

场所与空间： 景观人类学研究概览

PLACE AND SPACE: A REVIEW OF LANDSCAPE ANTHROPOLOGY RESEARCH

DOI:10.15302/J-LAF-20170202	收稿时间 RECEIVED DATE / 2017-02-20 中图分类号 / C958 文献标识码 / A
陈昭 东京大学文化人类学院博 士候选人	Zhao CHEN PhD Candidate at the Department of Cultural Anthropology, the University of Tokyo
整理 涂先明 张健 EDITED BY Xianming TU Angus ZHANG	

摘要

景观人类学是20世纪90年代在欧美出现的新的学科分支。笔者将从三个方面来展开“文化人类学与景观设计”话题。首先对“‘文化人类学’是什么”做出简要介绍，为不同学科背景的读者提供一个基本的学科印象。其次，对本文中的“景观设计”一词，做出必要的限定和澄清，确保形成讨论的基本共识。接着，重点介绍文化人类学基于“景观”的研究的基本视角——“场所”与“空间”。“场所”视角重点关注“当地人”赋予其所处环境以文化意义的过程，以及人们的生活实践如何构建景观。“空间”视角关注学者、企业家、规划师等文化表象的主体如何表达地方文化，这种文化表象又如何影响空间的生产。本文重点梳理了以上两个视角的研究，并介绍了最新的研究动态，最后落脚“景观设计”的文化内涵，展望未来文化人类学与景观设计结合之可能。

关键词

景观人类学；空间；场所；表象

ABSTRACT

Landscape Anthropology is a new disciplinary branch of Anthropology emerged in European and American academia during the 1990s. The current review develops the topic of “Cultural Anthropology and Landscape Architecture” from three perspectives. Firstly, it provides a brief introduction to the definition of Cultural Anthropology to familiarize interdisciplinary readers. Secondly, it provides necessary conceptual clarification to the term “景观设计 (Landscape Architecture).” Thirdly, it provides a review of the research approaches to the study of landscape in the field of Cultural Anthropology: place and space. The “place” perspective focuses on how local people endow cultural meanings onto their surrounding environment, and how people’s routine activities construct landscape. The “space” perspective considers how academics, entrepreneurs, designers, and other main actors in cultural representation, express local culture, and how such representation influences the social production of space. The current paper emphasizes research on these two points and reviews recent studies. Finally, it looks ahead to the possible cooperation between the study of Cultural Anthropology and Landscape Architecture.

KEY WORDS

Landscape Anthropology; Space; Place; Representation

序

“文化人类学”与“景观设计学”都是内涵丰富、历史积淀深厚的学科。同时，在消费市场的推波助澜下，两者都面临着学界内纷争未平、学界外言论杂起的局面。所以就“文化人类学与景观设计”这样一个主题进行讨论，不仅需要跨学科的沟通，还需要充分考虑学科与相应的实践行为之间的落差，才能让讨论不止于象牙塔内的“矫揉造作”。

这样的沟通理想实现起来实属不易。笔者将从三个方面来展开“文化人类学与景观设计”这一话题。首先对“‘文化人类学’是什么”做出简要介绍，为不同学科背景的读者提供一个基本的学科印象。其次，对本文中的“景观设计”一词，做出必要的限定和澄清，确保形成讨论的基本共识。再者，本文将重点介绍文化人类学中“景观”研究的基本视角——“场所”与“空间”，以及景观人类学研究的最新动向。最后，笔者希望借用景观人类学的研究框架，展望文化人类学与景观设计结合的可能。

1 文化人类学是什么？

人类学是研究人的学科，大致可以分为两类：一是将人作为生物来研究，即体质人类学或生物人类学；二是将人作为社会性的、文化性的存在来研究，即文化人类学。

人类对自身社会文化的兴趣，始于遭遇“他者（异文化）”。19世纪后期，殖民体制的迅速扩张，大量西方人（主要是白人）开始接触到殖民地社会“千奇百怪”的原始文化，他们由此开始了对当地文化的记录。这种建立在殖民者（自者）与被殖民者（他者）权利关系

Preface

Both Cultural Anthropology and Landscape Architecture are academic fields with abundant contents and profound history. With the increasing influence from the industry and the market in general, their development has been confronted with fierce academic and public debates between distinct social entities. Therefore, reviews and discussions about Cultural Anthropology, Landscape Architecture and their relationship, like the current paper, should not only play a communicative role between the two fields, but also give practical considerations to their industrial implications and practices. Only in this way, can such review or discussion avoid being confined in ivory towers of ostentation.

Nevertheless, the pursuit to communicate two quarreling fields can hardly be easy. The current paper develops its discussion from three different angles. To begin with, I will provide a brief introduction to what is Cultural Anthropology and a necessary conceptual clarification to Landscape Architecture, which may give interdisciplinary readers a basic impression about this academic field. This will be followed by a focus on two primary approaches in the field of anthropology to study landscape: place and space, and updates of recent research will also be provided. Finally, based on the research framework of landscape anthropology, I will discuss the possibility to negotiate a way of cooperation between Cultural Anthropology and Landscape Architecture.

1 What is Cultural Anthropology?

Anthropology is the study of human beings, and can be categorized into two types: the first type, namely physical anthropology, is concerned with the biological and behavioral aspects of human beings; the second type sees and studies human beings as a social and cultural existence, and is thus known as Cultural Anthropology.

The interest of human beings in their own society and culture emerged with the encounter of “the other” (i.e. a different culture). In the late nineteenth century, colonialist activities have experienced a systematic expansion. This enables more Westerners (mainly white in ethnicity) to get in touch with all sorts of “strange and bizarre” aboriginal cultures in their colonies. The Westerners took record of these aboriginal cultures, and the discourse of these records was based on the power relationship between the colonists (i.e. self) and the colonized (i.e. other). These records largely promoted the development of Anthropology at an early stage. However, at

之上的文化描述与解释促进了早期人类学的发展。这个时期的研究深受社会进化论的影响，人类学家在描述异文化的过程中所带有的自文化中心主义（白人中心主义），常常成为后期学者批判的对象^[1]。

20世纪中叶以来，殖民地体系瓦解，那种封闭异域原始的文化图景被彻底打碎。20世纪90年代后，在曾经的殖民与被殖民权力关系下诞生的“文化书写”，也遭到后现代思潮的批判和反思^[2]。白人不再是文化研究的主体，研究的对象也从他文化扩展到了自文化。而“景观人类学”这一分支也正是在这样的背景下诞生的。今天的文化人类学强调整体观和文化相对性，认为任何一种文化特质都有其存在的“语境”，需要结合这一背景从整体上来对其加以分析。其主张研究者不应用自己固有的文化结构去判断或解释某一文化特质，而应保持中立无偏见的态度，去挖掘研究对象自身的符号体系^[3]。

虽然文化人类学这一学科历经变迁，但“田野调查”和“民族志”作为其主要的研究方法，被确立和传承了下来。“田野调查”，翻译自英文fieldwork，field包含领域和地域之意，因此田野调查中的“田野”，既可指研究对象所处的研究领域，也可指研究考察的地点^[4]。文化人类学家往往需要通过长期（通常1~2年）的田野调查，来观察和记录自己的研究对象，同时需要结合文献对田野中搜集到的资料进行挖掘和分析，最终以民族志的形式展现研究成果^[1]。民族志的撰写，需要不断与田野调查的经历对话。这一对话的过程是另一种形式的“田野历程”。所以“民族志”不仅指代呈现研究成果的文本，也指“书写文化”的过程。

田野调查并非文化人类学所独有，社会学、艺术创作等领域也都需要类似的调查过程。但文化人类学的田野调查强调研究者“参与”

that time, anthropological research was profoundly influenced by the Social Darwinism, and anthropologists usually made ethnocentric (i.e. white-centric) depictions about a different culture. Such ethnocentrism has been usually criticized by later researchers^[1].

