留白：
将城市虚空转变为公共空间

THE LIMIT TOWARD EMPTINESS: URBAN VOIDS AS PUBLIC SPACE

1 引言

作为资本积累的物质载体，城市具备吸引、吸纳并持有资本的能力。正如大卫·哈维所言：“城市发展依赖于剩余产品的地理与社会聚集。”^[1]虽然其他学者也曾发表过类似观点，但哈维做出了经典总结：城市是持续的资源消耗与资本持有的时空载体。

塞尔吉奥·洛佩斯-皮涅罗
哈佛大学设计研究生院讲师

Sergio LOPEZ-PINEIRO*
Lecturer of Harvard Graduate School of Design

*Corresponding Author
Address: 48 Quincy Street, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Gund Hall, Cambridge MA 02138, USA
Email: lopezpineiro@gsd.harvard.edu

摘要

城市是资本和文化聚集的空间载体，供养并服务着背景多元、需求迥异的广大市民。因此，城市需要那些可以包容并鼓励多样化的表达和呈现方式——无论是计划性的还是自发性的、受管控的还是不受管控的、永久的还是暂时的——的空间类型。本文认为，留白是一种可以满足这些公众需求的空间品质，而城市虚空即是一种典型的留白空间。“虚空”一词意味着这些空间并不具备与城市（即资本积累的载体）相关的那些价值。但是，这种（资本意义上、房地产意义上的、功效意义上的或生产意义上的）留白恰恰是催生其他场所特性和机会的原因。换句话说，价值上的缺乏是这些闲置空间显得边缘化的原因，而这种边缘性恰恰赋予了城市虚空其他城市空间所没有的公共性的可能。尽管城市虚空为市民创造了许多社交机会，但留白的消逝也暴露了城市虚空的局限性。

关键词

空白；公共空间；城市虚空；空地；模糊地块

ABSTRACT

Cities are spatial aggregations of capital and culture that host and serve a vast array of different and often contradictory publics. For this reason, cities need spaces that accept and encourage multiple types of representations and forms of expression: planned and spontaneous, regulated and unregulated, permanent and temporary. This essay argues that emptiness is a spatial quality that can satisfy these needs and that urban voids are a paradigmatic example of empty spaces. The term “void” implies that these spaces are emptied of the value typically associated with cities as places of capital accumulation. But this emptiness (of capital, real estate value, efficacy, or production) is what enables other sensibilities and opportunities to emerge. In other words, a lack of value is what makes these vacant spaces appear as marginal, and this marginality is precisely what gives the urban voids the possibilities for publicness that other urban spaces do not have. Despite the social opportunities offered by urban voids, the evanescence of emptiness ultimately exposes the limits of urban voids.

KEYWORDS

Emptiness; Public Space; Urban Voids; Void; Terrain Vague

翻译 田乐 冉玲于 蔡淦东
TRANSLATED BY Tina TIAN RAN Lingyu CAI Gandong

城市的文化积淀供养并服务着需求迥异的庞大人群。非城市环境主要由需求和愿望相似的同类人群构成，并形成稳定和标志性的社会及城市结构（如睡城、中央商务区、城郊或乡村）。相反，城市环境主要由拥有不同文化情趣与不同文化需求的人群构成，并借助不同类型的公共空间予以表达和满足。

城市结构具有资本聚集和文化聚集的双重特征。许多城市都面临着资本与文化的矛盾，这一点似乎在公共空间上体现得尤为明显。由于二者对于公共领域的构建和界定具有重要意义，人们期望公共空间能体现与城市的经济稳定性和活力息息相关的鲜明特征和魅力。但是，由于使用群体的多样性，这些空间必须具有临时性和重叠性，故而时常在属性和土地利用上发生冲突。

2 空白：空间品质的合成体

对于以上这些相互叠加的属性可以有多种审视视角。在我看来，“空白”（emptiness）是一种抽象的空间状态，其中所包含的重叠属性可视为一种既各自独立又相互关联的现实。对我而言，“空白”一词指的是那些经由设计形成的留白空间，也指从中抹去具体空间特征的过程。这种清空过程为计划或意料之外的用途与含义创造了可能性。为了在清空空间特征的同时也保留空间可能性，就必须清空对“空白”本身的空间想象，即打破对“空白”的固有观念。总而言之，我在本文中使用“空白”一词来指代一种既能满足公众需求、又能服务于设计师想象的双重空间条件：空白，既是空间上的清空，也是想象上的留白。

1 Introduction

As fabrics of capital accumulation, cities are physical entities capable of attracting, absorbing, and holding capital. As David Harvey has argued, “cities have arisen through geographical and social concentrations of a surplus product.”^[1] Following this line of thought—which has been discussed by many authors but is exemplified by Harvey—cities can be described as continuous resource-consuming and capital-holding spatiotemporal fabrics.

As fabrics of cultural accumulation, cities host and serve a vast array of different and often contradictory publics. Non-urban environments are mostly characterized by congruent publics with similar needs and desires. This coherent condition results in stable and recognizable social and urban fabrics (for example, dormitory cities, central business districts, suburbs, or villages). In contrast, urban environments are characterized by incongruent publics defined by a mix of different cultural interests and needs, expressed and satisfied respectively by different types of public space.

