67.
attribute this reaction to humankind in general: “Colors have cognitive and emotional content...A colour impression is not only a mechanism of seeing, but also a sensation or feeling that simultaneously activates our thoughts and our cognitive mechanism.”\cite{Epperly} Epperly says there is still a wide range of research to be done on Montgomery’s visual imagination, but that colour is one of the “most wonderful” aspects yet to be discovered, especially as science moves closer to being able to describe the full range of effects colour has on the human brain: “Maybe someone will be able to tell me some day what my colour-blind father was seeing when he wept with delight at Montgomery’s colour-drenched depictions of nature.”\cite{Epperly}

**THOUGHTS ON THE INTERPRETATION OF LITERARY LANDSCAPES AND THE AUTHOR’S AESTHETIC**

Three thoughts about the interpretation of literary landscapes emerged out of this landscape architectural-based research. The first is that the field of landscape architecture may be well equipped to address the land use planning/viewshed/regional aspects of literary landscapes—which, along with the way visitors already experience literary landscapes, challenges the assumption that literary places are restricted to a single site. Literary pilgrims disappointed with specific literary sites often extend their understanding of the literary landscape into the surrounding region, to other sites where they can truly say, “this is what the author/character would have experienced.” The heritage/literary value of land beyond the immediate borders of a literary site should be considered not just in terms of conservation or heritage designation, but interpretation as well; the goal should be to both protect and make use of the literary landscape opportunities beyond the immediate site.

The second idea, related to the first, is that when planning the conservation and management of literary landscapes, landscape architects and site guardians might address the disappointments of the literary landscape in three ways: through conservation efforts, through experiential landscape design (where possible), and finally, by acknowledging the shortfalls and

\cite{Mahnke} Mahnke, *Color, Environment, and Human Response*, 7.

\cite{Epperly} Epperly, “Lasting Images,” 42.
disappointments of the specific site directly to the literary visitor. This would not only allow them to represent sites as ongoing, changing landscapes—why not tell the visitor that the early Green Gables park managers had an entirely different idea about leisure, that led them to make changes to the site that today we might consider unconscionable? Would that not make the visitor more emotionally reconciled to their disappointment?—but it would also offer them the opportunity to point visitors towards other places within the region that better fulfill some of the expectations and aesthetic themes that are not or can not be well developed on the site itself. Sending people off-site would not necessarily cut into visitor attendance, either. First, literary seeing is portable; literary visitors already extend their experience of imagined memories beyond the borders of specific literary sites, and are open to considering an appropriately scenic landscape a fulfillment (or best approximation) of their search for the literary landscape. Increasing a visitor’s satisfaction with their visit, and helping other literary sites at the same time, reinforces the pleasures of literary tourism and strengthens the profile of the literary landscape at the same time. In addition, by acknowledging the deficiencies of a site and sharing plans to improve visitor experience (and literary faithfulness), literary sites might create more interest in a literary landscape and increase the chance that visitors will choose to make a return visit.

Let us consider the example of the Balsam Hollow trail at Green Gables Heritage Place. The Balsam Hollow Trail represents an interpretive conundrum for the literary landscape. The interpretive theme of this trail is to connect L.M. Montgomery with plant and animal species of the Acadian Forest. The setting of the trail, surrounded as it is by a golf course, and the forest composition itself being neither undisturbed old growth or early succession forest means it does not represent the full range of Acadian Forest ecosystem types of Prince Edward Island. There is, however, already a destination on the Island that fulfills the goal of providing visitors with the experience and knowledge about the Acadian Forest more thoroughly than can be accomplished at Green Gables. MacPhail Woods Ecological Forestry Project is actually the location of Montgomery’s 1911 meeting with the Governor General of Canada, former home to Dr. Andrew MacPhail, and only a few kilometres from the childhood home of Montgomery’s husband (where she occasionally stayed while visiting the Island). MacPhail Woods “combines protection of the natural area along the streams with wildlife enhancement, forest stewardship, watershed
protection, environmental education and ecological research. It includes the home of Dr. MacPhail, one of the last fragments of old growth Acadian Forest on the Island, a native plant nursery, trail system, forestry demonstrations, workshops on natural history, children’s programs, nature guides, and more.

The final thought that emerged out of the research regarding interpretation at literary sites involved the role of plaques and other written descriptions and how they may affect the landscape experience. Studies about the adoption/awareness of ecological landscape aesthetics, and studies about visitor preferences for interpretation, both tend to point out that less is more when it comes to disseminating information, particularly in written form. Beeho and Prentice discuss how informational plaques that are text-heavy can be tedious for visitors and particularly isolating to children. Poria, Biran and Reichel observe that the need for heritage sites to have individualizable, high-quality interpretation actually requires site guardians to step back from the everything-but-the-kitchen-sink style of interpretation. Meyer’s argument that aesthetic experience makes site users more open to knowledge and interpretation implies that landscape architecture’s theoretical and practical work on experiential landscape design could help guide the integration of site interpretation with the design and management of literary sites.

The L.M. Montgomery sites in Prince Edward Island that were described in Chapter Two provide an example of the role that information plaques can play in the literary landscape. The Haunted Wood Trail interpretation suggests two interpretation quandaries; first that the essence of the Haunted Wood in Montgomery’s journals and in Anne of Green Gables is meant to inspire a certain type of experience. The frequency of the panels along the trail serves to continuously draw the visitor out of the embodied experience and asks them to engage with the landscape cognitively and, perhaps most egregious, didactically. Second, the content of the panels themselves may not be suited to the visitor expectations and level of knowledge of the two main groups of visitors, literary pilgrims and casual cultural tourists.

The plaques along the trails at the Green Gables site, though in general not excessively full of text, probably have too much text for the landscape setting (see Appendix 1 for examples
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of the Haunted Wood and Balsam Hollow trails). Along the Haunted Wood Trail, there is not enough landscape, or specifically variety of landscape, motif, or natural ‘tableau’ to contain the number of textual prompts that occur. There are too many invitations to thought, and not enough offerings of setting in which to think. The visitor is obliged to frequently interrupt what should be an immersive walk in the woods, or else to skip plaques and wonder if they might have missed important information by doing so. Ideally, the Haunted Wood Trail could use more text-based prompts that act more like the concrete poetry and less like instruction. Engraved boulders, benches, or even wooden signs that name a metaphor out of Montgomery’s writings (for instance, “cathedral” placed where the trees take on that particular columnar arching quality that Montgomery loved) could convey messages about Montgomery’s appreciation of nature without overwhelming the visitor with text, and might even be more enjoyable for children who may play a sort of eye-spy game with these concrete literary-nature references.

These suggestions encompass the tourists seeking thematic experiences of Green Gables Heritage Place, but are not terribly conducive to the information-seeking tourists. For those tourists, guides or informational plaques would probably be most effective if they described the state of the “Haunted Woods” in Montgomery’s day, the cutting down of the Schoolhouse Woods, images of regrowth as the forest grew back up, and an open acknowledgement of how the golf course has changed the face of the landscape. This allows tourists to compare and contrast the past landscape with the present, and can help them understand the sort of landscape changes that affected Montgomery so profoundly. As a compromise between the educationally- and the experientially-motivated tourists, perhaps limiting the number of panels along the Haunted Wood Trail to three or four context-based panels could be used that would combine the historical/environmental context and the writings inspired by these settings at the same time.