Since the mid twentieth century, the melt down of the colonist systems around the world shattered the closed, exotic and aboriginal cultural outlooks of colonies. Since the 1990s, cultural depictions and scripts born with an old colonist-colonized relationship were reassessed and criticized by postmodernist researchers^[2]. White people ceased to be the predominant players in cultural research, objects of research were also expanded from other cultures to the culture of “the self.” Landscape Anthropology as a sub-field of Anthropology also emerged in this general historical background. Nowadays, the study of Cultural Anthropology emphasizes taking panoramic views and the consideration to cultural relativism: it argues that any cultural feature has a discourse environment in which it resides, when analyzing any cultural feature, its discourse environment needs to be considered in connection to the big picture. The researcher should not judge or explain a certain cultural feature using his / her pre-existing cultural framework, but should rather keep a neutral and unbiased standing ground from which he / she could reach out, and discover the unique symbolic system of the research objects^[3].

Although Cultural Anthropology as a field of academic inquiry has been evolving in many different aspects, performing fieldwork and ethnography as its main methodological approaches have been firmly established and inherited through generations of researchers. “Field” involves notions of domains or geographical regions, and thus a field in the sense of Cultural Anthropology can mean either the research domain or the geographical location of the research object^[4]. Cultural anthropologists usually need to spend a considerable length of time (usually one to two years) in doing the fieldwork to observe and record their research subjects. In the meantime, they also need to analyze and make sense of the data generated in the fieldwork in association with relevant literature, and produce in writing the research outcomes. The fruit of this endeavor would be the ethnography^[1]. The writing of ethnographies requires the researcher to repeatedly dialogue with his / her own fieldwork experience. This ongoing dialogue itself constitutes to a part of the fieldwork process. This means that ethnographies are not only the very discourse or record as the research product, but also the exact process of “writing the culture.”

Fieldwork is not solely utilized by Cultural Anthropology, sociological research or the study of arts and humanities

^[1] 近年来，民族志电影也是常见的表达方式，但文本依旧是主流选择。

^[2] Recently the ethnographic film has become common, but the written text is still the mainstream choice.

研究对象，“成为”“他者”，再抽离出来，“书写”“他者”，这一系列的主体性构建。因而，人类学理想中的田野调查，不仅是对某个地方的实地考察，也要求与研究对象长时间相处，力求参与“他们”的日常生活，内化“他们”的价值体系，成为“他们”，达到一种“自我”定义的临界状态，而后再抽离开来，与田野中的“我”及“他们”对话，从而发掘那些已经内化了的，曾经一度习以为常了的“蛛丝马迹”。

上述田野调查中的主体性构建，恰恰是文化人类学与景观设计的共通之处。不论设计师的价值取向为何，其都需要深入了解田野之困之需，最终以景观设计的“民族志”——设计作品——的形式与田野进行时空的对话。谓之“营造”，其本质与“文化之书写”，并无二致。但在中国，就“景观设计”这一术语的名称与含义，学术界仍存在诸多的分歧，在此笔者首先对其进行简要的澄清。

2 什么是本文所指的“景观设计”？

首先，本文所指的“景观设计学”或“景观设计”，从教育学科体系角度而言，与2011年被列为一级学科的“风景园林学”相对应。该学科的综合性，以及学科实践内涵的深度和尺度的扩大，呼应了中国当下的时代需求。对于这一学科的称谓曾在学术界有过激烈争论，但在学科定位上，笔者认为学者们其实已经达成了相对共识，其对我国现有学科和实践中存在的问题的认识是一致的：在环境危机的情势

also need this type of research method. However, cultural anthropological fieldworks emphasize the blending of the researcher and the research subjects. In other words, the researcher needs to participate in the activities of research subjects, and become one of the “others.” Then he / she would retreat from the “others” and try to describe and analyze the “others” as a process of describing him / herself. Thus, an ideal fieldwork in Cultural Anthropology should not be limited to an on-site investigation, but should rather be a process in which the researcher accompanies the subjects for a long time, participate in their routine lives, internalize their values and become them. Once such critical state of self-identity is reached, the researcher would then retreat from the field and communicate with the “self” and the “others” in the field. Therefore, those internalized values, thoughts, attitudes and behavioral patterns could be felt and observed.

The above-mentioned subjectification process is just the common ground shared by Cultural Anthropology and Landscape Architecture. Every designer, no matter what kind of value preference he / she may have, needs to understand in depth the difficulties and needs of the fieldwork. The final design product would at the same time be the “ethnography” of Landscape Architecture. It is through that design product that the designer would be able to communicate with the field. In this sense, “architecture” is fundamentally identical to the “writing” culture. Nevertheless, the numerous debates in academia about the definition and conceptualization of the word “landscape architecture” in China, still necessitates the current study to provide more conceptual clarification.

2 What is Landscape Architecture in This Article?

Firstly, Landscape Architecture (“景观设计学”or“景观设计” in Chinese) here in this article, refers to the discipline named “风景园林学” (alternative Chinese translation of Landscape Architecture), which has been listed onto the first-degree subject by Ministry of Education of China since 2011. Its integrated contents and deepened practical significance in greater scale echoes the very need of the contemporary Chinese society. Although there had been debates over the name of the discipline, the two debating sides have reached a consensus about how the discipline should be academically posited. People from both sides concurred that facing the challenges of global environmental crisis, the discipline should adjust itself to fulfill the social demand and to communicate with the world. This agreement provides a clear image of how Landscape Architecture should be: (no matter what it is called in Chinese)

下，该学科必须做出调整，以便与世界沟通，促进学科发展。这些共识给大家提供了一个相对清晰的学科定位——这是一门需要人文素养与理工训练的综合性的学科；这是一门（一种）协调人与自然和谐发展的学科（实践）。在传统造园、园林绿化之外，“大地规划”尺度的研究与实践，也应纳入学科与实践的范畴，应参考和应用生态学等相关学科的成果，并建立健全的教育职业体系^{[5]-[8]}。本文所提及的“风景园林学”“景观设计学”都以此为基础。

在对景观设计这一术语的讨论中，一些学者认为“景观”一词表达的是“看得见的景”，给人以强调视觉美的语感^{[9][10]}，因缺乏对于环境价值的考量而不利于市场规范^[11]，以及学科的综合发展^[12]。笔者认为，景观一词是多元复杂的^[13]，所表达的人与环境的关系是基于五感的、立体综合的。本文取景观人类学之主流观点，将“作为物质条件的客观外在”定义为“环境”；而“充满文化含义的环境”定义为“景观”^[14]。所以，“景观”一词强调的是客观“环境”在人脑中的投射。

对“设计”一词，本文参考赫伯特·西蒙的意见^[15]，将其定义为“为解决问题寻求途径的过程和结果”，是一种综合性的、人的主体性的实践。

3 “场所”与“空间”：景观人类学的基本视角

3.1 “场所”与“空间”

景观人类学是20世纪90年代在欧美出现的新的学科分支。20世纪80年代后，“资本空间化”^[16]愈演愈烈。相关学科对空间资本研究的发展，使得人类学也开始正视景观。对人类所处环境的关注，一直以来就是人类学的话题。对当地特殊地理风貌的文学式描述，往往是经典民族志的开篇^[17]。但在经典人类学的研究中，环境往往只是背景式的存在。景观人类学认为，人们基于知识、价值观和行为赋予其所处环境以文化意义，而这样的文化意义又反过来影响人们的认知和行为。景

it is an integrated discipline that demands the researchers and students to have education in humanities as well as training in engineering; it pursuits the harmonization of the social development and natural environment. Beyond traditional gardening and reforestation projects, its practical scale needs to be broadened to an “earthscape” level; research outcomes from other disciplines should be taken as educational references in order to supplement and complete its own educational and professional system^{[15]-[18]}. In this article the term of Landscape Architecture (“风景园林学” or “景观设计学” in Chinese) is used based on this conceptualization.