This dual condition as aggregators of capital and culture characterizes urban fabrics. While the tensions between both are experienced in many of the cities’ realms, public space appears to be where these pressures can be felt most evidently. Due to their role and meaning in the construction and definition of the public realm, public spaces are expected to embody a well-defined character and gravitas typically connected to a cities’ economic stability and vitality. Due to the public’s diversity, however, these spaces must engage with temporary, overlapping, and often contradictory sensibilities and occupations.

2 Emptiness as a Synthetic Spatial Quality

There are different ways to engage with these overlapping realities. From my perspective, emptiness is an abstract spatial condition that allows me to work on this overlapping condition as both independent and interrelated realities. With the term emptiness, I am referring to both designed spaces that appear to be empty and to the process of emptying space from a concrete characteristic. This emptying process opens up space for unplanned or unexpected uses and meanings coming from different citizenries. To enable this simultaneous process of emptying and opening up space, the spatial imagination of emptiness must itself be kept empty. Summarizing, I use the term emptiness in this article to refer to this dual spatial condition that applies to both citizens and designers: emptiness refers to both empty space and empty expectations.

因此，虽然空白通常被理解为绝对条件，但我更愿意将其理解为是对公共领域进行想象的可能性所提供的一种有用视角；我也将空白视为一种数学极限，一种趋于——但不能且永远不会——完全实现的状态。

尽管有很多空间类型都具有这种空白的双重属性，但在本文中，我将着眼于城市虚空（urban void）这一最为典型的空间类型。在讨论城市空间时，“空白”一词可能会让人产生负面联想（因为有人会将“空白”误以为是什么都没有），因此，“城市虚空”的表述可能也会引起误解。且若有人从其他非经济视角（如生态可持续性 or 社会多样性）来重新理解城市，可能也会提出质疑，认为这些空间不是空的——对于这些人来说，城市虚空实际上充满了另类（非经济）潜力。由于这些空间的边缘化，它们可以蕴含其他公共空间所不具备（或无法提供）的机会（如生态或社会机会）。这类观点——即使只是出于实际考虑——所讨论的应该是另一个概念。

但是，我认为“虚空”并不代表这些空间空无一物——换句话说，“虚空”不应等同于“空空如也”。“虚空”一词是指这些空间并不具备与城市（即资本积累的载体）相关的那些价值。但是，这种（资本意义上、房地产意义上的、功效意义上的或生产意义上的）空白恰恰是催生其他场所特性和机会的原因。换句话说，缺乏价值正是这些闲置空间显得边缘化的原因，而这种边缘化恰恰赋予了城市虚空其他城市空间所没有的可能性。

3 城市虚空：在资本与文化之外

城市虚空是资本主义城市化进程的“边角余料”、被遗弃之地，人们对它们不再存有产出上的计划和期望。因此，它们在价值、生产力和效率上都是“空白”的。资本的清空使这些城市空间处于边缘状态，但同时也为其提供了潜力和机遇。因此，城市虚空是被有意或无意地排除在组织、权力、表达、基础设施和城市控制范围之外的空间，它们是不受资本和社会管控的地方。

1995年，伊戈纳西·德·索拉—莫拉埃尔发表了《模糊地块》一文，引起了建成环境设计领域（建筑设计、景观设计及城市设计）对

For this reason, while emptiness is usually understood to be an absolute condition, I argue that emptiness is better described as a useful horizon of possibilities for the imagination of the public realm. Accordingly, I propose treating emptiness as a mathematical limit, a condition to tend to, but that cannot and is never fully reached.

While there are different types of spaces that could be argued to satisfy this dual nature of emptiness, in this article, I briefly discuss urban voids as one of its most exemplary. The term void can project bad connotations when discussing urban spaces—as some people mistake void for vacuum—and, thus, the expression “urban void” could be misunderstood. People interested in redefining the city according to other ideologies or points of view that are not exclusively economic (ecological sustainability or social diversity, for example) might argue that these spaces are not empty. To them, these spaces are, in fact, full of alternative (non-economic) potential. Due to their marginality, these spaces offer opportunities (ecological or social, for example) that other public spaces do not—and cannot. Following this line of thought, it could be argued that another term should be used—even if it is only for practical reasons.

However, I do not use the term void to imply that these spaces are emptied of everything—in other words, a void should not be confused with a vacuum. The term void means that these spaces are emptied of the value typically associated with cities as places of capital accumulation. But this emptiness (of capital, real estate value, efficacy, or production) is precisely what enables other sensibilities and opportunities to emerge. In other words, a lack of value is what makes these vacant spaces appear as marginal, and this marginality is precisely what gives the urban voids the possibilities that other urban spaces do not have.

3 Urban Voids as Outsides to Capital and Culture

Urban voids are residues of capitalist processes of urbanization. They are leftovers, abandoned places that no longer yield the planned and desired output. As such, they are empty of value, productivity, and efficiency. The whiting out of capital turns urban spaces into a marginal state but, simultaneously, provides them with potential and opportunities. Therefore, urban voids are gaps, intentionally or accidentally left outside of the continuum of space, organization, power, representation, infrastructure, and control of the city. Urban voids are places where both capital and social management are no longer in existence.

