The chapter that follows is divided into two parts. The two parts cover the same
topic; however, their mode of generation is quite different. One part, “Reason,” is
written in a reasonable way. The other part, “Imagination,” is written in an imaginative
way—or at least such is my hope.

I make no claim of competence in either of these modes of thought. In fact,
using the two different voices is more an act of desperation than of hubris. I have
struggled for several years to construct a simple and clear argument in support of
my view that there is a commonly understood language of landscape space types. I
feel that presenting the topic in two different modes may be the best way for me to
convey my point of view.

Any language system functions at the point of intersection between the
mind and the natural world; language is the medium of that exchange. As a bridge
between the two realms, language exists half in the realm of reason (thinking,
ordering, computing, concluding) and half in the world of natural phenomena
(sensations, visions, pleasure, pain, stimulation, need). The world of natural phe-
nomena impresses the sensibilities and produces images in the mind; that is to say
that the natural world exists in the realm of the imagination. I am cognizant that the
words, reason and imagination, can be used in many other ways. I am using them
as expressed above.

Type is a language system and, as such, it too exists half in reason and half in
imagination. My previous attempts to explain landscape type by reason alone felt
incomplete—the image was left behind. On the other hand, a descriptive study of
a particular landscape type, as it presented itself to the imagination, did not pro-
vide me with reasons, i.e., explanations for why the space was so beautiful and
affecting.

Consequently, I here attempt to do both at the same time. I suggest that the
reader engage the two parts simultaneously, jumping from reason to imagination,
then back again. Others may prefer to read them in turn, first all of reason, then
all of imagination (or the reverse).
Reason

In this chapter I argue that the human creative spirit is expressed in the landscape in the form of identifiable types. I am using the same definition of the human spirit that Mike Brill develops in this volume: a creative force that charges forth to confront the chaos of uncontrolled and undifferentiated sensory impressions with an equal and opposite power, a power of ex-pression.¹ This power of expression is conceptual (holding a thought in the mind and in that way naming things), physical (making things), and social (sharing a language and making things together). An important product of this expressive naming and making is a shared language of designed landscape space types.

As the title suggests, the focus of this chapter is on designed landscape space types. By designed I mean any landscape that manifests a human design, whether the space is productive, like an orchard, or restorative, like a cloister. By landscape space I mean any landscape that we can be inside. The street is a landscape space; the garden gate is not.

I am suggesting that basic types of designed landscape space exist and are commonly appreciated. I believe that they are commonly appreciated because they strike the beholder as meaningful in a fundamental, almost primal way. To the extent that they are meaningful in this fundamental way, the landscape space types constitute a basic language of landscape experience.

The Dialectical Landscape

Most existing work on environmental type and typology comes from the discipline of building architecture. In applying this body of inquiry in landscape architecture we can rightfully ask: Are there essential differences in the way that the local spaces and fixed forms of buildings are experienced versus the way that the open and continuous spaces of the landscape are experienced?

I answer yes. The experience of landscape space types is special because the connection between humans and the landscape is dialectical. Since the idea of this dialectical connection is at the core of my argument, I will devote some space to explaining what I mean by it. To do so I thread together the thoughts of a few individuals who are, in my view, significant figures in the development of dialectical thought in the west. They are Robert Smithson, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Karl Marx, and the philosophers of the English Romantic Movement: Edmund Burke, Uvedale Price, and William Gilpin. I link together their different but related

Imagination

Some landscapes are made by nature without human help: natural landscapes.

Some landscapes are made by humans out of the living and inert materials that nature provides: built landscapes.

Natural landscapes are the ones we haven't had the audacity or the desire to reshape yet.

We are born into built landscapes. We die into built landscapes.

The story of my life and your life is unfolding in built landscapes.

Humans have been hard at work turning natural landscapes into built landscapes for a half-million years. More and more men and women were born, so more and more room was needed.

This half-million years of beating back natural landscapes will probably be finished within the next 50.

Nature doesn't care. Nature has other planets to work on.

At first, the room belonging to the forest was made into rooms belonging to humans.

The first room was the clearing.

Next the corridor through the forest was cut: an allée.

Many other types of rooms were cut from a reluctant nature by unrelenting humans: the orchard, the terrace, the street, the square, the yard, the cloister.

¹. See Mike Brill, Chapter 3, this volume. I take this occasion to express my debt to Mike Brill for this and other insights that he has freely shared with me.
Over time these rooms became more and more comfortable for humans. We worked to make them look a certain way, give them a certain order. When we ordered nature's materials and bent nature to human purpose, we no longer needed to be afraid of nature.

Over time nature's meaning changed. Nature the omnipotent, the unreasonable, the jealous, and the terrible became nature the inspirational, the kind, and the nurturing. It became pleasurable to behold the nature we had transformed. Framed inside the order of the rooms, nature the terrible became nature the beautiful — the vine that appalled in the bramble became the vine that captivated on the arbor.