More than ever, landscape architects are involved in discovering how knowledge and environmental psychology mediates our experience of designed and natural landscapes, and how these experiences play a role in the development of ecological consciousness. The existence of this research suggests that it is worth exploring further how landscape architects might participate in the interpretation of literary (and heritage) sites.
This chapter explored, even more than the previous chapter, how thematic and aesthetic approaches to literary landscape analysis can reveal points of connection between an author’s landscape aesthetic and the experience of literary visitors, even decades, sometimes centuries, after landscape was first ‘written into’ fiction or poem. An awareness and knowledge of an author’s way of seeing becomes part of the visitor expectations for literary pilgrims. Casual literary visitors, on the other hand, with only a generally thematic understanding of the significance of a literary landscape, seek confirmation of this theme in the landscape, but may be open to gaining knowledge about the author’s relationship to the landscape over the course of their visit. Thus, being able to ‘site’ the author’s aesthetic in the actual landscape through theme, form and function can contribute to site interpretation. Finally, an author’s landscape aesthetic can help guide the design, planning, and landscape management decisions of the literary landscapes and/or areas of literary heritage sites that do not fall under heritage conservation guidelines—for instance, parking lots, visitor centres, walking trails, site boundaries and entrances, etc. For all these reasons, it makes sense to take time to research and analyze an author’s landscape aesthetic from a landscape architectural position.

So what did the exploration of L.M. Montgomery from a landscape aesthetic and landscape element approach reveal in this chapter? Well, nature is part of Montgomery’s “portable landscape” in that nature is a phenomenon that people can experience anywhere—an embodied nature experience. This is an “immersive aesthetic” that encourages engagement with nature, not passive viewing. However, Montgomery’s own experience of nature was always highly specific to place and time, particularly the nature she loved best—in Prince Edward Island, and especially along Lover’s Lane. Montgomery had a desire to know nature—to know the names of the plants she saw, to follow the seasons of their growth, and to understand how the landscape she saw came to be. In addition, Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic as a way of seeing was largely based on the aesthetic experience of landscape and its potential to reveal inspiration, elevate our minds, and be physically beneficial. Though Montgomery, like environmental psychologists, contend that Peak Experience or “The Flash” cannot be willed into being, these same psychologists explicitly—and Montgomery, more often than not, implicitly—argue that it is possible to develop a sort of aesthetic ‘muscle memory’ that makes aesthetic apprehension of
any sort more likely to occur. Montgomery used the tools available to her—Picturesque and Romantic landscape traditions, conscious seeing, and everyday beauty—to increase her capacity to have embodied aesthetic experiences. Montgomery’s aesthetic was, distilled into its simplest message, about approaching every day with an openness to the world’s potential for beauty, in any place, and perhaps developing a kinder and more reciprocal relationship with the natural world as a result. Elizabeth Rollins Epperly reflects this lesson in her description of her own study of Montgomery’s visual imagination:

Montgomery’s written descriptions showed me what her black and white photographs also suggested: there is drama in the everyday world; there are metaphors to be perceived and understood through the familiar shapes and colours we find around us. We can choose the elements of the metaphors we want to live by.\footnote{Epperly, “Lasting Images,” 41.}
Chapter 5

A satirical fake-news program on CBC Radio recently posted an online news story about a new attraction in Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, “the Green Gabler, an Anne-of-Green-Gables-inspired roller coaster” that uses the story *Anne of Green Gables* to guide the design of the ride’s aerial twists and turns.

The coaster hopes to emulate all the thrills and twists in Anne's adventures. The cars are a bright red with braids, leaving riders with no doubt that they are Anne. It all starts with a steep climb up Foster Care Mountain to the Adoption Drop, an incredible 84 degree dive inspired by Anne's feelings about traveling to PEI to meet her adoptive family. The steel coaster then banks hard to the left as Anne learns the Cuthbert's were expecting a boy to help work the farm. And so it goes, every twist of the coaster ripped right from the pages of LM Montgomery's beloved book. The entire story unfolds in an intense, three-minute burst of helixes and drops and upside-down loops, leaving riders screaming with terror and joy as they look forward to the next "bend in the road." 

It is not difficult at all to add to the absurd description of the fictional roller coaster’s design. A tunnel of strobe lights could represent "The White Way of Delight," which might be followed by a sudden plunge into the "Lake of Shining Waters," and subsequently a climb up the Alpine Path would turn into a steep fall that represented "Sudden Death" (reflecting the loss of Matthew Cuthbert), followed by a blind turn representing Marilla's failing eyesight and the bend in the road, which would then reveal the final stretch of coaster track, a suspension bridge called "hopes and dreams" (as Anne puts off college to stay at Green Gables)... the power of Montgomery’s imagery lends itself easily to concrete expressions. This bit of satire is effective, in large part, because it draws on the existing reputation of *Anne* tourism as a kitschy, over-commercialized artifice, as well as the narrative authority of the novel. It makes the tourism infrastructure that already exists into an absurd version of itself, but this absurdity is not without precedent. From early on, Montgomery’s writings have been used to inform or justify the...

---

creation of any number of tourist attracts that were inconsonant with her landscape aesthetic. Take, for instance, the first iteration of the Green Gables Golf Course. In a 1940 brochure, Parks Canada proclaimed the course’s seamless integration of Montgomery’s narrative landscape with the golf landscape:

All artifices of modern golf architecture have been employed in designing the course, and many of the points of interest portrayed in the literature of the district, have been woven into the layout… The route of play, location of tees, and the selection of sites for greens have been carefully arranged to preserve natural features associated with the stories.\textsuperscript{543}

A circa-1940’s booklet said much the same thing, but expanded on the skill of the designer, and made more explicit the golfer’s interaction with the story: “…golfers may play over holes called the "Lake of Shining Waters," "Dryad’s Bubble," "Matthew's Field," and "Haunted Wood".”\textsuperscript{544} If a golf course can be designed to mimic the landscape and the events of a novel, then how far a stretch is it, really, to conceive that a roller coaster might do the same?

The ease with which we can imagine up literal landscape references to the events, characters, settings, and themes found in novels is a testament to how ubiquitous the literary way of seeing is in our culture. As long as we have a story, it is easy to site and invent landscapes and experiences to act them out in. The ongoing popularity of literary landscapes is aided by a healthy preference for cultural tourism and the proliferation of film adaptations of popular and classic novels. In addition, the internet, rather than usurping the attention paid to ‘real-life’ versions of fictional landscapes, has actually continued to reinforce and strengthen the literary landscape way of seeing. Online travel sites, blog posts, fan communities, image-sharing and social networking allow people to share experiences, celebrate places that serve the author’s landscape aesthetic, and locate fictional characters and events in the real world—and then add these places and experiences to their own personal travel wish-lists. And the types of sharing mentioned above are merely the user-generated methods of sharing literary landscapes online; to these must be added the literary landscape-themed web pages created by government agents such

\textsuperscript{543} “Prince Edward Island General Information and Map,” (Parks Canada, 1940), accessed May 20, 2014, \url{http://parkscanadahistory.com/brochures/pei-ipe/brochure-1940.pdf}.
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as the Canada’s Historic Places online listing, or the Library and Archives Canada page dedicated to a national “literary tour,” or the non-profit Project Bookmark Canada, that “puts stories and poems in the exact, physical locations where literary scenes are set.”

However much the literary landscape is reinforced online, however, the individual visitor will still have to deal with the disappointments that the novel, and then their virtual visits, do not address. The disconnect between visitor motivation and expectations versus the actual experience of the literary landscape remains built in to the very nature of real-and-imagined seeing.