In 1995, Ignasi de Solà-Morales published “Terrain Vague,” an article that launched widespread interest in the city’s vacant

城市闲置区域的广泛关注。德·索拉—莫拉埃尔使用的“模糊地块”（*terrain vague*）这一特定术语，指代的就是本文中的城市虚空。在这篇著名的文章中，德·索拉—莫拉埃尔指出，模糊地块的特点是“位于城市内部，但日常不被使用……这些奇怪的地方被排除在城市的有效交通和生产结构之外。”^[2]他进一步指出，模糊地块“是被遗忘于城市系统之外的；虽然位于城市物质空间内部，但从人们对城市的固有认知层面来讲，它并不属于城市；它是城市的负面形象，因而也饱受非议。”^[2]换句话说，模糊地块存在于城市内部，但不属于城市；它们位于那些已经不再算是城市的地方。^[2]按照德·索拉—莫拉埃尔的观点，城市虚空是城市的一部分，但它们日常不被使用。它们无法满足任何功能需求，因此也不隶属于城市中任何正式的生产性或娱乐性系统。当它们位于城市内部时，城市虚空便与周围环境分隔开来，成为文化范式之外的“隐匿角落”。这些特征不符合人们对于城市空间的认知，因此，城市虚空可谓是被摒除于资本和文化的范畴。

城市虚空既承载着城市发展的痕迹，也是城市的喘息空间：它们是城市结构左右人们生活能力的证据，但也为人们提供了喘息的机会。缺乏都市特征、不受明显控制，貌似开放可得，这样的边缘化空间使个体自发性得以展现。

城市虚空虽然是集体意志的失败，却展现出了巨大的个体自发性。它们被视为破败之地，因此在社会和文化想象中也边缘化。然而，作为潜力空间，这些隐匿的城市角落可以激发人们的想象力。这种同时存在的双重感知特征使城市虚空具备了成为新型日常公共空间的可能性。

4 空白：被时间界定的空间，或被空间包围的时间

与大多数其他类型的公共空间相比，城市虚空的边界更明确，也更封闭。由于这类空间具有明确定义的围合边界，城市虚空也可以被理解为是对城市结构内部的资本的清理。由于这种边缘性和封闭性，城市虚空成为了局部化的、有界限的空间，且充满了不受管制的社会文化自由。

斯坦法诺·博埃里、阿图罗·兰扎和厄多阿多·马里尼等人将城市虚空视为无名之地，认为在公共空间语境下城市虚空的价值观

areas within the design disciplines of the built environment (architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism). He used the specific term “*terrain vague*” to refer to the kind of spaces that today are generically known as urban voids. In his now well-known article, de Solà-Morales argued that the *terrain vague* should be characterized as “internal to the city yet external to its everyday use... These strange places exist outside the city’s effective circuits and productive structures.”^[2] He further described the *terrain vague* as “foreign to the urban system, mentally exterior in the physical interior of the city, its negative image, as much a critique as a possible alternative.”^[2] In other words, the *terrain vague* exists within the city but does not belong to it; the *terrain vague* is located “where the city is no longer.”^[2] Following de Solà-Morales’ line of thought, it can be argued that urban voids are part of the city, but they are located outside of its everyday use. They do not satisfy any functional need, and as a consequence, they are not part of the city’s formal productive or playful tissue. While they are located inside cities, urban voids are separated from their surrounding environments, becoming spaces of seclusion located outside of cultural norms. Due to this condition as exteriors to urban space, urban voids can be described as places outside to both capital and culture.

Urban voids are both evidence and respite. They are evidence of the urban fabric’s capacity to dominate people’s lives, but they also offer a respite from this dominance. Devoid of urbanity, without apparent control, and appearing as open and available, marginal spaces allow for the emergence of individual spontaneity.

Urban voids are both failures of collective will and becomings of individual spontaneity. Due to their categorization as failures, they are represented as marginal within the social and cultural imagination. As potentials, however, they become places of seclusion that can help unleash people’s imaginations. This simultaneous double perception is what makes urban voids an alternative to common public spaces.

4 Emptiness as Spaces Framed in Time or Temporalities Enclosed in Space

Urban voids have boundaries that are more defined and less porous than most types of public space. Because of their clearly defined containment, urban voids can be considered clearings of capital within the urban fabric. Due to both their marginality and containment, urban voids are localized bounded spaces that allow for unregulated sociocultural freedoms.