Over the millennia the orderly rooms fashioned of nature's materials became a predictable framework for human experience in space. Consequently there was no need to take specific note of them anymore. The pleasurable and secure sense they conveyed persisted, but these sensations sank comfortably into the subconscious, their important characteristics obscured behind the veil of the habitual. Nature the horrible was safely sequestered in "far-off lands" while nature the nurturing was our loyal, dutiful, and dependable companion.

In some parts of the world this situation remained stable for almost 2000 years. But about 200 years ago some especially sensitive people noticed that there were so many rooms being cut from nature that both nature the horrible and nature the nurturing were disappearing — only the human order remained. They started to paint pictures of the "room in nature" before nature vanished entirely, leaving the room a barren white shell. They thought that the rooms for human activity should have walls woven of nature's materials, and that without them the human body, mind, and spirit would freeze. I am thinking of painters like George Inness and Frederic Church.

Eighty years ago a different group of people came along. They said that in this Modern Age, people were tough enough to live in bare white rooms. People need not dialectical notions of landscape/human interaction to propose a way of thinking about designed landscape typology — a way that may be useful for practice.

I illustrate my contention that the designed landscape space types that structure our everyday experience are, in Merleau-Ponty's terms, "practical categories" (Merleau-Ponty 1974, 180) that are manifested in the landscape when we, as Marx would put it, "oppose nature and thereby change our own nature" (quoted in Fromm 1966, 40). I argue that this interdependent opposition of humans and nature is an identifiable aspect of form in the landscape, and that this dialectical opposition produces an aesthetic "charge." Beautiful, human-initiated order is one side of the dialectic; sublime nature's complexity is the other (Smithson's and the Romantics' idea). Finally, I choose particular designed landscape space types for inclusion in this typology if they powerfully manifest this dialectic in physical form.

Robert Smithson: Earth Artist. The American artist Robert Smithson is best known for his earth sculpture, the Spiral Jetty, built on the shore of Nevada's Salt Lake in 1970. He died in 1973 when his plane crashed while he was photographing the site for his Amarillo Ramp project; he was 33 at the time.

During the last few years of his life, Smithson devoted much of his creative energy to developing an idea he called the dialectical landscape (Smithson 1972, 1973). The dialectic of which he spoke was not the dialectic of Hegel; it was not the purely internal process of the mind by which a thesis is changed into an antithesis, and the contradiction thus engendered resolved in a higher form of truth, the synthesis. He used the word dialectic in the older, more basic, sense of two conceptual categories (words and the things they signify) that are mutually dependent on each other for definition. Thus, night and day, man and woman, right and wrong, life and death, mind and body, inside and outside are all defined in relation to their opposites.

When Smithson retreated from the galleries of New York to the landscape, he erected an intellectual redoubt from which to attack an entrenched enemy: the art of static, dead, abstract, metaphysical, timeless, and ideal "truths" holed up in hermetically sealed galleries and museums. Smithson felt that nature, with all of its contradictions and complexities, was a more significant issue for artists to wrestle with precisely because "nature is indifferent to any formal ideal" (Smithson 1973, 63). He meant that nature presents a picture to our eyes and mind that resists the absolute clarity, purity, and completion of a pure and unam-
Chaotic and ordered at the same time, the ponderosa pine is indifferent to any formal ideal. (photo by author)

Occult notions of “concept” are in retreat from the physical world. Heaps of private information reduce art to hermeticism and fatuous metaphysics... Art’s development should be dialectical and not metaphysical (Smithson 1972, 39).

When Smithson refers to the metaphysical, he means metaphysical in the sense of the immaterial, or the incorporeal. For him, art that does not refer to the material, corporeal world is nonsensical. It is completely sealed off from the world, and is consequently without general value.

Because he believed that art’s development should be dialectical and not metaphysical, he was drawn more and more exclusively to the landscape. The problem, as he saw it, was to join the experience of nature with the material of nature, with the “thing itself.” He wanted to join physical nature with the meta-

freeze because we have invented “machines for living.” That took care of the body. As for the spirit, “no problem, that’s just an old myth. The sooner we do away with the spirit the better!” The mind, on the other hand, was a different matter altogether! There was no limit to what the mind could become if humans could throw off their chains to nature. The mind could be like a god!

These people thought that the landscape could become the location for the machine. They thought that the landscape of rooms in nature was not a suitable setting for the machines for living. They wanted it changed. They banished the landscape of space and they were glad of it. I am thinking of architects like Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe.

About 35 years ago, other people thought again about the rooms in nature. By this time the rooms in nature had nearly disappeared entirely, and our spirits had nearly disappeared along with them. The modern city of no-space and no-place had made the spirit moribund, they said.