Consider, for instance, a recent article published in the New York Times called “Searching for ‘Anne of Green Gables’ on Prince Edward Island.” The author of the article, Ann Mah, who would almost certainly qualify as a literary pilgrim, experienced the literary landscape as a succession of moments of elation and deflation, as Cavendish both was and was not the real-and-imagined landscape she was seeking:

The east gable room — in fact, the entire house — was so exactly as I’d pictured it during my many readings of the book, I felt a pang of nostalgia for my own childhood.

Outside, the farmyard jolted me back to reality — both its depictions of 19th-century rural life, particularly grueling in the harsh Canadian Maritimes climate, as well as its incongruous surroundings, which quickly broke the spell. An 18-hole golf course now spreads over the former woods and farmland that abutted the home; the drone of a lawn mower accompanied my walk through the manicured grove of trees recreated as the book’s “Haunted Wood,” and instead of the wailing ghost of Anne’s imagination, I met club-toting golfers.


Mah’s visit to Prince Edward Island could stand in as the archetypal literary pilgrimage to the Island. Consider her impression of Cavendish, which revealed “slivers of beauty snatched between the carnival-style attractions peppering [the community],” a place that would be “unrecognizable” to Montgomery, “no longer the “haunt of ancient peace”. This impression is balanced out by Mah’s experience of the Island as a whole: “…as I ventured farther afield in my rental car, the island’s splendor opened up to me…” the island felt “familiar” because Mah knew Montgomery’s scenic descriptions so well. Cavendish may be lost to time and tourism, “but elsewhere, the island’s “green seclusion” endures.”

Mah, like the literary pilgrims Sweet interviewed, turn to the entire Prince Edward Island landscape to find the fulfillment of their aesthetic literary landscape expectations.

In light of the ongoing popularity of literary tourism and its proliferation online, it seems unlikely that literary-influenced ways of seeing and visiting landscape will diminish any time soon. Such a popular way of seeing, with its great potential to engage people’s emotions, intellect, and environmental ethos, should certainly be acknowledged within landscape architectural theory, and part of the knowledge set of any landscape architect who frequently works with cultural and heritage landscapes.

**RELEVANCE TO LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE**

A number of different fields have engaged with the subject of literary landscapes; their origins in literary style and early expressions of form, the history of literary tourism, the experience and motivations of the literary tourist, literary landscapes as cultural symbol, as heritage site, and as metaphor. Within the field of landscape architecture, even within the theoretical dialogue, there appears to be a dearth of work that deals directly with this subject. In fact, the only research solely dedicated to literary landscapes that could be found while researching this thesis, Jane Gillette’s exploratory essay/bibliographical proposal (mentioned in the first chapter), treated literary landscapes as exclusively virtual, fictional spaces, with no real-world presence. This thesis aimed to provide a theoretical and practical background to literary

---


550 I am not considering narrative landscape theory in this statement, whose proponents seek to distance themselves from literary landscapes and “literalism,” anyway.
landscapes that could be applied to the theory, research, and eventually practical concerns of the field of landscape architecture. Although it is a synthesis of the theory and evidence from fields such as tourism studies, cultural geography, environmental and landscape history, and literary criticism, it has hopefully revealed the connections between those fields and landscape architecture, connections which warrant future research.

**THESIS TAKE-AWAYS: A SUMMARY OF THE LITERARY LANDSCAPE APPROACH**

This thesis has discussed how the literary landscape is both a type of place and a way of seeing. It argued that the study of literary landscapes could contribute to the theory of landscape architecture, in particular the scholarship on landscape meaning. It proposed that this theoretical discussion of literary landscapes can also have practical application, and that the well-established research on existential authenticity, visitor experience, and visitor motivations, not to mention landscape preference and reception theory, can all contribute to this application. By embracing a literary, narrative, and thematic approach to landscape, landscape architects might develop analytical and indeed design methods that encompass the full place- and culture-specific context of literary landscapes, as well as better understand the role that landscape meaning plays in the experience of the landscape visitors. The following is a series of statements, followed by explanations, that summarize the main points touched on in this thesis:

**Literary landscape meaning is experiential**
This thesis, while using the example of literary landscapes, has been pointing towards the idea that the perception of meaning in landscape relies as much on experience as it does on intended meaning and prior knowledge. Meaning may or may not be able to be designed into the landscape, but literary landscapes show us that meaning can be found in the landscape. How does this happen? On one level, authors mediate their observed landscape into fiction, that is read and embraced by visitors who project this meaning back into the “real” landscape as they experience it. Experience is the key word here. We may not design meaning into the landscape but as landscape architects we can design experience into the landscape. This is where narrative landscape devices and experiential design can play a part. Meaning ‘comes to pass’ through the visitor experience of these features, especially when the experience is designed so as to spark
some recognition of landscape preference in the visitor, a transcendent moment of beauty, to evoke a landscape that could be populated by the ghosts of authors and characters, and to bring about an ‘existential state of Being’ that the visitor feels, to their bones, is authentic—that they are truly themselves in that moment. Herbert highlights the experiential quality of literary place and addresses how these landscapes are made ‘real’ by the visitor:

Places acquire meanings from imaginative worlds, but these meanings and the emotions they engender are real to the beholder… literary places can be “created” with these fictional worlds in mind and tourists may be less concerned with distinctions between fiction and reality than with what stirs their imaginations and raises their interests.\(^{551}\)

**The experience of literary landscapes implies a specific mode of conscious seeing that parallels the tourist gaze.**

The tourism industry that sprang up on Prince Edward Island around L. M. Montgomery’s novels could not have done so, as successful as quickly as it did, if the novels did not already replicate practices of touristic seeing. This is true for all successful literary landscapes, since both writers and visitors are linked in a shared cultural way of seeing landscape. The literary landscape way of seeing is not vaguely “cultural,” but specifically touristic, since both literature and tourism engages the reader in the practice of landscape semiotics (of seeing, understanding, and sometimes replicating symbols and their meaning), in an escape from the everyday, and in evaluating our pleasure in the novel or trip based on existential authenticity.

**An author’s landscape aesthetic can be analyzed using much of the design language already available to landscape architects, including landscape preference, landscape narrative, and when relevant, ecological aesthetics.**

While Chapters Three and Four drew heavily on the literary criticism of Montgomery’s work and life in order to draw out characterizations and themes of the author’s landscape aesthetic. This approach revealed, however, that when an author’s aesthetic is considered alongside the cultural, historic, and environmental context of their time, and also with a knowledge of the nature of

aesthetic experience, then it is possible to draw more direct correlations between the author’s aesthetic and the design language used by landscape architects.

The meaning of literary landscapes is usually nostalgic and antimodern, but care must be taken not to uncritically reinforce the simplifications that are necessarily present in narratives and symbolic landscapes.

 Literary landscapes are wonderful opportunities to encourage imaginative, immersive experiences with landscape and literature simultaneously. There are, however, drawbacks to be aware of. The very practice of story-telling requires distilling information into smaller, more comprehensible units. Mike Crang writes that one of the most interesting aspects of a literary landscape is “seeing how certain places and spatial divisions are established within the literary text” through plot, character, and the author’s life. These spatial divisions in the literary text do not always stay in the text, however, and the simplifications or idealizations in the textual landscape can be reinforced in the real-world literary landscape (and become destructive to local knowledge and access) if care is not taken in the design and especially interpretation of literary sites. It is not absolutely necessary to discard the nostalgia that appeals so strongly to Montgomery and her readers. Steffler suggests there is space for innovation in nostalgia, which

…can inspire important beliefs in alternatives for the future... As family, place, and nation become more fluid, such self-generated, compensatory, and alternative affiliations begin to provide the criteria and definition of home. Nostalgia is capable of playing a constructive role in this process.