In their article on urban voids as nameless spaces, Stefano Boeri, Arturo Lanzani, and Edoardo Marini address urban

“必须在两个极端情况下寻求集体身份的可能性。一种极端情况是，这种可能性会在可见的‘公共’空间中体现，在这种公共空间中，社会呈现出明确的集体身份，且这种身份正逐渐被对某些消费品的拥有或某类服务的利用来定义……另一种情况是，这种可能性会体现在更加个人化的层面上及更为隐蔽的地理环境中，这些场所的亲密关系由社区、宗族、种族或地域网络粘合在一起：例如，小型火车站的候车室，不同身份背景的当地居民在此相遇；或者是独栋住宅附近的空地，可以被用作临时性的橄榄球场。”^[3]城市虚空可以提供一种新型的公共空间，进而促进不同的集体和个体的临时流通。必须指出的是，这种可能性的产生主要缘于城市虚空的局限性，即其作为城市内部具有明确边界的一种空间。

在提到城市虚空的品质时，一些学者使用了具有时空双重特征的表述。例如，吕克·莱维克使用“空隙”（interstice）一词描述这些空间，并指出该术语体现出了空间和时间上的双重维度。^[4]此外，许多学者还使用了一些将时间和空间相结合的术语来反映时空品质。如德·索拉—莫拉埃尔最初使用的“模糊地块”就是早期的一个例子——正如他所解释的那样，从词源上讲，这一术语是指地表的振动性和波动性扩展。^[5]其他类似的表述还包括城市触媒概念下所使用的“时间间隔”（time gap）一词，这一概念将城市虚空形容为“在先前的用地性质瓦解之后、在新的商业发展之前的停滞时刻”。^[6]

除了空间限制外，临时性这一特点在城市虚空的构成中也起着决定性作用。正是由于这些特征，城市虚空将不仅仅是临时的一种空间，在这些空间中所进行的活动的持续时间也非常有限。因此，城市虚空也可以理解为被时间界定的空间，或被空间包围的时间。

5 未被充分认知的美学^①

在资本积累和消费的过程中，诞生了诸如办公大楼、机场或高端购物中心等特殊而纯粹的空间形式，以至于其背景环境因素（如区位、气候等）都已变得不足为道。因此，无论这些空间位于何处，总会呈现出自我相似性，或者趋于雷同。从其在经济体制下所承担的目

voids’ value within discussions of public space by arguing that the possibility for a collective identity “must be sought at two extremes. On the one hand, we can seek it in the case of visible ‘public’ spaces, in which society renders explicit a collective identity which is increasingly defined by the possession of certain consumer goods and the utilisation of services.... At the other extreme, this meaning can be rediscovered in a more personal, hidden geography of places, in whose intimacy a more limited community meets, connected by networks of neighbourhood, parentage, ethnic or regional factors; a waiting room of a small railroad station, which becomes a point of encounter for natives dispersed by immigration; or vacant lots near a residential area of single family houses, periodically used for football games.”^[3] Urban voids can offer a new type of public space that enables the temporary circulation of different collectivities and individualities. It is essential to note that this possibility arises primarily because of the urban void’s boundedness as a clearly defined space interval within the city.

In referring to the urban void qualities, some authors have used terms and expressions that speak of a dual spatial and temporal character. For example, Luc Lévesque uses the label “interstice” to name these spaces and points out that this term implies a double dimension, both spatial and temporal.^[4] Furthermore, in many cases, authors have used expressions that reflect both spatial and temporary qualities by using a combination of temporal and spatial terms. This tendency was already started by de Solà-Morales with the use of his original term, “terrain vague,” which, as he explained, etymologically refers to an oscillating and fluctuating extension of ground.^[5] Other authors have explored a similar line of thought. For example, Urban Catalyst uses the expression “time gap” to refer to urban voids as moments of “standstill between the collapse of a previous use and the beginning of new commercial development.”^[6]

In addition to its spatial containment, the quality of its temporary duration also plays a fundamental role in an urban voids’ constitution. Urban voids are not merely temporary spaces due to their character; the activities that take place in them also have limited durations. For this reason, urban voids could be defined as spaces framed in time or as temporalities enclosed in space.

5 The Aesthetics of Underspecification^①

The purest forms resulting from processes of capital accumulation and consumption—office towers, airports, or high-end shopping malls, for example—are highly specified spaces to the extreme that local circumstances such as site, climate, and

① 作者非常感谢奥马尔·汗借助一般控制论思想以及对戈登·帕斯克作品的分析，向他引介了“定义不足 / 定义欠缺”（underspecification）一词。

① The author is grateful to Omar Khan for introducing him to the term “underspecification” through his analysis of cybernetics in general, and the work of Gordon Pask in particular.

标和角色来看，这些空间的特殊性或许是合乎逻辑的，但它们更应被视为有别于其他任何空间的一种“过度定义”的空间。

与这种过度定义的空间状况相反，城市虚空是城市资本浪费与闲置的最为直接的表现，即可以将其视为资本积累和资本消费过程的边角余料。正如迈克尔·格林伯格、弗兰克·波普尔和贝娜黛特·韦斯特在他们研究临时废弃地的文章中所述说的那样：“每个城市都存在这样的场地，它们大小不一、形态各异、零零散散地随机分布于未利用的土地上。”^[7]