They said that we should rebuild the rooms of our old house on earth. A new structure of rooms cut into the earth, the forest, and the city, would warm our souls, they said. I am thinking of Jane Jacobs, Christopher Alexander, Rob Krier, and Christian Norberg-Schulz. They struggled to recapture the names of the forgotten rooms. They started in the heart of the city and agreed that there were stoops, yards, streets, and squares. I think that they were right. There are other rooms in nature that

2. Viewed from one perspective, humans are transient nothings in the face of nature’s eternal persistence. Viewed from another perspective, the human mind and spirit are endowed with the ex-presusive and creative capacity to make a cosmos out of a chaos – to order the physical world in a way that makes it meaningful. Smithson seems to revel in these contradictory readings: humans as nature’s excrement versus humans as nature’s transcendent.
we can suggest. They are rooms that we order from nature’s materials for human ends, rooms that have persisted throughout the millennia and are therefore so commonly recognizable that they are now unremarkable. They are rooms but not a combination of rooms (a park is a combination of rooms, a garden is a combination of rooms). I wonder if these are the names of the rooms: the single tree, the clearing, the cloister, the square, the street, the front yard, the backyard, the allée, the orchard, the bosque, the theater, the stair, the terrace, and the promontory. It might be that these are the rooms of our house on earth — our house in nature. I would like to express my impressions of some of these rooms.

The Clearing

Making the clearing makes a room in the unrelieved immensity of the forest. The sun now strikes the ground and brings forth a teeming horde of new plants and insects. The stable life of the forest hemorrhages. The forest edge appears, a dynamic and productive place. The settler builds the cabin at the edge — the deer browse at the edge — the birds feed at the edge.

The act of making the clearing begins the dance of oppositions. The light that floods the clearing betrays the true darkness of the surrounding forest. The forest is alternatively gloomy and depressing, or shady and inviting. The clearing is alternatively brilliant and open, or scorching and exposed. As the sun arcs across the ceiling of the sky, the shadows lengthen. Nightfall extinguishes the opposition, along with everything else, in the total blackness. The duality of the clearing has made it a magnet for meanings. Clearings figure prominently in the myths of many peoples from forested landscapes.

Nature greedily wants to take back what humans have changed. The forest dispatches billions of seed minions to reclaim lost territory. Other species seek to confiscate the fruits of this human labor. But human labor to maintain the clearing is orderly and efficient. Humans defer gratification. Humans plan for the harvest and engineer a

physical mind. His “dialectical landscape” was all about structuring an opposition between the physical world and the sensibilities of the mind. Within this structure, all the inherent oppositions and contradictions between the mind and the world would be maintained intact.

Smithson carefully stipulated that his definition of the dialectic differed from other more metaphysical definitions. His was a “real world dialectic,” specifically opposed to Hegelian dialectics that “exist only for the mind” (Smithson 1979, 128).

The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque. Smithson’s view was not new and he knew it; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries others had said the same thing. Smithson supported his argument with the long, moribund, and at the time completely disreputable aesthetic theory of the picturesque. He claimed that his art and the art of America’s great nineteenth-century master of the picturesque, the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, were in the same tradition. Both were trying to conjoin, and by this means express, the dialectic between the expressive, creative, naming, ordering, mind/spirit, and the im-perressive, dynamic, fecund, and chaotic processes of the physical landscape. Both men did their work in open landscape locations that were subject to all the influences of “land, labor, and class” (Smithson 1979, 219). Smithson argued that both he and Olmsted tried to make the dialectic palpable — experienced in the body as well as the mind, with all its contradictions intact. According to Smithson this kind of art is picturesque by virtue of the oppositions and contradictions it exposes (Smithson 1973).

Both Smithson and Olmsted were familiar with earlier theories of the picturesque and its antecedents, the theory of the beautiful and the sublime. Olmsted admonished his employees to understand these theories as their first task upon joining the firm: “You are to read these seriously, as a student of law would read Blackstone,” he would tell them, referring to the works of William Gilpin and Uvedale Price (quoted in Smithson 1973, 63). Smithson attributes similar importance to this earlier aesthetic theory. He summarizes the evolution of these theories, beginning with the publication of Edmund Burke’s A Philosophical Enquiry into our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful, first published in 1757:

Burke’s notion of “beautiful” and “sublime” functions as a thesis of smoothness, gentle curves, and delicacy of nature, and as an antithesis of terror, solitude, and vastness of nature, both of which are rooted in the real world, rather than in a Hegelian Ideal (Smithson 1973, 63).
The picturesque, articulated by Uvedale Price (1810), provided the synthesis. Smithson said that the picturesque synthesis is:

related to chance and change in the material order of nature. The contradictions of the “picturesque” depart from a static formalistic view of nature. The picturesque, far from being an inner movement of the mind, is based on real land; it precedes the mind in its material external existence… Central Park is a ground work of necessity and chance, a range of contrasting viewpoints that are forever fluctuating, yet solidly based in the earth (Smithson 1973, 63).

To the extent that this synthesis remains “forever fluctuating,” it departs from Hegelian notions of synthesis. In Hegel’s synthesis the opposing forces of the dialectic solidly congeal into a higher form of being. Smithson suggests that in the picturesque synthesis of the landscape dialectic, the vibrancy and tension of the beautiful and the sublime are retained intact; they never congeal.