Among the objection against using “景观” as the equivalent of “landscape”, most has given to its visual precedence nuance^{[9][10]} which is thought to be the reason of design lacking environmental values^[11] and harm the discipline development^[12]. However, the meaning of the term landscape is multielement and sophisticated^[13], which expresses the relationship between the human and the environment based on multi-senses. According to the major idea of Landscape Anthropology, this article defines “environment” as “the objective surroundings,” and defines “landscape” as “the surroundings fulfilled with cultural meanings”^[14]. So the term “landscape” emphasizes the projection of the objective “environment” in human minds.

The current paper respects and adopts Herbert A. Simon’s definition of design^[15]: the process and the result of approaching solutions for a problem. This definition implies that design is a comprehensive and integrated subjective practice by human beings.

3 Place and Space: Basic Approaches of Landscape Anthropology

3.1 Place and Space

Landscape Anthropology is a new disciplinary branch of anthropology emerged in European and American academia during the 1990s. Since the 1980s, the spatialization of capital has upgraded^[16]. The research development from relevant discipline urges Cultural Anthropology to address landscape. The attention paid to human environment is an old topic in Anthropology. The spatial description of the local society always occupies the opening of classic ethnography^[17], but mostly serves only as the background. From the perspective of Landscape Anthropology, people endow cultural meaning, which influences their own behaviors and perceptions, onto the environment they live in. And Landscape Anthropology endeavors to understand the interaction between a human being and his / her surroundings by studying this “cultural” medium between

观人类学就是通过研究人与环境之间的“文化”这一介质，来理解人与环境之间互动的学科^[18]。然而，这种视角并非是景观人类学的创新。比如象征人类学、人文地理学在20世纪60年代都提出过类似的观点。

景观人类学为何能成为一个新的学科分支？其新意主要有二。其一，景观人类学在后现代思潮对于“书写文化”的批判的基础上，转换了研究思路。正如前文所述，20世纪90年代以来，文化人类学内部出现了后现代思潮对该学科的批判，认为对于“他者（异文化）”的民族志描述，不可避免地掺杂了人类学家的主观判断和恣意选择，他们故意营造出一种“怀旧感伤的异域风情”。这一批判质疑了文化人类学的客观性，动摇了学科赖以生存的基础。景观人类学的兴起是这场批判的延伸，其承认了民族志书写所带有的主观性。但景观人类学并不仅仅停留于对民族志修辞学的批判上，其进一步关注了这种无法摆脱“主观性”的“文化书写”到底如何造就或改变现实社会这一命题。这种思维的转换，无疑给后现代人类学松了绑，开辟了新的可能。

其二，景观人类学极大地发展了“场所”与“空间”这对概念。如段义孚所言，因主体视角的不同，环境被赋予了不同的文化含义^{[19][20]}，而景观人类学中的景观，常被分为“场所”和“空间”这两种视角。“场所”和“空间”的内涵，多参考克里斯托弗·梯里的定义。梯里认为，“场所”是“由人们的经验、感觉、思考等建构成的范围”；与此相对，“空间”是“为了达成目标而划出的资源领域”^[21]。英国人类学家提姆·英格尔德关于景观的论述也与“场所”和“空间”这对概念形成对应。英格尔德提出了两种不同的景观认识，一是“自然主义视角，景观是人类开展活动的中立的外部背景”，二是“文化的视角，每一处景观都是一种特定的认知与象征性空间序列”^[22]。所以，在景观人类学中，“场所”通常是指通过血缘关系、邻里关系等社会关系形成的，承载着共同记忆和归属感的当地人的生活环境。“空间”通常指国家、省市区县、经济开发区等为达成政治经济目标而圈地划界的作为资源的环境^[23]。空间/场所这对概念，也会被表达为一次性/二次性景观^[24]或内在/外在景观^[25]。

顺着“场所”和“空间”这两大概念，可将先行研究一分为二。“场所”视角的研究重点关注“当地人”赋予其所处环境以文化意义

them^[18]. However, this perspective is not an original invention by Landscape Anthropology — Symbolic Anthropology and Human Geography in the 1960s, for example, also had similar views.

Then one may ask why Landscape Anthropology could be a new branch of discipline since such perspective existed long ago? It is mainly because of two of its achievements. The first one is the transformation of research direction. As mentioned above, critiques from postmodernist theories since the 1990s pointed out that cultural depictions and scripts are inevitably mixed with the arbitrary choice and subjective intention. Also, the writers of such works intentionally created exotic pictures of nostalgia. The criticism questioned the objectivity of Cultural Anthropology, and shook its foundation as a discipline. The emerging Landscape Anthropology was a part of the criticism, as it admits the subjectivity of Anthropology in the first place. However, the conclusive notes of Landscape Anthropology were not only about the rhetoric nature of ethnographies, but also concern how the writing of culture, which is hardly free from subjectivity, changed and produced social reality. This transformation of research direction brings new possibilities to a postmodernist Cultural Anthropology.

The second achievement of Landscape Anthropology is the development of the dyadic concept “place / space” as analytical theory. As Yi-Fu Tuan said, different cultural meanings are given to the environment because of the subjective differences in the observation perspectives^{[19][20]}. And in Landscape Anthropology, there are mainly two different ways to approach “landscape”: the “place” and the “space.” Christopher Tilley’s definition of this dyadic concept is one of the most accepted. According to him, “place” is constructed by people’s experience, feelings and thoughts, while “space” is a resource sphere created artificially for a particular purpose^[21]. British Anthropologist Tim Ingold also indicated the existence of two different approaches to landscape, in his words, “the naturalistic view of landscape as neutral, external backdrop to human activities”, and “the culturalistic view that every landscape is a particular cognitive and symbolic ordering of space”^[22]. So in Landscape Anthropology, “place” usually refers to people’s daily-life stage where the sense of belongings and social memory are constructed and shared through relations of kinship and community, while “space” refers to the sphere as resource demarcated by the state, the province and on the municipality, etc. aiming at economic and political purposes^[23]. And the dualist concept space / place would be expressed also as “the landscape we initially see” and “the second landscape”^[24] or the inside / outside landscape^[25].

Following the dyadic concept, the previous research could be divided into two groups. Research from the “place” perspective

的过程，以及人们（当地人）的生活实践如何构建了景观。“空间”视角的研究关注学者、企业家、规划师等文化表象的主体如何表达一个地方的“特色文化”，以及这种表达又如何 在政治经济利益的驱使下，生产出了城市规划中展现的景观。河合洋尚将这两类视角的研究大致归纳为“景观构建论”与“景观生产论”，为本文的文献综述提供了思路^[26]。为避免混淆，本文采用“场所构建论”、“空间生产论”的表述。同时，笔者将结合“景观设计”这一话题，对先行研究进行一定取舍。对更多人类学研究感兴趣的读者，可参考河合洋尚的相关论述。

3.2 场所构建论

“场所”视角的研究关注的是人们（当地人）生活实践所形成的景观。这一类型的研究，深受象征人类学和认知人类学中有关环境认知的研究的影响，在“景观人类学”出现以前就存在已久。象征人类学就曾深入探讨男/女、圣/俗等文化概念与屋顶/地面、屋里/屋外等空间概念的对应关系。