罗伯特·史密森认识到城市资本积累与城市虚空的双重性。在新泽西州帕塞伊克河的古迹之旅中，他调研了帕塞伊克河沿岸的过度定义和未被充分认知的城市组成部分，包括基础设施、商业空间，以及废弃的或未被充分利用的空间，并发现，无论这些组成部分本身具备怎样的特性，最终都呈现出相似的命运，并且通过全然的普遍性、匿名性和必然性而获得了无法忽视的地位。这似乎是一个令人困惑的结论：城市虚空何以与基础设施和商业空间相提并论？对此，他不禁提出了帕塞伊克河是否“取代了罗马而成为真正的永恒之城”^[8]的疑问。事实上，在提出这一疑问之前，他就已经给出了答案——“这一缺乏想象力的城郊地本可以作为‘不朽之城’的廉价复制品而拥有一种不得体的永恒性。”^[8]

因此，可以说无论城市虚空位于何地，我们都能辨认其外观。这种特征使城市虚空区别于传统的公共空间形式，它们无需关注周边与本地环境，无需体现文化与在地特征，也无需遵循城市法规。究其根本，是因为城市虚空是一种残余物般的存在，它们的特征并不受这些场地因素的影响。无所限制，故无处不在。也正因如此，周围的城市和社会文化背景并未赋予城市虚空独有的特征：无论它们在哪里，看上去都极为相似（图1~9）。正如克里斯托夫·吉鲁特所言，城市虚空是一种“普遍的产物”，“模棱两可的性质就和它们无处不在的性质一样普遍：没有文化承载、亦无固定之所，无论是在何处，这类模糊的地块看起来似乎都是相同的。”^[9]对于城市虚空而言，这种定义的对缺失（相较于传统的公共空间定义）往往促使人对它们的品质产生负面印象；事实上，从另一个角度来看，这一特征恰恰是催生新型公

others become unimportant. For this reason, these spaces always appear as self-similar and tend to be almost identical regardless of their location. While this specification level is logical according to their aims and roles as nodes within the economic system, these spaces should be considered overspecified from any other urban perspective.

In opposition to this condition of overspecification, urban voids are the purest form of capital dissipation and idleness in cities. They can be considered the residue of the processes associated with capital accumulation and consumption. As suggested by Michael Greenberg, Frank Popper, and Bernadette West in their article on temporarily obsolete abandoned derelict sites, “every city has them; scattered, random unused parcels of land of varying size and shape.”^[7]

Robert Smithson recognized the duality existing between urban accumulations and their counterparts, urban voids. In his text “A Tour of the Monuments of Passaic, New Jersey,” he surveyed Passaic’s overspecified and underspecified urban components—infrastructural elements and commercial spaces as well as abandoned and underused spaces. Smithson argued that, regardless of their nature, all these components share a similar fate and achieve monumental status through sheer ubiquity, anonymity, and apparent unavailability. This seemingly confounding situation—how can infrastructures and commercial spaces have the same status as urban voids?—leads him to ask if Passaic has, in fact, “replaced Rome as The Eternal City?”^[8] His response, stated even before he asked the question, is evident as “that unimaginative suburb could have been a clumsy eternity, a cheap copy of The City of the Immortals.”^[8]

For this reason, we know what urban voids look like regardless of where they are located. This characteristic makes such spaces uniquely different from traditional forms of public space, which tend to pay attention to their circumstantial and local context—as it appears via cultural identity, neighborhood characteristics, or urban regulations. Since the urban void emerges as a residue, their character is not influenced by these local factors, and, as a consequence, they tend to appear as siteless. The surrounding urban and sociocultural context does not give the urban void a unique character: they all look quite similar regardless of location (Fig. 1 ~ 9). As argued by Christophe Girot, the urban void is a “universal artifact” whose “ambiguity is as pervasive as their ubiquity: culture-less and placeless, the ‘terrain vague’ looks identical no matter where it is found.”^[9] While this lack of specification usually tends to be perceived as a negative quality in the definition of public space, in the case of the urban void, however, it should be considered as the enabling and liberating factor for the emergence of an alternative

1 © 2019 MassGIS, Commonwealth of Massachusetts E054, Maxar Technologies, Sanborn, Map data © 2019 Google

2 © 2019 Maxar Technologies, New York GIS, U.S. Geological Survey, USDA Farm Service Agency, Map data © 2019

3 © 2019 Google, Map data © 2019

4 © 2019 CNES / Airbus, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2019 Inst. Geogr. Nacional

5 © 2019 Google, Imagery © 2019 Maxar Technologies, Terra Bella, Map data © 2019

6 © 2019 CNES/Airbus, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2019

7 © 2019 Maxar Technologies, Imagery © 2019 CNES / Airbus, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2019

8 © 2019 Digital Earth Technology, The GeoInformation Group, Map data © 2019

9 © 2019 Google, Imagery © 2019 First Base Solutions, Maxar Technologies, Map data © 2019

共空间的原因。由于未被定义或未被充分认知，城市虚空变得随处可见，进而产生了巨大的公共潜力。

6 为市民创造享受留白的机会

由于虚空具备边缘化空间的特征，城市虚空便拥有了传统公共空间所没有的“自由”。这种另类的公共性发挥了清空功能，典型的公众面貌或发展期望在这里一概不见。丹尼尔·坎波对于城市虚空所带

kind of public space. As a result of both unspecification and underspecification, placelessness gives urban voids a ubiquitous and anonymous appearance that further strengthens their public potentials.