One way to deal with the antimodernisms of the imagined and the real literary landscape is to keep in mind that these expressions are not reflections of fact, but contemporary ways of negotiating change and identity, as themselves abstractions of concrete things.

A fear of literalism should not restrict our approach to literary landscapes, which are, by definition, literal (as in, a reference).

Rather than thinking of our attempt to reflect the author’s landscape aesthetic in terms of converting words into form (which invites the criticism that narrative landscapes are one-note,
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too literal, and simplify complex ideas), we can think of the design of literary landscapes in two ways. First, these literary landscapes are the embodied form of a story that has been told about our place in nature. They represent a relationship with nature conceived of by the author. What can be implied in the design of the literary landscape is that relationship, and that way of seeing. The visitors will tell the story to themselves, individualized through their own experience, if they can first understand the significance of the landscape from its design. Second, and even more essentially, these landscapes are not word translated into form. Rather, as Laurie Olin points out, “forms come from forms first. Forms do not come from words. They cannot. Words can describe physical forms, but they do not (or did not) originate them; nor can they perform operations upon them.”

The act of designing for literary landscapes that are based on an author’s own aesthetic can be understood as the act of turning form back in to form. This act requires interpretation, yes, and interpretation can be fallible, but fortunately the type of interpretations visitors themselves enact on the landscape can often make up for the shortcomings of the designer.

The author’s landscape aesthetic can be described formally, thematically, or as specific elements and motifs that repeat throughout the author’s work.

Chapters Three and Four revealed was that it is not enough to state that an author’s landscape aesthetic can serve as a guide to the design of literary landscapes. They showed that there are two levels that the author’s aesthetic operates: in an overarching, thematic way—for instance, the “Home” theme of Chapter Three, or the “conscious seeing” of Chapter Four—as well as in the very specific observations and manipulations of the author—specific plants highlighted in writing or journals, gardening activities, descriptions of landscape form and function, and visual motifs that repeat and serve as both aesthetic inspiration and metaphors. While it is fully possible that site guardians can provide landscape architects with descriptions of an author’s landscape aesthetic, there can be particular value in the landscape architect’s ability to perform their own analysis and synthesize this aesthetic into a plan that considers the priorities of site guardians, visitors, and conservation.

---

554 Olin, “Form, Meaning, and Expression,” 34-5.
DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The first, over-arching research question, shared in Chapter One, asked what connections could be drawn between the nature of literary landscapes and the theory of landscape architecture, specifically, how we might characterize that relationship. In answer to that, this thesis has hopefully shown that landscape architects should feel confident in their ability to address literary landscapes on both a theoretical and practical level. There are many shared theoretical considerations between landscape architecture and literary landscapes—questions of landscape meaning, how people experience landscape, how to define and express landscape aesthetics, and the potential for embodied landscape aesthetics to be the entry point for greater levels of ecological knowledge and environmental empathy, for a start—that make landscape architecture a legitimate position from which to investigate literary landscapes. Furthermore, the popularity of literary landscapes, not just as literary sites but also their possible planning dimensions in terms of literary trails, heritage districts, and even their relevance to cultural planning in many towns and cities, make them enough of a concern to justify the existence of a body of theory and practice (however small) that landscape architects who come across literary landscapes can draw on. The additional research questions, with a description of the thesis conclusions, are as follows:

How would we define L. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic particularly as it relates to the theory of landscape architecture?

L.M. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic can be described as a combination of a formal aesthetic that is largely visual and an embodied practice of conscious seeing that embraces both small-scale landscape appreciation and transcendent peak experience. Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic can be transposed into the theory and design language of landscape architecture through comparisons to landscape preference, narrative landscapes, and individual landscape features. For instance, to describe Montgomery’s aesthetic in landscape architecture terms, we might discuss landscape preferences such as mystery and legibility, or design principles such as sequencing and naming, motifs and foci, with specific landscape features such as orchards and brooks, and the heavy use of native trees and plants, which are harmoniously combined with old-fashioned heritage/heirloom flowers and flowering shrubs.
What sort of landscape values or expectations are visitors likely to bring with them to these landscapes?

Literary pilgrims arrive at literary landscapes with a host of motivations, expectations, and hopes. Although literary pilgrims are knowledgeable about the author’s work and possibly the author’s life as well, and despite their familiarity with the descriptions of the landscape, literary pilgrims are primarily seeking an emotional connection with the landscape. While the specific details of the landscape have an effect on their experience, ultimately just one keenly felt moment of connection with the author, characters, or landscape can make a visit—despite its disappointments—worthwhile to the literary visitor. In fact, because of their familiarity with an author’s work, literary pilgrims are better able to cope with the disappointment of a literary site, as they have the knowledge that allows them to perceive the author’s aesthetic in places other than the site of the novel or its composition.

The average literary visitor, on the other hand, arrives at a literary place with only a general impression of the author’s work and significance. They have an idea of what the landscape should ‘mean,’ but it is a thematic meaning, not a specific one, and so they seek out symbolic signifiers of this meaning. The average literary visitor may be seeking an educational experience, or they may be seeking entertainment. In either case, when they perceive these landscape symbols, they are inclined to be more open to learning about the historical significance of the site and its relationship to the author.

What sort of aesthetic landscape message should be communicated to visitors unfamiliar with L.M. Montgomery’s life and work?

The answer to this question can be found in the previous answers. In order to be able to answer this question definitively, this research would need to go farther into this thesis has argued that a thematic approach to the design and interpretation of literary landscape has the most potential for simultaneously meeting the visitor expectations of both literary pilgrims and casual literary visitors. A thematic approach is highly compatible with the visitor experience approach to site management, especially at Green Gables, since Parks Canada has incorporated visitor experience into its management practices. The desire to provide a variety of interpretive themes to engage a wide swath of visitors, who can then individualize the visit for themselves, works well in a landscape setting. Trails at Green Gables are already thematic, for instance, while the garden, evokes yet another theme. The Macneill Homestead is strongly thematic with its
nostalgic/commemorative approach and its illustration of Montgomery’s home. Additional research might reveal other landscape themes, especially ones that build on Montgomery’s ecological aesthetic. This thesis identified some primary Montgomery landscape themes as:

1. The theme of Home manifested in the landscape (antimodern landscape symbols)
2. A theme of landscape change—but timeless experiences of nature
3. The theme of “nature on the doorstep”—with the garden, or alternately the experience of beauty, as intermediary between humanity and nature.

LOOKING FORWARD: FURTHER RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This thesis has been written first and foremost to introduce landscape architects to the theory and background of literary landscapes. Author L.M. Montgomery was used as a sort of informal case study to help explore the nature and function of literary landscapes, but an attempt was not made to provide a definitive, applied study of L.M. Montgomery’s literary landscapes. Moving forward, there are a number of directions for further research that involve applying the theory discussed here to the research, analysis, design, interpretation, and management of literary landscapes.

1. Developing analytical tools
   Explore how to analyze the real and the imagined aspects of literary landscape using both critical visual study and the descriptive/reception theory approach, and how to integrate these findings into the design and management plans of literary sites. Part of the purpose of this research would be suggest when specific literary landscape approaches are warranted, and how they would be applied, and when current practice for cultural and heritage landscapes already suits. This approach would probably also use grounded theory, as it would provide a more flexible, reactive way to research and design, considering the complicated relationships between author, literary visitors, site managers, heritage concerns, and so on.