大量关于“场所构建论”的文献聚焦于大洋洲的景观。研究指出，这个地区的原住民有其特殊的风土，他们所生活的岛屿、陆地往往与他们的神话相结合^[27]，每片土地都承载了祖先的知识，都是具有灵性的^[28]。在大洋洲的村落地区，那些神话、历史和社会关系不仅仅是抽象的知识和观念，而且与日常的空间经验与实践结合在一起，并不断具象再现。通过不断对外界环境指认，以及与此相伴的对神话的复述，人们与土地和祖先的关系不断得以确认^[29]。人们赋予环境以对祖先的记忆，又通过作为记忆载体的神话不断认识环境，在这个过程中，人们得以认知自我，建立集体认同。有关大洋洲的研究建立了一种空间与文化的对应范式，用以描述和解释当地文化。比如巴布亚新几内亚有一种特别的习俗，少女初潮后需要拜访各个村子里的亲戚。阿斯

focuses on how local people endow cultural meanings onto their surrounding environment, and how people’s routine activities construct landscape. The “space” perspective considers how academics, entrepreneurs and designers who are the main actors in cultural representation, express local culture; and, how such “local culture” representation, urged by economic and political profit, leads to the production of the landscape such as those shown in urban planning. Hironao Kawai’s division of the literature into “theories on landscape construction” and “theories on landscape production,” offers a structure for the current review^[26]. To avoid confusion, this article adopts the expression of “theories on construction of place” and “theories on production of space,” and the literature is selectively reviewed here regarding to the issue topic “Landscape Architecture.” Those who are interested in other relevant anthropological research may refer to Kawai’s work.

3.2 Theories on Construction of Place

Research from “place” perspective which focuses on how local people’s routine activities construct landscape, has been deeply influenced by Symbolic Anthropology and Cognitive Anthropology, and the study of this kind has been developed before the term Landscape Anthropology came into use. For example, Symbolic Anthropology has discussed the corresponding relationships between cultural concepts such as male / female, sacred / mundane and the spatial location such as roof / floor, interior / exterior (of buildings).

The research from the “place” perspective has been largely reported about Oceania landscape. The original inhabitants in this region had distinctive customs, and the islands and continent they lived in were always related to local mythologies^[27], thus every land has spirits that carry the knowledge of the ancestors^[28]. In the region’s rural places, the myth, the history and the social relationships were not only abstract knowledge and concepts, but also embodied and constantly repeated in people’s daily spatial experience and practice. Through the constant reference to the surroundings and the accompanying myth-telling activities, the relationship between people, their land and their ancestors was established^[29]. People endowed their memories about their ancestors onto their surroundings. Based on the myths, they also got to learn the place they live in. Finally, people learned to know themselves and to construct a collective identity. The landscape research about Oceania has built a paradigm based on the reference between the culture and its environment to describe and interpret the local culture. For example, in Papua New Guinea, teenage girls should visit their relatives in all villages after menarche, and Astrid Anderson explained this

里德·安德逊对此的解释是，少女走过的路线，是对她们人格形成造成影响的社会关系在地理空间上的再现^[30]。

上述“空间与文化的对应范式”确实有助于我们理解当地人与环境的互动，解读“场所”的文化含义。但此范式“想当然”地认为大洋洲的景观与其文化含义之间必然存在一种直接且具象的对应关系，而且当地人对这种关系的解读毫不费力、顺理成章。由此，景观变成了一种“透明的媒介”^[31]。里见龙树调查了大洋洲所罗门诸岛的原住民阿斯族，否定了现行研究中的“想当然”，质疑了这种“想当然”背后存在的“身体和物质环境之间关系是稳定不变的”这一假设。里见指出阿斯族祖先有着丰富的迁徙经历，所以当前居住地的景观，不能直接简单地与祖先知识、民族来历相对应。同时，受基督教影响，阿斯族感受环境的方式也发生了变化——曾经用以祭拜祖先的神圣的树荫地，渐渐成了“恐怖”与“令人不安”的地方。

费尔南多·桑托斯-古拉耐劳对秘鲁原住民的研究，也提到对土地命名和附会故事的行为，并指出这些“填写”于环境之上的“场所意义”传递着当地人的记忆和起源神话^[32]。另外，人们赋予“场所”以文化含义的方式除了神话以外，还有“歌曲”。巴布亚新几内亚的案例分析了歌唱在赋予环境以意义的同时，通过“讴歌”这一身体实践，集体认同与个人结合在了一起^[33]。

与人类学整体发展有关，景观人类学的研究多为关于殖民地的研究。确切地说，作为后现代思潮的体现，景观人类学的主要研究关注于殖民体系下的“弱者”^[34]，挖掘原住民所构建的文化含义，发现原住民的“场所”，并解释“场所”构建的载体——神话、歌曲等。因此，强调景观之中的对立关系是景观人类学的一大特点。这一点在“场所构建论”中十分突出。原住民的内在景观与西方执政者缔造的外在景观之间的差异与对立被反复讨论。罗伯特·莱顿在对澳大利亚北部原住民阿拉瓦人的研究中指出，当地人认为祖先是景观的缔造者。他们基于对祖先的信仰，建立起自己与土地所有权之间的关系。

custom by indicating that the tours of girls were the projections of the social relationships on space that would be important to the girls’ personality formation^[30].

The paradigm above truly helps us to understand the interaction between human and environment, and contributes to reading the cultural meaning of “place.” However, this paradigm doubtlessly believes that the reference between Oceania landscape and its cultural meaning should be direct and in detail, and that the reading of it by the residents should be easy. As the result, the landscape becomes a transparent medium^[31]. Ryuju Satomi’s research about the Asi natives in Solomon Islands challenged the stability and consistency of the human-environment relationship that previous research took as granted, and criticized the doubtless belief of the research paradigm. Satomi pointed out that the ancestor of Asi people had plenty of migratory experience, so the landscape they lived in could not easily provide a direct reference to original knowledge of the ancestor. Also with their conversion to Christianity, the perception of the environment itself transformed. For example, the “shadow under the lush of the tree,” where used to be considered sacred, becomes a place of “fear” and “unsafety.”

Fernando Santos-Granero’s research about native Peruvians also mentioned the behavior of naming land and endowing myth tale on it. The research indicated that these “topographic writings” on the landscape delivered the memories and original myth^[32]. Moreover, myth is not the only way by which people casted cultural meaning onto their surroundings. “Singing” is also reported as one. Studies on Papua New Guinea analyzed that through singing, not only the cultural meaning was embodied and casted on the landscape, the collective identity was also internalized^[33].

Related to the history of Anthropology, previous research of Landscape Anthropology is mainly about colonies. More precisely, as influenced by postmodernist theories, Landscape Anthropology pays attention mainly to the “weak” people in the colonist systems^[34], and focuses on digging the cultural structure of the aboriginals, discovering the “place” they construct, and translating the media (such as myth or song) of the construction. Therefore, emphasizing the contestation of landscape is one of the characters of Landscape Anthropology, which is especially obvious when concerning the academic discourse about construction of “place.” The difference and opposing relationship between the inside landscape constructed by the colonized native and the outside landscape produced by western authority, have been constantly discussed. Robert Layton’s study about Alawa people in Northern Australia pointed out that the Alawa thought their ancestors created landscape, and the ownership of the land

然而，这一方式与西方的环境感知方式存在显著的差异，原住民拥有土地所有权的那些依据——那些感受性的、微妙的“表象”，往往被澳大利亚白人视为“谎言”^[35]。帕梅拉·斯图尔德与安德烈·斯特拉泽也强调了景观“内外”的对立，提出关注“内在景观”（场所）的重要性^[36]。