6 An Opportunity for Citizens: Enjoying Emptiness

Due to their status as marginal spaces, these spaces offer freedoms distinct from and not found within traditional public spaces. The emergence of this alternative type of publicness can

1. 波士顿市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
2. 水牛城市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
3. 休斯敦市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
4. 马德里市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
5. 米兰市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
6. 圣地亚哥市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
7. 上海市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
8. 东京市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）
9. 多伦多市内的城市空墟航拍图（2019年）

1. Aerial view of an urban void in Boston [2019]
2. Aerial view of an urban void in Buffalo [2019]
3. Aerial view of an urban void in Houston [2019]
4. Aerial view of an urban void in Madrid [2019]
5. Aerial view of an urban void in Milan [2019]
6. Aerial view of an urban void in Santiago de Chile [2019]
7. Aerial view of an urban void in Shanghai [2019 year]
8. Aerial view of an urban void in Tokyo [2019]
9. Aerial view of an urban void in Toronto [2019]

来的体验给予了生动描述，“这个空旷的场所曾是布鲁克林东区航站楼所在地，如今，它被废弃了，但却意外地满足了当地部分居民的基本游憩需求，如欣赏风景、享受独处、嬉戏游玩等。但是，它又不仅仅是城市公园的一个简单替代品。因为人们能够且确实在这里做了任何他们想做的事情，无论是在河里游泳，还是烧烤、溜冰、放烟花，亦或是利用捡拾的瓦砾进行艺术创作……这是一个没有明确规则的地方，你可以做一切你想做的，其他人亦可如此。”^[10]

7 设计师的责任：保护虚空

尽管空无一物，但城市虚空可以同建筑一般拥有多种结构形式。杰森·扬在其针对底特律的“留白的密度”研究中恰如其分地描述了类似情况，他认为留白是历经连续的建设与衰败过程之后的一种存在。在他的文章中，留白被描述为是底特律城市体验的原始空间品质，这与传统城市肌理所造成的拥挤体验相反：“留白给予了人们喘息的机会，从而创造出充实感和期待感来缓解拥挤的城市生活对人们精神所造成的压力。”^[11]

作为可利用土地，城市虚空总是可以被再次开发并整合进城市肌理中。在许多情况下，由于社会或环境因素，这可能是必要之举。但是，如果需要被完全重新整合的理由并不充分，则应尝试去保护这些城市虚空，以促使其发挥作为新型公共空间的潜力。但问题是，如何才能在不破坏其最初的空间品质的前提下，使之转变为现实？正如史蒂文·托尼特精辟地发问：“如何在建成项目中保留虚空最初的那份迷人的不确定性？”^[12]尤其是，如何在被权力和权威所掌控的规范下实现这样的自由与不确定性？

数位学者对于建筑学改变这一现状的能力表示怀疑。例如，吉尔·多伦使用了“越界区域”（transgressive zone）一词，称城市虚空的产生恰恰是由于建筑学与城市规划学学科范畴的局限性。雷姆·库哈斯也表达了相同的怀疑，当他反思其对于柏林进行城市概念与空间

also be considered a result of a temporary process of whitening out typical public decorum or expectations. Daniel Campo has richly described the experiences afforded by one such urban void, the abandoned yard of the former Brooklyn Eastern District Terminal: “It served basic recreational needs of some but not all local residents—including a place to experience beauty, solitude, play, or the company of others—but was no mere substitute for a city park. People could and did do what they wanted, whether it was to swim in the river, have a barbecue, build a skatepark, practice loud music, play with fire, or create art out of found rubble.... It was a place without explicit rules: You did what you wanted, but with the understanding that others would do the same.”^[10]

7 A Role for Designers: Protecting the Void

Despite their emptiness, urban voids can have as much presence as built forms. Jason Young aptly describes this condition in his study of Detroit, “Density of Emptiness,” in which he analyzes the presence acquired by emptiness in a city that has undergone successive processes of unbuilding and decay. In this text, Young describes emptiness as the primordial spatial quality of Detroit’s urban experience, which stands in opposition to the typical congested experience of traditional urban fabrics: “Emptiness perforates density, countering the mental effects of congestion with a ‘fullness’ and a sense of expectancy all its own.”^[11]

As available land, urban voids can always be developed and thus reintegrated into the city’s fabric. In many instances, this might be the necessary line of action due to social or environmental circumstances. However, if the context does not require a complete reintegration, then urban voids should be protected to fulfill their potential as alternative public spaces. The question that emerges is, how can this opportunity be made physical without destroying the qualities that made it possible in the first place? As Stéphane Tonnelat succinctly phrased it, the question is: “how to retain in a built project the indeterminacy of the interstice that made it attractive in the first place?”^[12] Particularly, how can freedom and indeterminacy be enabled through disciplines that epitomize and generally require power and authority?