2. Children’s experience of literary landscapes
   In addition, research into how children experience literary landscapes, and what can be done to engage them at literary sites might be valuable. Nicola J. Watson observed anecdotally that
children’s relationship to literary landscapes is markedly different from that of their parents, and children make up a significant portion of literary visitors—20 per cent of Montgomery attraction visitors in Prince Edward Island, for instance—their experience warrants further investigation. Although literary places such as Green Gables and Hill Top Farm (Beatrix Potter) are ostensibly about childhood, in practice they are generally designed and interpreted to appeal to adult memories of childhood. For instance, L.M. Montgomery reminisced very frequently about childhood, but there appear to be limited opportunities for childhood play and discovery at the sites associated with L.M. Montgomery (to clarify, Green Gables operates children’s programs, but the landscape itself is not designed to maximize unstructured play for children). While the nearby tourism attraction Avonlea Village may meet the childhood need for play and imagination better, Montgomery sites with legitimate, in situ Montgomery connections should still aim to provide greater interaction for children in the landscape.

3. Visitor-generated literary landscape content
One of the more intriguing research ideas that arose from researching this thesis was the potential for using online travel reviews and other user-generated online content to analyze the experience and performance of literary landscape destinations. These unsolicited, informal reviews provide a wealth of information to the landscape architect. People self-identify as literary pilgrims or casual visitors, assess their visit in relation to its cost, its quality of experience, complain about facilities, identify and extoll stand-out landscape features, identify opportunities for improvement, celebrate or complain about the quality of interpretation, and more. The images visitors share of their visit to these travel websites and the ones they host on photo sharing sites such as Flickr and Instagram provide landscape architects and site managers with a catalog of visual landscape characteristics. These images represent what each visitor considers worth remarking on in the landscape, and while they may represent exclusions from the scene—few tourists share the ugly and disappointing aspects of their travels—they also show what ‘works’ at a literary landscape, and might reveal some landscape features and landscape opportunities that have value to visitors, but of which we are yet unaware of.
4. Determining significance and conservation approach

There are a few occasions in this thesis where I point out that the traditional approach to heritage landscapes and landscape conservation may very well suffice when it comes to the designations and protection of literary landscapes. The first step of conservation decision-making process includes understanding the site by “identify[ing] and describ[ing] the character-defining elements that are important in defining the overall heritage value of the historic place.” Statements of Significance, as they are presented in the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, are sufficient for explaining the connection of a literary site to its author, and pointing out the cultural values and landscape features still extant at the site. Still, research might be directed towards the confirmation of this argument, with a goal of pointing out when exceptions might be needed to grant stronger recognition of the literary value of certain heritage places and cultural landscapes. In addition, we might ask how a Statement of Significance could be applied to the interpretation of literary landscapes.

Finally, the emphasis in this thesis on visitor expectation and visitor experience and the idea that we can understand an author’s landscape aesthetic as both real and imagined, raises the potential for a fundamental disconnect between the literary landscape in and of itself, and the literary landscape as a heritage site. In some cases, it seems plausible that Standard Two of the Standards and Guidelines, which require protection of “changes to an historic place that, over time, have become character-defining elements in their own right,” would be compatible with a literary landscape approach when the site has been developed over a long period of time as a literary destination. Standard Four, however, “do not create a false sense of historical development by adding elements from other historic places or other properties or by combining features of the same property that never coexisted,” seems to preclude landscape interventions—even simple ones—that enhance the realization of the author’s landscape aesthetic, but are not considered valid from a purely heritage conservation angle. What to do when best conservation practices—for instance, those laid out in the Standards and Guidelines mentioned above—are in conflict with the meaning and aesthetic values of the author? Is interpretation the only way to incorporate the ‘imagined’ into those landscapes? This situation could be examined.
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at greater length, particularly from a case study approach. Additions made to literary sites over the years should be evaluated based on whether or not they qualify as character-defining elements, and if their potentially legitimate literary value can outweigh the heritage values that disapprove of “additions that falsify the story of a place.” Special weight might be placed on whether these changes define the literary character of the site. So, for instance, the changes carried out by Montgomery’s cousins who owned Green Gables might qualify as a character-defining element, as might the early move by Parks Canada to paint the house with its white and green colour scheme, and add shutters to the windows. There is some indication this has already been done, but the distinction between “original” elements, fictional elements, and introduced elements is not always clear in the Statements of Significance. In Appendix 3, the Statement of Significance for Green Gables Heritage House, the shutters and green paint colour are described as “traditional,” but it does not specify that this is a literary landscape tradition, rather than an original feature. Likewise, the Statement of Significance for L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Sites of Canada (Appendix 4) includes in its Character-Defining Elements the Balsam Hollow Trail, which has no antecedents in Montgomery’s Anne novels or Montgomery’s journal (she does mention the brook, and the hollow, but does not name it as such). The Canadian Register of Historic Places guide “Writing Statements of Significance” lists “aesthetic value” as one of the heritage values that contribute towards the case for designation:

Aesthetic value refers to the sensory qualities of a historic place (seeing, hearing, touching, smelling and tasting) in the context of broader categories of design and tradition. A place may have aesthetic significance because it evokes a positive sensory response, or because it epitomizes a defined architectural style or landscape concept. Visual aesthetic value is typically expressed through form, colour, texture or materials. It is possible for historic places to have other aesthetic values as well, such as auditory ones. Historic places with aesthetic significance may reflect a particular style or period of construction or craftsmanship, or represent the work of a well-known architect, planner, engineer or builder.

---

557 Ibid., 27.
558 I may be mistaken, but I could not find any mention of “Balsam Hollow” in Montgomery’s Selected Journals.
Additional values that might relate to literary landscapes include social value, spiritual value, and cultural associations.\textsuperscript{560} So, the cultural and community activities that currently take place at the Leaskdale Manse and Church Museum—which supports local playwrights and performers and other creative arts inspired by Montgomery and uses the church as a performance space—might some day in the future incorporate this cultural significance into what is at the moment a very straightforward, historical accounting of facts in the Statement of Significance (Appendix 5).

5. Post Occupancy Evaluations for literary landscapes
Finally, future research into literary landscapes might include conducting Post Occupancy Evaluations to determine if the designed literary landscape and/or specific landscape interventions meet the interpretive goals of the site.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

On the weekend that I made my site visits to Prince Edward Island, a windstorm had swept through the Maritimes, closing down the Confederation Bridge to high-sided vehicles. The tractor-trailers were parked on the side of the road, one behind the other, for what seemed like kilometres. Driving across the bridge, I resisted the buffet of the wind against the steering wheel, and since the speed limit had been lowered for safety, I was able to catch glimpses of the Northumberland Strait, water churning feverishly and red-brown with sediment. The wind kept up overnight, and in the morning when I headed over to Green Gables, the sky was the sort of grey that throws green grass into bright relief, but seems to dim all other colours. It was easy to keep a critical eye out as I walked around the Green Gables grounds and did the trails. Though my fingers were cold and stiff, I kept my camera tucked inside my coat to keep the batteries warm, made notes on a map of the site, and jotted down my thoughts on a clipboard I had loaded up with paper. Here were some weathered interpretive panels; here was a garden with hollyhocks and daisies, and here an unfortunate bed overflowing with ratty end-of-season hostas. Oh, so this is Lover’s Lane—or is it? Something not clear here—there goes a golf cart as an interpretive panel encourages me to think about my spiritual connection to nature.