In Smithson’s interpretation of the dialectical landscape, the aesthetic power (and consequently the meaning) of Central Park, and by extension of any landscape, is found in the relationship between the “beautiful” of human originated formal order, and a nature that is “indifferent to any formal ideal” (Smithson 1973, 63). In Central Park the sublime Ramble, an im-pressive, terrifying labyrinth where nature’s dynamic processes seem indifferent to human formal order, connects to and collides with the Bethesda Fountain, where nature’s materials are composed in a beautiful ex-pression of human formal order.

landscape that conforms to the human body — row on row, one foot apart. When the human dies and is not replaced, the forest returns, indifferent to the temporary disruption, unmoved by the order that was struck.

The Bosque

What the clearing is to the forest, the bosque is to the open landscape. The bosque of trees, in the open landscape, fixes a sacred vortex in profane doldrums. The bosque was the first temple, with the gods ensconced in the sanctuary, the sanctuary protected by phalanx after phalanx of guarding tree trunks.

Trees are so big, so alive, so unearthly. They touch and block out the sky. Nearly all cultures were certain that the trees of the bosque or the grove were, in actual fact, gods (or at the very least inhabited by gods). One need only remove the post-Enlightenment blinders from our eyes even momentarily to re-experience this original truth.

You are in the grove. Observe the tree. The elephantine torso of the tree splits repeatedly until it is an infinity of impossibly thin fingers, grasping azure. The syrupy air, never completely at rest, is palpable in the grove. The massive tree waves its wooden arms. Its tortured limbs groan out a melancholy exchange with the vagrant rephrons whispering through the branch tips. The trees of the grove heave, roll, and surge en masse, an infinitely precise dance, the choreographed phenomena of an animated planet. The observer is transported. Edges between air and solid matter lose their crispness. Vitality billows into the space in stupefying waves — the sky, the air, the wood, the grass, the self, become unconsolidated.

Humans make the bosque, the copse, the wood lot, the plantation, the grove. Sometimes the purpose for the bosque is pragmatic: to produce the long timbers only possible in densely planted groves; to grow wood to feed the winter’s fire. Sometimes the objective is sensual pleasure: to create a protected space to eat; to create a shaded space to sit. Sometimes the goal is spiritual: to invite the
ancient Greek deities, to provide a setting for a Christian revival meeting. Pragmatic, sensual, and spiritual purposes can coexist in the bosque. Wherever it is, the bosque establishes the dance of oppositions between what nature gives, the expense and the seed, and what humans impose, the bosque.

The bosque is a pattern chosen by humans. It may be a grid as in the plantation; this will insure that the trees will all have straight trunks and mature at the same time. It may be a random order; this will insure that trees will have varied girths and mature at different rates. A widening may be imposed; this will make an entry, a path, and a center. Framed inside this subtle order, the terrible forest becomes the beautiful bosque.

The Orchard

The orchard is a most powerful example of how humans make rooms for living out of nature’s materials. When humans cultivate an orchard, they choreograph a dance with nature. Humans arrange nature’s trees in a geometric pattern on the cleared land. Nature’s sun plays against the pattern in a daily fertility ritual, a ritual that culminates on the day of the harvest.

The orchard is a paragon of how and why humans order nature’s materials. Over time, humans came to understand the fructifying capacity of the tree and vine. This understanding suggested an order; the order structured the space. Arranging the trees in a grid insures that each tree gets a maximum of exposure to the sun as it arcs across the ceiling of the sky. Humans prune the trees (a radical hacking away, in fact) so that the remaining energy of the plants is directed toward fructification. The land must be at least well chosen for this aspect or, at most, terraced and shaped to hold the rain.

Human cultivation of the orchard must be continuous or nature will retake it. Continuous cultivation makes the orchard a powerful metaphor: it is employed repeatedly in both the old and new testaments of the Bible where “God tends the vineyard” of humanity.²

Smithson’s remark on nature’s “indifference” does not suggest a lack of insight into nature’s profound systems of order. Rather, he means that believing nature in general to have a formal intention indulges in a soothing but uncritical anthropomorphism.

The thoughts and work of Smithson and Olmsted help suggest how we might distinguish landscape types from the open and continuous landscape within which they must necessarily find their place. Smithson and Olmsted were both earth artists. As artists they brought to light a crucial but generally unrecognized property of human experience in typical landscapes—its dialectical quality. It follows that this dialectical quality would be a crucial and discernible feature of designed landscape space types.

The dialectical basis for this typology can now be summarized. As our human spirit emerged and confronted the chaos of our environment, we were both acted on by that environment and, in turn, forced to act back. To create a meaningful world, to distinguish the important from the unimportant, the sacred

![Image 4-3](Humans acting on the environment; the environment acting back. A beech tree slowly heals the wounds of words, marking the years. (photo by author))

![Image 4-4](The Rockery, by Frederick Law Olmsted, North Easton, Massachusetts. Olmsted maintains the tension between the order of the arch and the chaos of its apparent decay, apparent because the Rockery was designed to look like a ruin when new. (photo by author))
from the profane, the good from the bad, and the useful from the useless, required thousands of years of human effort. This work is still underway. In this millennial process nature became, on the one hand, understandable and nurturing (the garden, the orchard), while its incomprehensible and terrible aspect was suppressed but not eliminated (tornadoes, snakes, bottomless pits, AIDS).