Several authors have expressed doubts about the ability of Architecture to exercise this change. For instance, Gil Doron has used the term “transgressive zone” to refer to the fact that urban voids are defined by the disciplinary limits of Architecture and Urban Planning. Rem Koolhaas has also expressed similar doubts when reflecting on the manifesto on the conceptual reframing

重构的宣言（即他与奥斯瓦尔德·马蒂亚斯·翁格斯合著的《柏林：绿色群岛》）时说道：“无物存在之处，一切皆有可能。存在建筑之处，（其他）无一可能。”^[13]除了这些学者已经明确表达的对建筑学处理这一问题能力的担忧外，还需注意的是，城市规划学科其实也存在类似缺陷。而在建筑环境工程的主要设计学科中，景观设计学似乎是唯一可以借助适当感知力来改变这一现状的学科。

在许多情况下，城市虚空中的留白是不被大众所接受或欣赏的。虽然为了恢复过去的用途，有时可能需要某种弥补性策略，但是，多数设计师所设想的对于城市虚空的开发方式都不可避免地摧毁了虚空的留白性。因此，任何与城市虚空相关的设计都应以保护虚空性为先，以确保在资本主导下的连续的城市肌理中，城市虚空作为可承载真正公共性的开放空间的品质能够得以保留。

在1996年威尼斯双年展期间，集合了荷兰案例的《殖民虚空：鹿特丹港市West 8景观设计事务所设计师阿德里安·高伊策》一书出版，作者汉斯·范·迪克指出，建筑师和城市设计师已经开始意识到虚空（而非空间）才是建筑和城市设计真正应该关注的重点。不过，他同时也指出，两个术语之间存在显著差异——二者不能互相取代——并且，虚空意味着新的学科矛盾的出现，且尚未得到充分探讨。“虚空意味着没有计划；虚空意味着缺乏建筑；虚空是尚未兑现诺言和拥有无限机会的领域；虚空是我们欲望的投射。”^[14]

计划的缺失恰恰是虚空具备特有潜力的原因。为了利用这份潜力，需要在提出正式的计划之前对此时此地的城市虚空施以保护。一旦这里被各种计划填满，它们的留白性便消失了——因为这些计划必然会通过设计方案来具体执行，从而将其他的机会或可能性都排除在外。因此，在设想利用城市虚空之前，必须首先保护虚空所具备的不确定性和模糊性——但矛盾的是，这种想法必须确保虚空不具备任何属性。

8 留白的局限性

尽管城市虚空创造了诸多社交机会，但也不乏风险。作为一种副产品，城市虚空最初并未经过特意设计，因而也未被永久定义。因此，

and spatial re-imagination of the city of Berlin, *Berlin: A Green Archipelago*, which he produced jointly with Oswald Mathias Ungers: “Where there is nothing, everything is possible. Where there is architecture, nothing (else) is possible.”^[13] It is worth noting that while these concerns have been explicitly expressed about Architecture, the disciplines of Urban Planning exhibit similar deficiencies. Out of the main design disciplines of the Built Environment, Landscape Architecture seems to be the only discipline that might approach this transformation with the right sensibility.

In many cases, the emptiness found in urban voids has not been accepted or appreciated. While some type of remediation might sometimes be necessary due to prior uses, the reclamation processes imagined by most authors to develop an urban void would inevitably destroy the void’s emptiness. Consequently, the first role of any design process engaging with an urban void should be to protect its voidness so that it can retain its qualities as an opening in the capitalist continuum of the city that can allow for true publicness to emerge.

In *Colonizing the Void: Adriaan Geuze, West 8 Landscape Architects, Rotterdam*—a book published on the occasion of the Dutch contribution to the 1996 Venice Biennale—Hans van Dijk argues that architects and urban designers are beginning to realize that the void, rather than space, is the real concern of architecture and urban design. However, he points out that there are significant differences between both terms—one does not merely replace the other—and that the void presents new disciplinary contradictions that have not yet been thoroughly discussed. “The void points to the absence of intentions. The void is the absence of architecture. The void is the domain of unfulfilled promise and unlimited opportunity. It is the projection screen of our desire.”^[14]

This lack of intentions is precisely what gives the void its characteristic potential. To take advantage of the opportunities they present, urban voids need to be protected in this specific state that precedes the formalizing of any intention. When voids are filled with intentions, their emptiness evaporates, as intentions will inevitably be materialized with design plans that prevent the appearance of other opportunities and possibilities. For this reason, the first step of any design act conceived for an urban void must be the protection of the void in its indeterminate and ambiguous state. Paradoxically, this first intention must absolutely ensure that the void lacks any other additional purposes.