\textsuperscript{560} Ibid., 11.
I intended to visit the Macneill Homestead second, because at the time I was still thinking the thesis would be about how literary site managers took imagined landscape features and introduced them into the ‘real’ literary landscape. I expected that Green Gables, which was the most ‘invented’ of the two sites, would provide me with more to comment on. Also, I was delaying gratification a little bit, since I expected to get more personal enjoyment out of the Macneill Homestead site. The Anne books have never been my favourite Montgomery novels; I always preferred the Emily trilogy. I walked the length of the Haunted Wood Trail, but I had not paid admission to the Homestead, so I backtracked, got in my car, and drove over instead. As I pulled into the parking lot, the wind, which had maintained its bluster this whole time, finally seemed to punched a hole into the oppressive cloud cover, and just like that the grey sky broke up into a thousand smaller clouds and the sun cast its warm October glow over everything. Given the way Montgomery wove nature into her narratives, it was just the sort of moment you would expect and hope to happen while on a pilgrimage to her much-loved home, and I couldn’t help but give in to it. Though I tried to maintain a certain distance from the subject matter over the course of the visit, my professionalism came and went. I could calmly photograph and admire the way the interpretive panels matched content to scene so perfectly one minute, and then be overtaken with a thrill over the same scene in the next. John Macneill was clearing away branches and tree limbs that had come down in the windstorm, and he was friendly and helpful at pointing out some features of the site to me. His son’s dogs wandered the property, grinning with sleepy Sunday afternoon smiles (even though it was a Friday—they were Labrador retrievers). I visited the Macneill Homestead expecting some enjoyment, but intending to be focused mostly on landscape analysis. I ended up a literary pilgrim, the kind who takes pictures of everything, whether it be tourist gaze-approved scenery or a hedge along the edge of the parking lot.

What did my experience show me? It certainly confirmed pretty much everything I had been reading about the experience of the literary tourist. I now saw personally how a bit of knowledge about an author’s life and landscapes can be powerfully effective at heightening one’s experience of landscape. I engaged in a landscape experience of imagined memories. I saw, and was disappointed, by the ‘failures’ of the landscape to live up to the fictional setting at Green Gables. At the same time, one simple sight, such as the farm fields south of the Macneill Homestead, was enough to lift my spirits and provide me with a feeling of authentic experience; “Yes, this is where she lived, this was the view out her window as she daydreamed in the
evenings—and it is still here!” And I realized it is okay to give up on the myth that a landscape architect could approach literary landscapes impassively. Perhaps personal passions—the kind that might have inspired an author’s landscape description in the first place—should also have a role in the design and interpretation of literary landscapes. After all, experience is the thing.

William Cronon encourages environmental historians to write “not just stories about nature, but stories about stories about nature.” It strikes me that this is the goal and function of narrative landscape; the way we reveal natural processes in our designs, gather and name and conceal… all this is really our story about a story about nature. And adopting a landscape aesthetic approach to Montgomery’s landscapes does the same—Montgomery’s landscape aesthetic is really a story about nature, and what our relationship to it could be. So, if we seek to reflect Montgomery’s landscape values in her landscapes, we are telling a story about her story about nature. I think the Macneill Homestead is so successful as a literary pilgrimage destination because its present-day form and function is a story made manifest in the landscape; it tells the story of a home in its landscape, how it was lost to Montgomery, and how by assuming care for that ruined homestead, a husband and wife healed an old family breach. The site guardians themselves are characters in this landscape story, and their care for the land reflects Montgomery’s own relationship to this exact same place.
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APPENDIX 1 - SITE VISITS

Green Gables Heritage Place

The first view of Green Gables House from the driveway that accesses the parking lot.

View from the bottom of the parking lot looking toward the visitor centre (upper right). Without meaning to belabour the point, the parking lot of Green Gables is overwhelmingly large, especially in the shoulder seasons when it is mostly empty (a preferred travel time for literary pilgrims)

The front step of Green Gables, looking toward the reconstructed barn.
Green Gables house. Note the sickly fruit tree outside the parlour. The house’s green-painted gable ends are not contemporary to Montgomery or described in the novels, but are an invention of Parks Canada.

A view of the golf course from the south side yard of Green Gables. Montgomery photographed the same scene when it was still a pasture. The slight resemblance to past land uses can be welcome or unsettling.

The beginning of Lover’s Lane. It is not obvious while walking the path where it deviates from its original route and becomes Balsom Hollow Trail.
The Haunted Wood Trail features older single-age spruce wood as well as a more mixed second-growth stage. It is divided by the golf course, which visitors must cross to continue on the trail. A recent trail re-alignment has been disguised by the planting of some White Pine trees. Visitors who choose to simultaneously pay entrance fees to Green Gables and Montgomery’s Cavendish Home can walk to the end of this trail and cross Route 13 to reach the other site.

“Everything was invested with a kind of fairy grace and charm, emanating from my own fancy. L.M. Montgomery worked a special magic on her quiet Cavendish surroundings. Use your own imagination to discover how real-life people, places and events inspired the enchanting world of Anne.”

While visitors to the Haunted Wood Trail are encouraged to engage in imaginative projection, the experience is general, reliant more on impressions not information, and not a narrative recreation of Anne’s walk through the Haunted Wood.

The Balsam Hollow Trail criss-crosses the brook multiple times, and along with natural grades, run-off from trail and golf course, required restoration work undertaken in Fall 2013, included re-routing the trail away from the banks of the brook as much as possible.

“I had always a deep love of nature. A little fern growing in the woods, a shallow sheet of June-bells under the firs, moonlight falling on the ivory column of a tall birch...all gave me...feelings which I had then no vocabulary to express.”

The text of Balsam Hollow plaques emphasizes Montgomery’s poetic appreciation of nature, while the native species featured on each plaque receive no further explanation.
L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish Home
(Macneill Homestead)

“I consider it a misfortune to love any place as I love this old homestead... the agony of parting from it is intolerable. I love this old home deeply... and I love Cavendish.”

The red sandstone foundation of the Macneill Homestead.

Site guardians, Montgomery’s great-nephew and his wife and son, carefully maintain and cultivate the grounds, giving an air of stewardship and continuity to the site, making it a living site, rather than solely a nostalgic ruin than conveys the impression of being frozen in time.

An apple tree, one of the remnants of the old front orchard, grows off the corner of the house foundation.
Possibly the most important (and last) Montgomery “view” still left intact following the tourist development of Cavendish. Interpretive signage informs the viewer without overwhelming with information.

The start of the old laneway leading up to the Macneill Homestead, when approached from the Haunted Wood Trail.
The old lane balances care while showing the effects of time in the landscape. The tunnel effect, with the field alongside partially obscured, evokes the visual motifs of Montgomery’s Lover’s Lane, transposed to her home landscape.

“As I walked up it I would see the kitchen light shining through the trees. I would pass under the birches... and then around the curve. The old house would be before me.”

Interpretive panels are perfectly suited to evoking “imagined memories” in the visitor via Montgomery’s words and images.

Tangible remnants of the past. The old stone “dyke” persists, more than 130 years after Montgomery’s childhood.

More tangible remnants, in the area that was previously the beloved, magical front orchard of the homestead.
Leaskdale Manse and Church Museum

Other than the National Historic Site plaque, the Leaskdale grounds are void of interpretive signage. On the left is the porch. The post in the middle secured one end of the hammock, where Montgomery’s husband spent his days during bad episodes of mental illness.