The nurturing aspects of nature and our ex-pressive capacity to order nature for human purpose are manifest in the landscape of the beautiful, i.e., in formal order — the field, the lawn, the alley, the arbor, the house — all of them representing stability and predictability. But nature is indifferent to formal order. Nature in its essence is incomprehensible and terrible. It is the im-pressive landscape of the sublime, i.e., of chaos — the bramble, the landslide, the forest fire, the volcano. It is one giant elm tree in flower with a billion buds bursting forth a billowing pollen explosion. Nature is a state of constant change and threat, an ocean of aggression and overkill, a chaos of unpredictabilities that only lets up, for us, on the day we die. Human life occurs in the landscape of the dialectic between the beautiful and the sublime, between order and chaos, between mind and matter. Both Smithson and Olmsted recognized this middle ground as the ground for their art. I am suggesting that the meaning and impact of landscape types result from this relationship between the beautiful and the sublime, between the beautiful order of the arbor structure and the chaos or sublime indifference of the vine.

Other Voices. It is interesting that others who were working on political and philosophical problems recognized the importance of this middle ground between the inner world and the physical world. Karl Marx thought of this middle ground as labor:

Labor is, in the first place, a process in which both man and nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates, and controls the material reactions between himself and nature. He opposes himself to nature as one of her own forces, setting in motion arms and legs, head and hands, the natural forces of his body, in order to appropriate nature’s productions in a form adapted to his own wants. By thus acting on the external world and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature. He develops his slumbering powers and compels them to act in obedience to his sway (quoted in Fromm 1966, 40).

It was left to Maurice Merleau-Ponty, the influential postwar French philosopher, to extract the implicit aesthetic that is grounded in Marx’s notion of the
indifferent to our voyeurism. Nature’s indifference leaves us feeling overwhelmed and abandoned. While these and other equally violent disruptions go on, only the unchanged lines of trunks linked to the base of land treasures us, integrates us, holds the self inside the skin.

The Cloister

The cloister has gone by many names: Persians called it the walled garden; Greeks called it the agora; Romans called it the forum. The square of the cloister orients to the cardinal points—in this way it re-presents the four quarters of the world. The cloister is the clearing transcendent. The clearing carves out the trees of the forest and sets the sun come down; the cloister walls out the world and lets the spirit fly up.

The cloister is a clearing with nature’s dynamic flux congealed. The trunks, branches, and leaves of the forest edge are petrified, they are the columns, the arches, the carved adorning of the arcaded edge. If the clearing is the least emphatic ordering of nature’s materials, the cloister is the most. Nearly all of nature’s violent dislocating transformations are frozen in stone. Only the arcing sun is admitted, the rational, predictable, and constant sun, the gentlest possible weaving of nature’s phenomena into the solid fabric of the cloister.

But even this one force, the razor vector of the sun, can still transport. One does not cross the open center of the cloister; rather, one walks through the perambulatory, around the edge. The sun angles through the screen of the colonnade, projecting a radiant filigree on the warm stone floor ahead. You walk with dignity through alternating membranes of hot and cool air. The pulsing slap of

human/landscape interaction. In his essay “Marxism and Philosophy,” he suggests that:

It is... understandable that the introduction of the notion of the human object, which phenomenology has... developed, was reserved for Marx. Classical philosophies dissociated this notion; for them, streets, fields, houses were complexes of colors in all ways comparable to objects of nature and merely encased with human significance by a secondary judgment. When Marx speaks of human objects, he means that this significance adheres to the object as it presents itself in our experience... The spirit of a society is realized, transmitted, and perceived through the cultural objects which it bestows upon itself and in the midst of which it lives. It is there that the deposit of its practical categories is built up, and these categories in turn suggest a way of being and thinking to men (Merleau-Ponty 1974, 180).

When we think about the designed landscape space types that structure our everyday experience, we are actually thinking of the practical categories that Merleau-Ponty describes. These landscape space types are manifested in the landscape when we “oppose nature and thereby change our own nature” (quoted in Fromm 1966, 40). This interdependent opposition of humans and nature is discernible in space as the opposition between humans’ own “beautiful” order, and nature’s own “sublime” complexity (Burke [1757] 1958; Condon 1991). The result of all this effort over the millennia is a set of “practical categories,” i.e., types, that manifest their mode of development to our aesthetic sensibilities as a tension between the beautiful of human formal order and sublime nature which is “indifferent to any formal ideal” (Smithson 1973, 63). The different designed

3. See Matthew 20: 1–16; Matthew 21: 33–43; Mark 12: 1–12; Luke 20: 9–16; and Isaiah 5: 7 for just a few examples.
landscape space types should therefore quite markedly manifest in form the dialectic between the human compulsion for the beautiful formal ideal and nature's sublime indifference to formal ideals of any kind.