3.3 空间生产论

“空间”视角的研究深受后现代空间理论的影响，尤见于米歇尔·福柯和亨利·列斐伏尔的理论中。福柯的空间理论与其“规训权力”的讨论是一体的，空间是权力控制“身体”的“装置”^[37]。列斐伏尔受马克思主义空间理论的影响，认为空间是相对化的、历史的。列斐伏尔指出了空间的意识形态属性，探讨了空间是如何经社会性生产而形成的^[38]。福柯和列斐伏尔的理论都是在权力斗争的框架下展开的，这种权力关系在景观人类学“空间”视角的研究下，往往表现为殖民与被殖民之间的景观对立。

苏珊·蔻希拉的研究提供了德国殖民地的案例^[39]。从19世纪到20世纪，德国殖民者统治了巴布亚新几内亚东北部新爱尔兰岛的马尔甘人。西方世界深信马尔甘人在丧葬仪式中使用的雕刻是本土文化的象征，为了保护这种本土艺术，使其在西方文化侵蚀下不至灭绝，近5 000件雕刻被大量搜集并展示于西方博物馆内。然而，蔻希拉经深入调查后发现，这些被视为本土文化的雕刻是在土地所有权和土地流转机构化的背景下诞生的，是殖民及后殖民文化的一部分，而在被殖民前，作为马尔甘人葬礼中纪念物的另有他物。蔻希拉指出，虽然“表象”确实是环境与文化含义（记忆）相互作用的结果，但我们不能忽略景观产生的政治和历史背景，否则将无法认知景观生成中的动态过程。

通过上述案例，我们可以看到，在对于“文化特色的表达”这种表象行为上，殖民者和被殖民者的视角并不一致。殖民者赋予了那些雕刻以不符合“当地人/被殖民者”自我解释的文化含义，生产出了一个与当地人生活经验的“场所”相背离的“空间”。对于殖民者（非当地人）的对当地文化的表象与随之而来的“空间”生产之间关系

was based on the belief of ancestors. However, since Westerners’ perception ways of environment were sharply different, the evidences of land ownership that Alawa people hold — those sensitive and subtle “representation” — are considered as “fictions” by the white Australians^[35]. Pamela Stewart and Andrew Strathern also emphasized the contestation of landscape and pointed out the importance of inside landscape (place)^[36].

3.3 Theories on Production of Space

The research of “space” perspective is influenced by postmodernist theories of space, especially those of Michel Foucault and Henri Lefebvre. Foucault’s discourse on space relates to those of disciplinary power, stating that space is the “dispositif (apparatus)” of governance of body^[37]. Lefebvre took a Marxist approach toward space and has indicated that the space is relative and historical. Lefebvre analyzed the ideology of space and how it was produced socially^[38]. Foucault and Lefebvre have conducted their research under the framework of power struggles. For them, the discourse of “space” perspective would focus on the tension between the landscapes of the colonists and the colonized.

Susanne Küchler’s research provided us with cases from German colonies^[39]. From the 19th century to the 20th century, German colonists ruled Malangan people in New Ireland in Northeast Papua New Guinea. Malangan sculptures used at burial rituals were assumed to be part of “an extremely complex art tradition or ancient origin,” threatened by western influences. Some five thousand objects were collected from the island and exhibited in western museums. However, Küchler’s later research found that the sculpting was inseparably bound up with the institutionalization of land rights and their transmission, and was historically situated in the colonial and post-colonial culture. The pre-colonial type of funeral monument was wooden log which served as platform for dances. Küchler indicated that though the art representation was resulted from the relation of landscape and memory, we should not miss its political and historical significance, otherwise we would never recognize the dynamic process of the landscape formation.

This case is a good example that illustrates the colonists and the colonized have distinct perceptions about the representation of “cultural features.” The colonists have given cultural meanings, which are not in line with the explanation from the locals / the colonized, to those sculptures. They have thus fabricated a space in conflict to the place in which the locals live their daily lives. The space perspective is concerned with the relationship between colonists’ representation of the

的关注，是“空间”视角研究的共同之处。另外两个案例说明，“地图”这一表象也成为了殖民者生产空间的途径。比如在17世纪，英国为了侵略和统治爱尔兰，把当地凯尔特人的口述知识一一标注在地图上，汇成图集。视为凯尔特人“湖上居住”特征的地点，也被绘制在地图上，以便根据地图让当地人迁入英式住宅中，利于统治^[40]。无独有偶，19世纪英军大规模地绘制爱尔兰地图，那些与生活经验有关的“场所”知识被转化为“地图知识”，“地图”这一表象成为了殖民侵略的工具及其生产“空间”的基础^[41]。

“景观画”在空间生产中具有重要意义。景观画发展于16~19世纪的欧洲，以描绘美丽闲适的乡村自然风光为主题。当时欧洲各国工业快速发展，城市问题开始显现。景观画引发了人们对于乡村风景的理解与向往。托马斯·格林在对19世纪巴黎的研究中指出，乡土田园被理想化了，脱离了日常性，并通过“景观画”这种视觉描绘在新闻、广告上传播^[42]。在乡间拥有一处住宅，甚至成为了成功中产阶级的象征。景观画不仅是对自然的描绘，更提供了一种“观看之道”^[43]。它引发了人们对乡土田园的向往，又与园艺或不动产的经营结合，极大改变了人居环境。景观设计学早期的发展也与这样的背景息息相关，著名景观设计师胡弗莱·雷普顿就采用了景观画的方式展现设计效果。19世纪由埃比尼泽·霍华德倡导的“田园城市运动”，更是与此有着深刻的联系^[44]。霍华德的最终理想是把两种看起来互相排斥的选择调和在一起：一边是充满经济机会的城市社会，一边是悠闲自得的乡村风光。在画家、新闻广告、房地产开发商、规划设计师的合力打造下，乡村这一“空间”诞生了。格林威治村的案例突破了殖民语境，描述了在同一个国民国家内部，“表象”与空间生产的关系，揭示了参与空间生产的主体的多样性。

local culture and the consequential creation of “space.” Two other cases showed that maps as a form of representation could also be a channel through which the colonists create space. For example, in the 17th century, in order to invade and reign Gaelic Ireland, the Tudor have put Gaelic oral knowledge on maps and organized the maps into collections. Locations that showed Celtic features of Gaelic Crannogs were also included and noted on the maps, so that the locals could be found and moved into English-style houses^[40]. In another example, the English army started to map Ireland on a massive scale in 19th century, and all the knowledge about “places” of routine activities was turned into the knowledge of maps. Maps as a form of representation became the tool for colonization and invasion, and thus the basis on which the colonists produced “spaces”^[41].

“Landscape paintings” play a significant role in the production of space, the subject of which is usually the rural scenery of beauty. This art has greatly developed from the 16th Century to the 19th Century, when the problems of cities created by the process of industrialization exacerbated. Landscape paintings largely informed people’s understanding of the countryside, and aroused their aspirations to rural sceneries. Thomas Green, in his study about Paris in the 19th Century, found that landscape paintings broadcasted via newspapers and advertisements detached the rural landscapes from ordinariness and further idealized them^[42]. Owning a house in the suburb became the symbol of the middle-class success. The landscape painting was not only the drawing of the natural landscape but also provided a “way of seeing”^[43]. The images of landscape and the aspirations to it, together with development of the landscape gardening and real estate, radically changed people’s living environment. The development of Landscape Architecture at an early stage closely related to the situation mentioned above. Landscape architect Humphry Repton used landscape paintings to present the after effect of his design. The Garden City Movement proposed by Ebenezer Howard was also profoundly related to the idealization of rural landscape^[44]. Howard’s final pursuit was to coordinate the two mutually exclusive choices: on one hand is the urban society full of business opportunities, on the other hand is the leisure rural scenery. In the participation of painters, advertisers, real estate developers and landscape planners, the rural place as “space” was produced. Greenwich’s case broke through the boundaries of the colonization context, and successfully described the complexity of the subjects involved in the production of space within a single nation-state. It also illustrated the relationship between representation and the creation of space, and the diversity of subjects participated in the process.