At the time of the site visit, the museum was planning to renovate the grounds and establish a garden dedicated to Montgomery on the church site. Since that time they have started work on a garden in this location and installed a patio where an L.M. Montgomery statue/bench will be

The L.M. Montgomery Society of Ontario, which owns and runs the Manse museum, also owns the nearby church where Montgomery’s husband ministered. Tours begin from here.
A historic landscape conservation study for the manse property identified this as the original sidewalk contemporary to Montgomery’s day.

Although at some point the laneway was moved to the opposite side of the manse, the wheel ruts from Montgomery’s time persist.

Tour guides point out the view from Montgomery’s parlour, where she frequently wrote. Montgomery would have seen the visitors, coming to disturb her writing, from this window.

Volunteers for the L.M.M.S.O have planted up one of the recreated circle beds (Montgomery had 4, there are currently two) with asters and mums, reflecting a letter Montgomery sent to a penpal.
View of the rear yard at the manse. On the left, Montgomery had her vegetable and cut flower garden. The current vegetable garden at the manse is nowhere near the size of Montgomery’s. It can be seen at the bottom left hand side. The lattice fence and archway attached to the front corner of the house and reached to the fence line on the left. Wood was stacked against the back of the house; the pump was over the concrete well cover seen adjacent to the white-sided part of the house. The stable for the horse (later car) was beyond the image borders, to the right, nearer to the rear property line.
George Leask’s Home across from the manse ca. 1917, and in 2011 as seen from church parking lot. LMM Photo Collection XZ1 MS A097048

View from kitchen window of manse, c. 1917, and again in 2011. LMM Photo collection XZ1 MS A097048

Leaskdale Manse, Montgomery’s home from 1911-1926, provides a particularly poignant example of how landscape change is magnified on a small site, with implications for visitor experience and interpretive strategy, especially when landscape interventions are not an option.

Gate, Leaskdale, Ontario, c. 1917 and again in 2011. LMM Photo Collection, XZ1 MS A097046
Green Gables House
Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, Canada

Formally Recognized: 1985/07/10

OTHER NAME(S)
Green Gables House
Maison aux pignons verts

LINKS AND DOCUMENTS
FHBRO Heritage Character Statement

CONSTRUCTION DATE(S)
1831/01/01 to 1870/01/01

LISTED ON THE CANADIAN REGISTER: 2009/02/25

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE

Green Gables House sits in the midst of Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada. A warm and welcoming residence, the one-and-a-half storey house is painted white and topped by the famous green-gable roof. Its front façade is highlighted by a dormer window, a small vestibule entrance, and green shutters that flank the double pane, wood, sash windows. The designation is confined to the footprint of the building.

HERITAGE VALUE

Green Gables House is a Recognized Federal Heritage Building because of its historical associations,
and its architectural and environmental value.

Historical Value
Green Gables House is internationally famous as one of Canada’s most celebrated fictional houses. It is one of the best examples of a building associated with the Canadian author, Lucy Maud Montgomery, who used the farmhouse as both the inspiration and the setting for her famous novel, “Anne of Green Gables.” The story was an instant success in 1908 and has since been translated into 17 languages. Green Gables House has been of interest to tourists since the publication of the novel, and has played an important role in the interpretive programs of Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada.

Architectural Value
Green Gables House is valued for its good aesthetic and functional design. Its farmhouse design, built in successive stages, places it firmly in Canadian vernacular building traditions of the 19th century. It is of a type very common in Prince Edward Island and most of eastern Canada. The interior of the house has since been reconstructed to appear as it did in the novels.

Environmental Value
Green Gables House reinforces the picturesque character of its recreational setting at Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada and has become a symbol of the region.


CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS
The following character-defining elements of Green Gables House should be respected.

Its good aesthetic and functional design and good craftsmanship and materials, for example:
- the one-and-a-half storey, L-shaped massing topped by a gable roof with a dormer window on the front façade;
- the small vestibule entrance;
- the wood frame construction clad in white painted shingles;
- the window arrangement and the green shutters as well as the gable ends which have traditionally been green;
- the interior plan, finishes and details.

The manner in which Green Gables House reinforces the picturesque character of its recreational park setting and is a symbolic landmark in the region, as evidenced by:
- its overall scale, design and materials, which contribute to its park surroundings;
- its role as a symbolic landmark, due to its literary associations;
- its role as part of the Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada interpretive program, which makes it familiar to international tourists and visitors of the park.
RECOGNITION

JURISDICTION
Federal

RECOGNITION AUTHORITY
Government of Canada

RECOGNITION STATUTE
Treasury Board Heritage Buildings Policy

RECOGNITION TYPE
Recognized Federal Heritage Building

RECOGNITION DATE
1985/07/10

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

SIGNIFICANT DATE(S)
n/a

THEME - CATEGORY AND TYPE

FUNCTION - CATEGORY AND TYPE

CURRENT
HISTORIC
Residence
Single Dwelling

ARCHITECT / DESIGNER
David McNeil

BUILDER
n/a

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

LOCATION OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
National Historic Sites Directorate, Documentation Centre, 5th Floor, Room 89, 25 Eddy Street, Gatineau, Quebec.

CROSS-REFERENCE TO COLLECTION
Back Range Light Tower
New London, Prince Edward Island
The attractive Back Range Light Tower with an attached dwelling is located on the flat, coastal…

Tower
North Rustico, Prince Edward Island
The attractive Tower, with its attached dwelling, is located on the flat, coastal landscape at…

Dalvay-by-the-Sea Hotel
The Dalvay-by-the-Sea Hotel in the Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada is a large, two-and-a-half storey, asymmetrical building in the Queen Anne Revival style. A…

L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site of Canada
L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site is a cultural landscape that embraces the landscape near Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, that author L. M. Montgomery knew so…

Silver Bush Campbell Farm House
Silver Bush Campbell Farm House is a well-preserved Gothic Revival farm house overlooking Campbell's Pond, also known as the Lake of Shining Waters, located in the rural community…
L.M. Montgomery's Cavendish National Historic Site of Canada

Route 6, Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada, Prince Edward Island, C0A, Canada

Formally Recognized: 2004/10/12

OTHER NAME(S)
L.M. Montgomery's Cavendish National Historic Site of Canada
L.M. Montgomery's Cavendish
Cavendish de L.M. Montgomery
Lucy Maud Montgomery's Cavendish Home

LINKS AND DOCUMENTS
Prince Edward Island Website with the Anne of Green Gables Itinerary

CONSTRUCTION DATE(S)

LISTED ON THE CANADIAN REGISTER: 2007/06/26

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE
L.M. Montgomery's Cavendish National Historic Site is a cultural landscape that embraces the landscape near Cavendish, Prince Edward Island, that author L. M. Montgomery knew so well and made famous in her "Anne of Green Gables" books. The designated area includes the Green Gables house, Montgomery’s Cavendish home, and several landscape features such as the Haunted Wood Trail, Balsam Hollow Trail and Lover’s Lane, dear to Montgomery and familiar to her readers.

HERITAGE VALUE
L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish was designated a National Historic Site because:
- it is intimately associated with L.M. Montgomery’s formative years and early productive career;
- it establishes Montgomery in time and in place in her world of Cavendish, and reveals the natural
surroundings and circumstances in her life which influenced the setting and story of her most famous
novel, "Anne of Green Gables", and its sequel, "Anne of Avonlea";
- many places in this landscape of rolling farm fields and wooded groves and paths were dear to her
and have continued to hold special meaning for generations of her admirers.