8 The Limits of Emptiness

Despite the social opportunities offered by urban voids, emptiness also poses risks. As byproducts, urban voids are

城市虚空可以因不同功能而被赋予不同内涵，正是这种“流动的品质”促使不同身份背景的人们都能以各自的方式去使用这些虚空。可见，欲使城市虚空保持其开放性，就必须使之不被永久定义——即城市虚空应当作为一种无法留存记忆的空间。换言之，城市虚空是一种患有“失语症”的空间。

记忆是形成与定义身份的重要途径。因此，无法留存记忆可以有效打消公众想要在公共空间维持和保护他们个人或集体身份的意图。鉴于此，对于一些特殊情况或特定社区而言，城市虚空可能是一种不适宜的或完全无法被接受的公共空间类型。然而，当面对城市虚空能同时为不同群体提供服务方面所具备的极大话语权时，这些缺点实在不足一提。留白是一种难以捉摸的空间品质，充满了不断逃离（现实）的可能性——如若这种特征能受到保护，城市虚空将拥有无与伦比的开放品质。

确实，城市虚空创造了各种社交机会，但是，这些虚空的消失也暴露出它们的局限性——即，无法抵达极致的留白。**LAF**

注释

本文包含了作者撰写的《城市虚空术语汇编》修订版的部分内容。经作者塞尔吉奥·洛佩斯－皮涅罗和出版商JOVIS的许可发表于本刊。

REFERENCES

[1] Harvey, D. (2008). The Right to the City. *New Left Review*, (53), 23-40. Retrieved from <https://newleftreview.org/issues/1153/articles/david-harvey-the-right-to-the-city.pdf>

[2] De Solà-Morales, I. (1995). *Terrain Vague*. In C. C. Davidson (Ed.), *Anyplace* (p. 120). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[3] Boeri, S., Lanzani, A., & Marini, E. (1993). *Nuovi Spazi Senza Nome* [New Nameless Spaces]. Casabella, (597-598), 123.

[4] Lévesque, L. (2013). Trajectories of Interstitial Landscapeness: A Conceptual Framework for Territorial Imagination and Action. In A. M. Brighenti (Ed.), *Urban Interstices: The Aesthetics and the Politics of the In-Between* (pp. 21-63). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315548807>

[5] De Solà-Morales, I. (1995). *Terrain Vague*. In C. C. Davidson (Ed.), *Anyplace* (pp. 119-120). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[6] Oswalt, P., Misselwitz, P., & Overmeyer, K. (2007). Patterns of the Unplanned. In K. A. Franck, & Q. Stevens (Eds.), *Loose Space: Possibility and Diversity in Urban Life* (p. 273). London, England; New York, NY: Routledge.

[7] Greenberg, M. R., Popper, F. J., & West, B. M. (1990). The Toads: A New American Epidemic. *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, 25(3), 435-454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004208169002500306>

[8] Smithson, R. (1996). *A Tour of the Monuments of Passaic*, New Jersey. In J. Flam (Ed.), *Robert Smithson: The Collected Writings* (p. 74). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

[9] Girot, C. (2016). *The Course of Landscape Architecture: A History of Our Designs on the Natural World, from Prehistory to the Present* (p. 285). New York, NY: Thames & Hudson.

[10] Campo, D. (2013). *The Accidental Playground: Brooklyn Waterfront Narratives of the Undesigned and Unplanned* (p. 13). New York, NY: Empire State Editions.

[11] Young, J. (2010). Density of Emptiness. In G. Wilkins (Ed.), *Distributed Urbanism: Cities after Google Earth* (p. 123). New York, NY: Routledge.

[12] Tonnelat, S. (2008). 'Out of Frame': The (in)Visible Life of Urban Interstices—A Case Study in Charenton-Le-Pont, Paris, France. *Ethnography*, 9(3), 291-324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138108094973>

[13] Koolhaas, R. (1995). Imagining Nothingness. In R. Koolhaas, & B. Mau (Eds.), *S, M, L, XL* (p. 199). New York, NY: The Monacelli Press.

[14] Van Dijk, H. (1996). *Colonizing the Void: Adriaan Geuze, West 8 Landscape Architects, Rotterdam*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: NAI Publishers.

not spaces originally designed through conscious acts and, therefore, are not endowed with permanent meanings. For this reason, urban voids can have different implications for different constituencies, and this fluid quality is what ultimately allows voids to become appropriated and used by heterogeneous publics in differing ways. For urban voids to retain their openness, then, the lack of permanent meanings—or, in other words, the emptiness of permanent meanings—must be protected, and, consequentially, urban voids should remain as spaces unable to retain or represent memories. Urban voids should remain amnesic.

Memory is an essential vehicle for the construction and definition of identity. Therefore, the inability to retain memory can be an instrument of power to prevent subjects and communities from maintaining and protecting their individual or collective identities. For this reason, urban voids can be an inappropriate or just unacceptable type of public space for particular circumstances or communities. However, this inadequacy should be considered an exception against the ruling usefulness that urban voids suggest in serving incongruous publics. Emptiness is an elusive spatial quality, an ever-escaping horizon of possibility that, if protected, can be genuinely public in ways incomparable to any other urban quality.

Despite the social opportunities offered by urban voids, the evanescence of emptiness ultimately exposes the limits of urban voids. And, consequentially, the unreachability of a limit toward emptiness.**LAF**

NOTE

This article includes edited versions of texts from the book *A Glossary of Urban Voids* by the author, Sergio Lopez-Pineiro. They are reprinted here by courtesy of their author, Sergio Lopez-Pineiro, and publisher, JOVIS.