在景观人类学的研究中，“空间”视角的研究在数量上不及“场所”视角，因为人类学更多的兴趣在于挖掘弱者（当地人）的文化体系。与“场所构建论”相同，这一视角的研究案例也多与殖民地相关，缺乏对现代社会的描述。并且同样也强调景观中的对立关系，即关注殖民者如何描述被殖民地的“地方特色文化”，以及这种地方特色文化的表象又是如何与当地本土文化或“场所”相背离。

综上，沿着“场所”和“空间”两大概念，景观人类学促进了人们对人与环境之间的“文化”介质的理解。但景观人类学对于分析概念的创新，恰恰又是其研究中最大的问题所在。景观人类学的研究陷入了“场所”和“空间”二元对立的范式，后现代空间理论和“为弱者代言”的人类学基因使得现有的研究虽揭示了“场所”与“空间”存在的内外景观之间的龃龉和对立，及其产生的机制，却并未深刻发掘、阐释“场所”与“空间”之间转化共存的动态过程。2010年之后，在亚洲开展的景观人类学研究极大地弥补了这一点，下文将展开论述。

4 迈向“景观共生”

针对先行研究存在的非此即彼的二元论倾向，以及对他和自我的严格区分，日本景观人类学代表学者之一的河合洋尚根据多年在中国广州地区的人类学研究，构建了“景观共生”的独创性概念——“多相”。并将其定义为“两种以上的景观在一定条件下保持平衡并融合为一体的动力学”^[45]。一个景观既有“空间”相，又有“场所”相，换言之，一个景观既有政府、媒体或学者所生产出来的具有地方特色的景观，又有当地居民生活实践形成的景观。河合从“空间”与“场所”视角对景观进行了分析，并通过实例揭示两个不同面相景观之间共存的条件，由此建构了独创的“多相”概念。

In the study of Landscape Anthropology, research that adopted a “place” perspective is far more than that adopted a “space” in terms of quantity. This may be due to the fact that anthropology is more interested in the exploration of the cultural systems of the weak people (e.g. the locals). Similar to theories of place construction, research that adopted such perspective is also usually related to colonization, and thus lacks the depiction of modern societies. The “space” perspective also emphasized the confrontation between different notions of landscape. For example, they are more concerned with how the colonists portrayed the local cultural characteristics, and how the representation of such characteristics is confronted with the true aboriginal culture and “place.”

In conclusion, using the dyadic analytical concepts of “place” and “space,” Landscape Anthropology has made contributions to the understanding of culture as a medium between human beings and their environment. However, this contribution is at the same time one of the most terrific challenges that Landscape Anthropology faces. To a considerable extent, the study of Landscape Anthropology is trapped in the confines of dualistic confrontation between place and space. Postmodernist theories, and the natural intention of anthropology to speak for the weak, created an embarrassing situation: although existing research could illustrate the above-mentioned confrontations and its mechanism, it was not capable of discussing a possible dynamic state in which both space and place could coexist. Since 2010, research from Landscape Anthropologists from Asia significantly filled that void, which will be discussed in the following sections.

4 Toward Landscape Unison

Previous research often adopts a conventional dualist perspective, and strictly separates and contrasts the self and the other. After several years of anthropological fieldwork in Guangzhou, China, Japanese Cultural Anthropologist Hironao Kawai, on the contrary, invented a concept for the unison of space and place: multi-phase landscape. He defines it as a dynamic state of coexistence and convergence of two or more landscapes under given conditions^[45]. In other words, a landscape has at the same time a “space” phase and a “place” phase. More specifically, a landscape can be at the same time the design product of government, media or academics, and the quotidian construction of local people’s routine venues. During the creation of the multi-phase concept, Kawai started by analyzing landscape by adopting respectively the “space” or the “place” perspective, and continued to illustrate the conditions under which the two phases of landscape could coexist.

② 荔枝为该地区生产的一种水果，亦为该区域的称谓。

② Lychee is the name of the fruit; its Chinese translation is also the name of Lizhi District.

河合曾就广州市的传统街区西关进行了为期约4年的田野调查。他分别从“场所”和“空间”两个角度描述了西关地区的景观变化。他首先从“空间”生产的角度讨论了西关地区景观改造的政治经济背景，揭示了政府、媒体、学术机构参与空间生产的过程。1993年，广州市出台了“建立具有地方特色的国际性大都市”的相关政策。西关街区所在的荔枝区政府为了落实这一政策，提出了将本区打造为“历史悠久、文化资源丰富的旅游胜地”的总体目标，“西关”也因此成为了焦点。在民间，“西关”没有明确的界定，泛指广州老城的西边。在当地政府、新闻媒体、旅游商各方的参与下，西关这个原本模糊的概念，开始与行政区“荔枝区”的边界重叠。而学者引经据典论述的“西关文化”，恰恰为打造西关提供了蓝本。从某种程度上说，对于“西关文化”的研究，本身就是打造城市特色的政策影响下展开的。另外，学者们还选出了六大类可以展现此文化的“象征符号”：荔枝^②等自然元素、西关大屋等传统建筑、西关小姐等传统文化、北帝信仰等地方风俗等。西关街区的景观改造工程，即围绕这些“象征符号”展开。同时，为了赋予这些“象征符号”以合理性，大量的媒体报道不断宣传和强调这样的景观意象。西关这个“空间”的文化含义就这样被政府、开发资本和学术表象创造了出来。

与先前的研究结论类似，“场所”和“空间”的背离在西关的打造中也同样存在。比如，开发商为了招商引资，政府为了统一美化，“西关大屋”的景观改造如火如荼地展开了。改造项目保留了外立面的传统样式，但所采用的材料和内部构造却不复原貌。仅仅在外立面做装饰的“西关大屋”在本土人看来并不实用，且因为结构问题漏

Kawai performed a four-year-long fieldwork in the traditional residential blocks of Xiguan. His research depicted the landscape development of the Xiguan area from respectively the space / place perspective. To begin with, he approached the analysis from the angle of the production of space. This includes a discussion of the political and economic background of landscape reformation of the Xiguan area, and the process in which government, media and academic institutions participated in the production of space. In 1993, the government of Guangzhou city published policies aiming at the construction of Guangzhou city as an international metropolitan area with local characteristics. The government of Lizhi District, where Xiguan area is located, proposed a plan to construct Lizhi district as a popular tourist resort with long history and profound cultural heritage. This made Xiguan area a focal point in the plan, however, traditionally there is no consensus among the public about an exact definition of the confinement of Xiguan area. In folklore conventions, Xiguan merely refers to the western outskirts of Guangzhou old town in general. However, along with the interference and participation of the local government, news media and the tourist industry, the concept of Xiguan area started to overlap with the administrative concept of Lizhi district. Also, the Xiguan culture, excavated and repolished by academics from ancient tomes or modern literature, became the blue print of such theoretical foundation. To a considerable extent, the study of Xiguan culture was developed under the influence of the policy to construct Guangzhou city’s new metropolitan features. Moreover, academics have selected and promoted six types of cultural symbols of Xiguan, which include elements of nature (e.g. lychee^②), human architecture (e.g. Xiguan Dawu), folklore culture (e.g. Miss Xiguan) and religious believes (e.g. Pak Tai temples), etc. Later, the reformation projects of Xiguan area were organized around these symbols. In the meantime, the mass media repeatedly primed these symbols in the news agenda to rationalize their existence among the public. The cultural meaning of Xiguan as a concept of “space” is thus produced by forces of the government, the capital behind investments and the academia.