In my reflections and in my own observations of the world since I first became interested in landscape type, the above hypothesis holds, for me, true. I invite you to reflect on this hypothesis and make your own observations with this hypothesis in mind.

Landscape Archetypes

Most writers on the topic of building typology suggest that types are the building blocks of an edifice of commonly understood meanings. It is also generally postulated that this edifice sits upon the foundation of natural archetypes — i.e., archetypes are the invisible but crucial basis for types. Brill, for example, suggests in his chapter that a shared natural language of landscape archetypes slowly took root in a millennial process involving millions of human spirits, all of them intent on making a cosmos out of chaos.

Aldo Rossi suggests that building and urban typology rests on a foundation of natural archetypes. In *The Architecture of the City* (1982), his section on “Typological Questions” begins with the following:

The city as above all else a human thing is constituted of its architecture and of all those works that constitute the true means of transforming nature (1982, 35). I am thinking of Francesco Milizia's definition of the essence of architecture as the imitation of nature: “Although architecture in reality lacks a model in nature, it has another model derived from man's natural labor in constructing his first house” (1982, 27).

Anthony Vidler, in his 1977 historical overview of type, recalls how Ribard de Chamoust, writing in 1783, argued that:

I mean by this word type, the first attempts of man to master nature, render it propitious to his needs, suitable to his uses, and favorable to his pleasures. The perceptible objects that the Artist chooses with justness and reasoning from Nature in order to light and fix at the same time the fires of his imagination, I call archetypes (quoted in Vidler 1977, 97).

In this same sense I am suggesting that the designed landscape space types find a basis in natural landscape space archetypes. The archetypes are the natural forest and the natural clearing.

heat on your cheek and sunshine on your retina initiates an inexorable and hypnotic meter, in step with your footfalls and your heartbeat. In time this oscillation loosens the grip of the self, gives rope to the spirit. But the unchanging beat does not threaten us with disintegration; we will not wander too far from reason in such a space.

The Single Tree

In undifferentiated forest landscapes, the clearing opens up and connects the warming sun to earth. In undifferentiated open landscapes, the single tree focuses an awful and undifferentiated plane on a center. It makes a here and a there out of a nowhere. Rooted in the earth, the single tree explodes out of the indifferent ground, fueled only by a voracious appetite for space. Humans watch their whole life away while she unfolds
and extends her constantly clearing spine, while she
dances her hundred-year solo. The single tree is a space
for performance. The measure is order. The rhythm is
chaos.

The single tree is a miniature ecology. The tree does
not relent until it has ordered all the dynamic flows of
sun, soil, air, and water within its compass.

The single tree is an evident cosmology. Come the fall
equinox, the tree "dies." Come the spring equinox, the tree
is "reborn." The single tree draws life from base earth, but
connects to immortal sky. Life force, somehow miracu-
lessly locked in the seed, forces the union. Such a center-
ing, ordering, and unifying power has made the single
tree a magnet for meanings. The single tree figures most
prominently in the myths of many peoples from both
forested and dry landscapes.

The Forest and The Clearing. By natural forest and natural clearing I mean forests
and clearings that occur through natural, ecological processes, prior to human
intervention. This proposition is supported from a number of quarters. René
Dubos (1980) postulates that since the savanna landscape, the cradle of our
species, is a landscape that is neither completely forested nor completely clear, but
rather a complex tapestry of forests and clearings, human beings are drawn to
replicate the conditions of this original landscape when they take up residence
elsewhere — planting groves in the desert and clearing openings in the forest. Jay
Appleton (1975) extracts an aesthetic from this principle in his "prospect refuge
theory." He postulates that when humans are in re-created or natural savanna-type
landscapes (the landscape of forest and clearing, a dialectical pair) they will nor-
normally experience a feeling of aesthetic satisfaction. He suggests that this feeling of
satisfaction comes from a built-in capacity to recognize that their biological need
for food and protection can be assured in such a landscape.

Sir George Frazer (1951) provides evidence of how important the forest
and the clearing were in the development of the human spirit. In his exhaustive
study of mythology, he convincingly shows that the Sacred Tree, the Sacred Grove,
and the Sacred Clearing are the organizing feature of and landscape locus for the
world's oldest myths. He finds this to be true across cultures for mythologies that
developed independently. This suggests that when the human spirit charged forth
to repel the chaos of sensory im-pres-sions with creative ex-pres-sions, it quickly
conjured a meaning and role for the forest and the clearing and made the forest
and the clearing crucial elements of the embryonic cosmology.

Taken together, the works of Dubos, Appleton, and Frazer support the
proposition that the forest and the clearing, understood as a dialectical pair, are
the archetypal landscape space foundation upon which the edifice of a designed
landscape space topology can be erected. In forested landscapes, the natural clear-
ing can be seen as nature's gift to humans. Imagine yourself thrashing through the
trackless forest wilds. Suddenly you burst forth into the light and space of the
clearing. Finally you are free of lurking threats (i.e., free of evil). You look up into
the open sky and are thankful.