L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site embraces two segments of a cultural landscape
intimately associated with the author: one is the farm of Montgomery’s maternal grandparents where
she lived for the first 37 years of her life. This farmscape incorporates the ruins of the house and farm
buildings that existed in Montgomery’s time, as well as the wooded groves and pathways described in
her stories. The second area encompasses Green Gables, the neighbouring farmstead which features
in Montgomery’s most famous novel, "Anne of Green Gables” published in 1908, and includes the
house in its natural setting with surroundings that inspired both her imagination and her fiction including
the Haunted Wood Trail, the schoolhouse, Lover’s Lane, the Balsam Hollow Trail and the babbling
brook. Together these landscapes evoke both Montgomery’s real life and the fictional world she
created.

The heritage value of L.M. Montgomery’s Cavendish National Historic Site resides in its evocation of
L.M. Montgomery’s world – both real and imaginary – at the time of her most famous accomplishments.
Its value lies in the physical properties of these two landscapes that both inspired Montgomery’s fiction,
and give her fictional world a basis in reality. They include the sites and settings, buildings and
landscape features that provided a backdrop for both Montgomery’s life and her literary work.


CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS

Key features contributing to the heritage value of this site include:
- the integrity of the two areas comprising the cultural landscape as a reflection of Montgomery’s
personal and literary worlds;
- their location in rural Prince Edward Island;

The Montgomery Homestead
- evidence of the extent and siting of the former house in its footprint as defined by the surviving
foundation;
- its setting among wooded groves, pathways and rolling agricultural fields;

Green Gables
- its illustration of the fictional Green Gables of Anne, notably its modest scale, vernacular design, wood
construction and sheathing, gabled roofline, use of the colour green, and interior layout;
- the walking trail to the east of the house in its features that illustrate Montgomery’s fictional Haunted
Wood Trail and to the south of the house in its features that illustrate Montgomery’s fictional description
of Lover’s Lane, Balsam Hollow Trail and the babbling brook;
- the continued ambience and well being of these features, particularly as landscape features are supported by the presence of specific varieties of vegetation and undisturbed spatial volumes.

RECOGNITION

JURISDICTION
Federal

RECOGNITION AUTHORITY
Government of Canada

RECOGNITION STATUTE
Historic Sites and Monuments Act

RECOGNITION TYPE
National Historic Site of Canada

RECOGNITION DATE
2004/10/12

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

SIGNIFICANT DATE(S)
n/a

THEME - CATEGORY AND TYPE
Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life
Learning and the Arts

FUNCTION - CATEGORY AND TYPE
CURRENT
Leisure
Museum

HISTORIC
Food Supply
Barn, Stable or Other Animal Housing

ARCHITECT / DESIGNER
n/a

BUILDER
n/a
Green Gables House
Green Gables House sits in the midst of Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada. A warm and welcoming residence, the one-and-a-half storey house is painted white and topped…

Silver Bush Campbell Farm House
Silver Bush Campbell Farm House is a well-preserved Gothic Revival farm house overlooking Campbell's Pond, also known as the Lake of Shining Waters, located in the rural community…

Green Gables House
Cavendish, Prince Edward Island
Green Gables House sits in the midst of Prince Edward Island National Park of Canada. A warm and…

Tower
North Rustico, Prince Edward Island
The attractive Tower, with its attached dwelling, is located on the flat, coastal landscape at…
Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site of Canada
Uxbridge, Ontario, L9P, Canada
Formally Recognized: 1996/11/19

OTHER NAME(S)
Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site of Canada
Leaskdale Manse
Presbytère de Leaskdale
Leaskdale Manse Museum
Musée du Presbytère de Leaskdale

LINKS AND DOCUMENTS
n/a

CONSTRUCTION DATE(S)
1886/01/01

LISTED ON THE CANADIAN REGISTER: 2007/07/11

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE
Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site of Canada is the former Presbyterian manse where Lucy Maud Montgomery lived with her husband and family from 1911-1926. It is a modest brick late 19th-century house set on a residential lot just north of St. Paul's Presbyterian Church on Durham Regional Rd. #1 in the hamlet of Leaskdale, Ontario, north of Toronto. The designation refers to the house on its legal property.
HERITAGE VALUE

Leaskdale Manse was designated a national historic site in 1994 because
- it was the home of Lucy Maud Montgomery in a productive period of her literary career when she wrote 11 of the 22 works published during her lifetime;
- her posthumously published journals for 1911-1926, written in the manse, are important literary works that provide for a greater understanding of the author and her early 20th-century work, and permit new interpretations of her fictional writings; and
- the manse and its immediate environment figure prominently in the journals, being the stage on which the drama of an important part of her life was played and documented.

The heritage value of Leaskdale Manse National Historic Site of Canada lies in its association with the life and later published works of Lucy Maud Montgomery. The value is illustrated in the form, materials, site and setting surviving from the 1911-1926 period when Montgomery was in residence. The house was constructed in 1886 as the manse for St. Paul's Presbyterian Church where Lucy Maud Montgomery's husband, the Reverend Ewan Macdonald, served as pastor from 1911-1926. It was here that Montgomery lived during the first 15 years of her marriage, bore and began to raise her family. It was purchased by the Township of Uxbridge for restoration as an historic site in 1993.

Source: Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, Minute, 1994; Commemorative Integrity Statement, 1999.

CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS

Key elements that contribute to the heritage value of this site include:
- location of the house adjacent to the Presbyterian church and on a street that remains sympathetic to its early twentieth-century state;
- its typicality as a late nineteenth-century middle class house, including its two-storey massing, T-shaped footprint and cross gabled roof with single storey rear shed;
- its yellow brick exterior facing material;
- its vernacular decorative elements, including a wooden verandah with restrained gingerbread bracketing, wooden side and top-lit entry door, simple wooden window frames;
- surviving interior layout, fittings and furnishings from the 1911-1926 period;
- landscape features from the Montgomery/Macdonald time period such as remnants of the carriageway, gardens;
- archaeological evidence from the 1911-1926 period including remnants of the carriage house, well, fence, and the pollen record;
- viewscapes from the house to rural surroundings, from the second floor windows west to Leask farm and beyond, north to the Leaskdale Creek and south to the church.

RECOGNITION

JURISDICTION

Federal
RECOGNITION AUTHORITY
Government of Canada

RECOGNITION STATUTE
Historic Sites and Monuments Act

RECOGNITION TYPE
National Historic Site of Canada

RECOGNITION DATE
1996/11/19

HISTORICAL INFORMATION

SIGNIFICANT DATE(S)
1911/01/01 to 1926/01/01

THEME - CATEGORY AND TYPE
Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life
Learning and the Arts

FUNCTION - CATEGORY AND TYPE
CURRENT
Residence
Single Dwelling

ARCHITECT / DESIGNER
n/a

BUILDER
William Gordon

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

LOCATION OF SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
National Historic Sites Directorate, Documentation Centre, 5th Floor, Room 89, 25 Eddy Street, Gatineau, Quebec

CROSS-REFERENCE TO COLLECTION
FED/PROV/TERR IDENTIFIER
1790
Former Canadian National Railway Station
450 Davis Drive, Newmarket, Ontario
The Former Canadian National Railway Station at Newmarket was built in 1900 by the Grand Trunk…

Briars - Peacock House
55, Hedge Road, Georgina, Ontario
The octagonal building located at 55 Hedge Road, commonly known as the Peacock House, is situated…