

Editorial: Points of View

JACKY BOWRING & SIMON SWAFFIELD

THIS ISSUE OF *Landscape Review* is an atlas of sorts, a collection of four contrasting 'maps', imagings and imaginings of landscape. The difference between them illustrates the critical nature of one's point of view. The landscapes plotted by the authors in this issue are both real and abstract terrains, topographies of history and theory. The atlas is a journey through possible worlds and travelling is like reading; a process of enlightenment. Reading is like walking in an experiential sense, where, as Eagleton once suggested, texts have "backgrounds" and "foregrounds", different narrative viewpoints, alternative layers of meaning, between which we are constantly moving' (1983, pp 77-78).

The first two papers in the issue, by Jan Kenneth Birksted and Gavin Keeney, offer the reader vast landscapes to negotiate, richly intertextual mappings. As Roland Barthes believed, the reader is an active participant in bringing a work into being, and his words offer a useful traveller's advisory: 'the space of the writing is to be traversed, not penetrated' (Barthes, 1967, section 3). Birksted's 'Landscape History and Theory: from Subject Matter to Analytic Tool' constructs a navigational chart, plotting the coordinates of a particular kind of theoretical terrain and reinforcing the cartographic analogy with a call to 'map' the 'domain' specific processes and forms. Birksted emphasises he is not intending to create a separate 'landscape' realm to neighbouring disciplines, nor to call in the 'border police', but to describe the topography that is peculiar to landscape and garden history and theory. He highlights the need for such a history to be specific, responding to particular characteristics, such as the movement of the beholder in the landscape and the phenomenological nature of landscape experience. The (extra)visuality of landscape experience echoes the parallels between reading and walking noted above, with Birksted gesturing towards de Certeau's 'rhetoric of walking' and Marin's 'sentence construction of space'. Walking is a kind of theorising as well, as in the notion *solvitur ambulando*, which refers to the type of illuminations that come through the measured contemplation of walking.

A landscape of movement, of feeling, a chart of effects, is reminiscent of the *Carte de Tendre*, produced by Madeleine de Scudéry in the seventeenth century. As part of a fashion for the mapping of subjective experience, Scudéry's fictional work *Clélie* transferred a chart of emotions to an imagined terrain. Ultimately, such maps became the source of real garden imaginings. It is such a *pays de tendre* that we travel through in the second paper, an essay by Gavin Keeney, titled 'Moravian Shadows'. The phenomenon of shadows haunts this evocation of the Czech lands - Keeney's 'cartography' sheds light on richly intertextual readings

Jacky Bowring is Senior Lecturer,
Landscape Architecture Group,
PO Box 84, Lincoln University,
Canterbury, Aotearoa, New Zealand.
Telephone: +64-3-325-3804
Fax: +64-3-325-3854
Email: bowringj@lincoln.ac.nz

Simon Swaffield is Professor
of Landscape Architecture,
Landscape Architecture Group,
PO Box 84, Lincoln University,
Canterbury, Aotearoa, New Zealand.
Telephone: +64-3-325-3804
Fax: +64-3-325-3854
Email: swaffies@lincoln.ac.nz

of landscape. Sculpting a terrain from the liminal zone of shadows, this point of view is reminiscent of Renaissance architect Vincenzo Scamozzi's belief that forms only truly come to life in the penumbral zone, between light and dark. Within Keeney's writing lurks the sometimes alarming depth and intensity of cultural shadows as they fall across time and space, revealing sharp details as they drape across surfaces, picking out otherwise unnoticed nuances. The play of light and shadow, the charisma of chiaroscuro, allude to revelation and discovery.

Marco Frascari connected shadows to a sort of mapping, memory and understanding. Explaining that a shadow is a type of sign, he describes how: 'The very notion of *theoria* is connected to the primacy of seeing. According to one etymological hypothesis, the word theory derives from the fusion of *thea* (seeing) and *hora* (care)' (Frascari, 1990, p 35). And *theoria*, as Giuliana Bruno explains, is intimately connected to ideas of mapping and space, with reference to Ripa's description from *Iconologia*: 'Theoria can be aptly represented in the form of a young woman who looks and aims upward, joining her hands together and holding on her head an open compass that points skyward. She is nobly dressed in blue, and is in the process of descending from the summit of a staircase' (in Bruno, 2002, p 216). Theory is thus ingrained in our experience of the world, spatially and temporally, with our mapping and imagining.

The final two papers, one jointly authored by John P. Adam and Matthew Bradbury and the other by Yvonne Weeber, investigate groundings of history and theory in particular instances through the work of a practitioner and the morphology of an urban landscape type respectively. Both papers were originally presented at the 2002 New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects conference. Adam and Bradbury present their investigation into the work of Fred Tschopp, a Swiss landscape architect who practised in New Zealand in the 1930s. Adam and Bradbury have made an important contribution to the exposure of Tschopp's work, mapping his connections to both Swiss and American influences and identifying the 'moment that contemporary landscape architecture arrived in New Zealand'. Weeber compares two urban 'edge of centres', one in New Zealand and the other in the United Kingdom, illustrating the ways in which morphological theories come to ground in different ways depending on a range of influences. Weeber makes very tangible connections between walking and landscape, illustrating the ways in which 'walkability' is expressed in a particular kind of environmental response.

The four papers present different points of view on ideas of history and theory in landscape architecture. Birksted makes reference to the need to find a 'kind of home' for landscape history and theory, paralleling disciplines such as art history. In order to see things, rather than to merely recognise them, however, it is important to defamiliarise them in some way. As James Clifford explains, "'Theory' is a product of displacement, comparison, a certain distance. To theorize, one *leaves home*. But like any act of travel, theory begins and ends somewhere' (Clifford, 1989, p 177, our emphasis), or as in Keeney's paraphrasing of Jean-Luc Godard, 'to see something, one must first see something else'.

Beneath the sun in June 1969, traveling along a quay in Stockholm, I was suddenly pulled up short. Emerging from the vegetable mass of building sections I thought I saw in the distance, on the port's horizon, there materialized before me the shape of a long and powerful warship. It had remained hidden thanks to its camouflage . . . I experienced what a landscape is . . . a reading of the vast horizon in its total sweep, had been made possible by the gathering of multiple, dissociated, and momentary sections, of objects which from another view were integrated parts (Lassus, 1998, p 24).

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R (1967) *The Death of the Author*, *Aspen* 5 + 6.
- Bruno, G (2002) *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*, New York: Verso.
- Clifford, J (1989) Notes on Travel and Theory, *Inscriptions*, vol 5, pp 177–178.
- Eagleton, T (1983) *Literary Theory*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Fascari, M (1990) A Secret Semiotic Skiagraphy, *Via*, vol 11, pp 32–51.
- Lassus, B (1998) *The Landscape Approach*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.