In open landscapes, the natural forest — or more appropriately the woods or
the grove — can be seen as nature's gift to humans. Imagine wandering through the
sun-bleached expanse, exposed and visible to predators and enemies from all
quadrants. Suddenly you "make" the grove. Now you are invisible to and protect-
ed from approaching threats. You look up into the diaphanous green ceiling of the
trees and are thankful.
The Land. The dynamic interaction of the natural forest/natural clearing dialectic takes place on land. Land, of course, is almost never completely flat. The particular topographic situation will alter the character and quality of the forest and clearing.

Designed landscape space types must somehow take their places, i.e., arrange themselves, within the continuum between the completely open natural clearing on the one side, and the completely closed natural forest on the other. The form of the land influences the continuum between the completely open and the completely closed. Land is either flat or steep or somewhere between. The land is either concave (inward facing) or convex (outward facing) or something between.

The Social Dimension. So far I have suggested a way to arrange the types relative to the morphological properties of the natural landscape archetypes on the one hand, and the morphological properties of the land on the other. This is useful; however, the human dimension is not yet incorporated. Humans interact with nature at many levels; the most direct would be the body in motion, hewing the forest, making the clearing, and bringing order to the chaos of nature. But as the clearing becomes a “thing for us,” through stabilizing our sensual relations (such as hunger) with the environment, so too does the street, as a human thing, become a “thing for us.” The street stabilizes our relations with nature. But the relations with nature that are manifest in the street are relations with nature’s other humans, or to put it another way, other natural creatures behaving in conformance with their

Humans plant, nurture, and protect the single tree. Sometimes the purpose is pragmatic and sensual: to provide a cool and shady space under its broad dome for human comfort and company. Sometimes it can mean more. Imagine a rocky promontory, on it the single tree, and in the shade of the tree a stone altar. Think of the "Liberty Tree" in Philadelphia. Picture a single tree the size of the Pantheon, quietly marking the changing centuries from its fixed place in an Aegean village square.

The Backyard

The backyard makes the transition and connection between the sanctuary of the shelter and the chaos of nature. The backyard can be as small as a porch with a flowerpot and still be a backyard (remove the pot and the transition evaporates and along with it the backyard).

Thinking about how backyards assert themselves in agricultural landscapes can be instructive. North American farmers can configure their yards in whatever way they wish since they control all the land around the house. The farmer usually cuts a regular form, like a rectangle or a square, out of the fabric of the surrounding fields and forests to make the backyard. This seems to echo an ancient compulsion. In nearly all the world’s cultures, humans mark the “four quarters” of the world by marking the square district. Apparently they do so to “make a world,” to make a cosmos out of a chaos (Elstade 1959).

In the backyard, humans make the quarters for their family. The quarters comfortably frame and control nature’s transformations. The quarters, marked out on the ground, extrude a space up to the sky — like the cloister or the clearing. Inevitably other elements are imposed to reinforce the quarters: fences, hedges, perennial beds, trees, orchards, garden plots. Each human intervention seems aimed at projecting an ideal order, a formal order, on an indifferent landscape.

Nature’s response is cool to this human toil. Nature will go where directed if this requires no extra effort. But
no matter how much energy humans expend, the feral habits of wind and rain, of sun and cloud, of plants and insects, provoke an onslaught of aberrations. This natural dissonance can only be sublimated, not obscured, by the power of the backyard's formal frame. The backyard with its tended plants and its fixed boundaries maintains the dream of nature the nurturing and wards off the menacing nightmare of nature the corrupting.

This most domestic and intimate of landscape spaces often expresses an imbalance in the life of the resident. In one backyard the battle with nature is lost, the backyard frame that fixes the image of "nature the nurturing" collapses. Nature the unreasonable, nature the downright ugly, reclaims it. Nature wallows drunkenly with the beer cans and old rusting wagons choking out everything that was once of value. In the other backyard the fight is obsessive. The family digs weeds out, days spent on knee pads, the bluegrass is "perfect." Nature is haughty and will not be bothered. Nature says from the heavens: "Your fears will be realized, your work notwithstanding."

The relationship between the resident and nature seems more balanced when it is less like a battle and more like a dance. The backyard gardener guides nature's forces; accepts nature's lead, then responds with her own thrust. She knows she's the frail one, but she still starts the music. Her pluck makes her special. She is the creator, no animal like her. Nature admires her for this, makes her lord of the flowers and says to her mildly "till you die we'll be partners."

The Promontory

The promontory is the place marked for elevated view. The promontory becomes a promontory when humans order it as such. It has a floor suited to the footfalls of humans. It has walls, real or implied, scaled to humans. The room of the promontory has walls made of rock, of trees, of air. The extent of the space is palpable even when it lacks solid definition. The promontory, like the single essential social nature. Therefore, another continuum along which landscape types might be arranged is conceivable. This pole would have human-to-nature designed types like the clearing on the one end, and human-to-human designed types like the street on the other.

Landscape Types and Their Arrangement. The three dimensions of the model I am proposing are: (1) the clearing to the forest continuum; (2) the human relations to nature continuum; and, (3) the landform continuum. These three dimensions are arranged on a three-dimensional model as shown in Figure 4-10. The form is that of a cone.