In consonance to previous literature, the contestation between “space” and “place” was also present during the construction of Xiguan. For instance, since land developers hoped to attract more investment and the local government hoped to perform a uniform city decoration. The project of Xiguan Dawu (mansion) landscape reform was initiated. The project kept the exterior outlook of the mansion, but the building materials and internal structure were largely changed. In the eyes of the local residents, the new Xiguan Dawu, whose reformation kept only its exterior outlook, was not at all reliable. The Dawu suffered from serious

水严重，被当地人视为“假”的景观。倒是大量外地人和海外华侨对“西关大屋”饶有兴趣，地产收入和面向游客的商业收入十分可观。相反，“承载着过去生活的记忆”而被媒体和开发商们忽视的“麻石路”却被当地人视为“真”的景观。

河合的研究目的不在于描述景观中的对立，而是探求“景观共生”的可能条件。例如，为了打造地方特色，政府委托中介公司重新修改“北帝诞仪式”的流程和内容。出于交通和市容市貌等因素的考虑，“北帝诞仪式”中的“巡街路线”被改变了。由于当地民众担心政府以新线路为由回收土地，同时也希望利用“地方特色打造”的机会保住自己的祖宅，所以接受了新的方案。只不过每次除完成“规定线路”外，他们还会绕道曾经的路线，完成他们内心的“巡街”。合河认为，“空间”和“场所”在此能达成统一，是因为民众“利用了”“空间”，借用“空间”的政治保住了土地，内外景观在民俗仪式上得以融合。河合这种基于大量实证研究之上的理论构建，以及学术表达上的完美自洽，获得了学界的好评。然而，空间相位是互相转化的，昨日的“空间”也可内化为今日的“场所”^[46]，“多相论”如何在历史学的视角下进一步发展，还需拭目以待^[47]。

2016年，日本国立民族学博物馆牵头的《景观人类学》得以出版，展示了日本学界对如何突破“场所”“空间”二元论这一命题的阶段性思考。首先是引入“移动性”的视角^[48]，探讨本地居民对景观的适应性^[49]，以及基于“徒步”这种身体实践内外景观如何统一起来^[50]，从而质疑“场所空间二元论”的前提预设——“土生土长式定居”，

problems of water leakage, and was regarded by the locals as a “fake” landscape. However, outsiders and overseas Chinese were largely interested in the new Xiguan mansion. Revenues from the land and the tourism industries sky-rocketed. In contrast, on the other side of Xiguan, a small trail called Mashi road, which does not interest the media or the land developers, was considered by the locals as the “true” landscape, because it “embodied the memories of lives in the past.”

However, the purpose of Kawai’s research was not to describe such contestation, but to explore the possible conditions that might support landscape unison. For example, to answer to the call of creating local characteristics, the local government entrusted agent companies to design the procedures and contents of local rituals of “Birthday Celebration of North Emperor.” As a result, the traditional parade route of the ritual was redesigned to coordinate local traffic and the city image. Because the new route could become a justification for the government to resume the land from the locals, they also hope to utilize this opportunity of “creating local characteristics” to legitimize existence of their houses, which are inherited from their ancestors and are a part of the traditional parade. The locals accepted the new parade route, but after finishing the new route, they would pass by the traditional routes, so that the “real” parade for them would be practiced. Kawai thought the reason that space and place could converge in this case was because the locals have utilized the “space.” They utilized the politics of the “space” to keep their lands and the two types of landscapes could be converged in a folklore ritual. Kawai’s theoretical construction was based on a large amount of empirical evidences and his harmonization of academic expression. Although his research has been largely praised, the notion of multi-phase landscape implies the possibility that phases are interchangeable, a “space” of yesterday might become a “place” today^[46]. The development of multi-phase theory from a historical perspective still requires further exploration^[47].

In 2016, the result of a research project led by National Museum of Ethnography of Japan, *Landscape Anthropology*, was published. This book demonstrates how Japanese academia performed a phased contemplation about how to break through the dualist research framework of “space” and “place.” It first introduces the perspective of mobility^[48], and then challenges the assumptions of space-place dualist theory by exploring how immigrants adapt to the local landscape^[49]. By “walking on foot” through local landscapes, pedestrians achieved a unification of their “space” and “place” through the utilization of their own bodies^[50]. Thus, one of the dualist theory’s assumptions, that “space” and “place” should be discussed only about people who are natively born and bred, was lifted. This is an attempt to

试图消解二元论中内外二分的基础；通过揭示身体和物质之间的“情况依存性”，就二元论对身体与物质之间的关系稳定性的假设进行了批判^[31]。其次，该书还对一些共存的实践性经验进行了介绍。岩田恭子的案例介绍了京都旅游开发中，企业和居民在景观营造上如何达成共识的经验^[51]。

毋庸置疑，对“移动性”的思考是未来景观人类学的方向之一。另一个方向则是探讨网络技术所带来的影响。网络和现代化通信加速了“时空的压缩”^[52]，深刻改变了“场所性”^[53]的产生方式^[54]。有关“动漫圣地巡礼”的研究表明，通过网络互动与个体的空间造访，虚拟的信息空间不断与现实环境产生互动，赋予了景观更加丰富的形态^{[55][56]}。“网络”这一介质又会如何与“场所”和“空间”相呼应？“网络”打破了固态的话语结构，消解了空间物理边界，重构了社会群体内部的组织形式，这些是否会为“景观共生”带来可能？

5 结语

虽然殖民地社会的风情可能遥远而陌生，但对那些“城市特色”的表象，景观设计师们绝不会陌生，因为景观设计师不仅参与了文化特色的“表象”的生产，一笔一划的施工图纸更是让“表象”变成了一砖一瓦的“现实”。如上所述，“场所”和“空间”的背离随处可见。“乡愁”突然成为了诸多城市建设项目的口号。既然“场所”和“空间”的背离很多时候源于“表象”，以及“表象”的“物质表达”，那是否可以在“表象”和“物质表达”的过程里统筹“场所”与“空间”，从而实现“景观共生”？

这不正是景观设计师的工作吗？

然而，奋斗在一线的景观设计师也许会抱怨，离谱的项目进程压缩了所有的环节，“地方调研”宛如明日黄花。很多时候，从景观设计师拿到CAD的现状图纸开始，就已经难以跳出“空间”的维度。在这一俯视的视角下，设计师开始切割作为资源的景观，分配经济技

challenge the foundation of dualism. Since the cases on mobility illustrates a situated relation between body and objects, it destabilizes the old assumption of the relationship between body and object^[31]. Beyond this, the research also introduced some empirical evidences of the above-mentioned convergence. Kyoko Iwada’s case study explored how companies and residents arrived at a consensus about landscape management and design during tourism development of Kyoto city^[51].

It is reasonable to say that the exploration into mobility is undeniably a direction of future research in Landscape Anthropology. Another possibility is the exploration of the influences brought by Internet technologies. The Internet and other types of modern communication technologies accelerate the compression of time and space^[52], and thus profoundly alter how “placeness”^[53] is crated^[54]. Research about pilgrimage triggered by animation shows that through interactions on the internet and individual visits to real-life locations of animation, virtual information spaces continue to interact with reality. This process gives the formation of landscape more possible states of being^{[55][56]}. How would the Internet as a medium correspond to space and place? The Internet shattered the solid discourse structure, dispelled the physical borders of space and restructured the internal organization of social groups. The question is, would these provide benign conditions for landscape unison?

5 Conclusion

Although the outlooks of colonist societies may be remote and unfamiliar, Landscape architects would not be unacquainted with the representations of those “city features.” Landscape architects not only participate in the production of the representations of cultural features, their endeavors on pieces of construction blueprints also extend this representation into a brick-by-brick reality. As mentioned previously, the contestation between “place” and “space” is omnipresent in modern cities. It is thus no wonder that nostalgia has suddenly become the slogans for many city construction projects. Since ways of representation, and the material expression of those representations, have in many cases led to such place-space tension, would it be possible to achieve a state of landscape unison by converging place and space in the process of material expression and representation?