The clearing to the forest continuum moves around the base of the cone. This continuum begins at the rearward edge of the cone and progresses in one direction, clockwise. The progression begins with the landscape space types that, for me, have the deepest association with the natural clearing; it ends with the types that seem to have the strongest association with the natural forest. In this progression we move generally from the most open landscape space types to the most enclosed.

On the human relations to nature continuum the progression begins in the same spot, at the rearward base of the cone; however, here the progression operates in two directions. One stream moves clockwise, the other counterclockwise,
the two streams ending and joining at the forward base of the cone. Thus the
bosque, the single tree, and the clearing are all types that, in my view, have order
out of the chaos of nature; they are all about human relations with nature. That is
why I have located them near the human to nature rearward base of the cone. Oppo-
site these types are those that seem to be mostly about humans behaving naturally
in conformance with their essential social nature - types such as the street and the
front yard. These are located near the human to human forward base of the cone.
Between the stream ends are types like the allée situated at the left side of the
cone, and the cloister situated on the right. For me the cloister and the allée seem
to manifest a similar degree of human interaction with nature. However, they are
quite different with regard to the forest to clearing spectrum, because they have
very different spatial structures, and very different degrees of enclosure.

The landform continuum is quite simple. There seem to be certain types of
designed landscape spaces that are all about landform. They are the theater, the
stair, the terrace, and the promontory. The theater is virtually all about human
relations to other humans. At the other end of the scale, at the pinnacle of the
cone, is the promontory. The promontory seems to be virtually all about human
relations to nature. The stair and terrace arrange themselves on the human rela-
tions to nature gradient between these two extremes.

The following is a list of the types in this designed landscape space typology.
In the landscape they can be found singly, in combination, or in some complex
superimposition. They can be thought of as the armature of our typical landscape
experiences, or, more precisely, the armature of our experiences in beautiful and
meaningful built landscapes. They are: the single tree, the clearing, the cloister,
the square, the street, the front yard, the backyard, the allée, the orchard, the
bosque, the theater, the stair, the terrace, and the promontory.

These designed landscape space types have been included because, after
long reflection, it is sufficiently apparent that they meet four criteria. First, they
manifest, in form, the dialectic between the human compulsion for the beautiful
formal ideal and nature's sublime indifference to formal ideals of any kind.
Second, they are the products of human intervention in the landscape. Third, they
are not logically reducible to a more essential space. Fourth, they are valid as types
by virtue of what they have persistently represented. For example, the single tree
has a long history as a symbol for life and female fecundity in Greek and Roman
mythology. The orchard (as vineyard or olive grove) has a long history as a symbol
for humanity in the Judeo-Christian tradition.

...
Obviously this list excludes many types of built landscape spaces that do not conform to these criteria. The parking lot and the interstate highway do not, for me, manifest the dialectic. The park and the garden are, for me, reducible to more basic space types. The ball field is more a function than a space; at best it is a function that takes place within a clearing. Is the alley a designed landscape space type? I am not sure; perhaps others would say yes. How about the path? Again, perhaps, to some.

I am aware that any listing of types, no matter how deeply embedded in the conditional tense, may seem incomplete at best and presumptuous at worst. Nevertheless I think that the list has value. It is a beginning design vocabulary – only words. It is up to the designer to write the sentence. Type by itself is nowhere near enough. The designer must also understand the specific material language of the site, the design language of the site’s history (past and future), and the design language of the human activities proposed. If, then, the designer uses type as the armature upon which the other more particular languages are fastened, the result can be a poem in space.

Conclusion

Every day we spend in the landscape is another day spent inhabiting a narrative. This narrative is half real, half invented. The real part, the part that is not a human fabrication, is the messy, horrible, and incredibly sublime physicality of nature itself. This is a nature that for the most part remains invisible. The invented part, the part that we as humans make up as we go along, is the order that we impose on nature to domesticate it. It is the idealized, abstract, and beautiful order of our lawns, our farms, our streets, even of our freeways and our shopping malls. This is the part that we see all too well, so well that we seldom experience directly the sublime nature that it suppresses.

Designed landscape space types are the words in this narrative. Like the narrative itself they are half sublime, half beautiful – half real, half invention. This language is truly alive. Its vitality springs from the sublime force of violent nature. Humans lash and leash this violent nature in the straps of beautiful human order.

The story of our lives is written with the words of this vital, beautiful, and sublime language when we shape, then experience, our yards, streets, clearings, groves. Since each of us simultaneously acts out and watches our story unfold, the narrative continues to fascinate us. But if the language of our world is shattered, we are helpless. Our communication channel with nature is closed; our communication channel with other people is impeded.

Designers of landscapes should take note; they contribute more than most people to building our shared world. Designers should understand and use the shared language of designed landscape spaces as the typical words of their unique sentences. In this way our communication channel with nature is kept open. The dance of oppositions between nature and the mind, between the beautiful and the sublime, between the arbor and the vine, endures.
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