Is this not exactly the job of Landscape Architects?

However, Landscape Architects who are working at the front lines may complain that outrageous construction schedules have compressed all the procedures; this made investigations of the local cultural environment a forgotten task. In many cases, since the moment that designers were handed a digital base map, they

术指标。而当需要一些“概念”灵感的时候，才开始寻求“地方特色”——传统建筑抑或风土人情——的帮助。不过景观设计师接触到的“地方特色”通常来自新闻报纸或学术文章——这些已经“空间”化了的素材。景观设计，似乎是“场所”和“空间”共生的绝妙机会，但终究敌不过服务行业的政治化。

景观人类学提供了对“景观设计”的文化思考，但在实践层面，其与设计行为依然存在差距。缘起于北欧的“设计人类学”，似乎提供了新的可能。人类学家开始进驻设计团队。例如，在某儿童游戏场地的景观设计项目中，人类学家为这个案例贡献了主要的设计概念^[57]。通过田野调查，人类学家指出，孩子们在玩的过程中往往会不断改变游戏规则；儿童游戏的本质是在团队中找到自己需要扮演的角色。这些洞察为设计提供了方向：儿童空间的设计需要一定的自由度，太具有指向性的空间设计，以及刻板的游戏器具摆设，都不利于实现这种创造性的“游戏”。设计人类学的维度是微观的，其出发点是设计即为产品，且关注于在设计过程中如何更好地贴近“使用者”的需求，从而实现“设计”的内外统一。“景观人类学”提供了一种对“景观设计”的文化理解，而“设计人类学”强调在“景观设计”的流程中融入文化人类学。因篇幅所限，有关设计人类学的讨论，另予别稿。

最后，落笔“景观设计”之理想作为结语。景观设计师注定要在诸多二元的张力——科学与艺术、理性与感性、普遍性与特殊性中，寻找一个突破点。在那一个点里，一些似曾相识却又无法言说的环境体验慢慢上演。在那一个点里，经过千万年进化的人类感官得以全部释放。历史的表象，投射于当下；空间的物质，开启了永恒。**LAF**

became incapable of retreating from the “space” phase. From this downward looking perspective, designers would have to slice open holistic landscapes as resources in order to satisfy a series of economic and technological requirements. Designers would only look for help from local cultural features (e.g. historical buildings or cultural traditions) when they need a few pieces of conceptual inspiration. But even in this scenario, the local cultural features that are available for landscape architects often come from the news media or academic discourses, which are clips originally fabricated of “spaces.” Although Landscape Architecture seems to be an ideal venue for the coexistence of space and place, still, it cannot withhold from the politicization of service industries.

Landscape Anthropology indeed provided an educated contemplation to the concept of Landscape Architecture, but it is still practically distant from the actual design activities. Design Anthropology, originated from Northern Europe, may have illustrated new possibilities: anthropologists start to have a more consistent role in designer teams. In a case where the landscape architecture project is a children’s playground, anthropologists provided the core design concepts for the project^[57]. After conducting fieldworks, anthropologists pointed out that children tend to frequently change rules of the games they play, and the essence of children’s games is finding the particular role one needs to play. These observations pointed out the direction for the design: it needs to give considerable flexibility and freedom to the playground. Designs that are too directive and rigid may not be beneficial to the realization of creative games among children. Design Anthropology looks at the micro level of analysis. It begins with the assumption that the design is the product itself, and focuses on how designs can be as intimate as possible to the users. It emphasizes the unification of the interior and the exterior of the exact design product. Cultural Anthropology focuses on landscape and provides a cultural explication of the design process. In contrast, Design Anthropology focuses on design and emphasizes the participation of Landscape Anthropology in the design process. Nevertheless, a deeper explanation and discussion about Design Anthropology goes beyond the scope of the current paper, and should be a standalone paper in itself.

To conclude, we may return to the ideals of landscape architecture. One of these ideals is that landscape architects are destined to find a point of break through between various kinds of dualist tensions: science and art, rationality and emotion, ubiquity and particularity, etc. Perhaps it is through that point, that we could slowly find those familiar but indescribable experiences, and unleash our long-evolved human senses to perceive an eternity created by the incarnation of historical representations of space. **LAF**

REFERENCES

- [1] Said, E. W. (1979). *Orientalism* (Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books.
- [2] Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. E. (1986). *Writing Culture: the Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [3] Shi, Y.-L. (2010). *Guide to Cultural Anthropology*. Beijing: Capital University of Economics & Business Press.
- [4] Sato, Y. (2006). *Fieldwork: Go to Street with the Book*. Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [5] Yu, K. J. (2004). Landscape Architecture in terms of the wholeness of land. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 20(07), 37-41.
- [6] Yu, K. J., & Li, D. H. (2004). An Introduction to Landscape Architecture: the profession and education. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 20(05), 7-8.
- [7] Sun, X. X. (2006). Forth topic: a suggestion on the establishment of “earthscape planning” discipline on the basis of improvement of “Landscape Architecture” discipline. *Landscape Architecture*, 02,10-13.
- [8] Sun, X. X. (2005). The Ecological Engineering of Modern Urban Garden and Green Space System and The Sustainable Development of Cities (Abridged). *Landscape Architecture*, 01, 3-8.
- [9] Wang, B. L., Chen, Y. M., Liu, J. L., Li, J. L., & Sun, X. X. (2004). Opinion of An Introduction to Landscape Architecture: the profession and education. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 18(05), 9-13.
- [10] Liu, J. L., Wang, B. L., & Li, J. L. (2004). Opinion of Landscape Architecture in terms of the wholeness of land. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 18(07), 41-42.
- [11] Wang, S. Z. (2005). Garden, Landscape and the future of Chinese Landscape Architecture. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 19(3), 24-27.
- [12] Sun, X. X. (2005). The Ecological Engineering of Modern Urban Garden and Green Space System and The Sustainable Development of Cities (Abridged). *Landscape Architecture*, 01, 3-8.
- [13] Lin, G. S. (2006). Evolvement and discrimination of the definition of Landscape. In *Papers on the History and Development of Landscape Architecture Discipline* (pp.74-80). Beijing: Chinese Society of Landscape Architecture.
- [14] Crumley, C. L. (Ed.). (1994). *Historical Ecology: Cultural knowledge & Changing Landscapes*. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research.
- [15] Simon, H. A. (1996). *The sciences of the Artificial* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- [16] Yang, Y. Z. (2016). *Spacialization of Capital*. Nanjing: Southeast University Press.
- [17] Lévi-Strauss, C. (2012). *Tristes tropiques* (J. Weightman, D. Weightman & P. Wilcken Trans.). New York: Penguin.
- [18] Kawai, H. (Ed.). (2016). *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality*. Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [19] Tuan, Y. F. (1974). *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- [20] Tuan, Y. F. (1977). *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [21] Tilley, C. (1997). *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments*. London: Berg Publishers.
- [22] Ingold, T. (1993). The temporality of the landscape. *World Archaeology*, 25(2), 152-174.
- [23] Kawai, Hironao. (2013). Subject of Landscape Anthropology: Representation and Revitalization of the Urban Environment in Guangzhou, China. Tokyo: Fukyo-Sha.
- [24] Hirsch, E., & O’Hanlon M. (Eds.). (1995). *The anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space*. Gloucestershire: Clarendon Press.
- [25] Stewart, P. J., & Strathern, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto.
- [26] Kawai, H. (2015). Trends and Scope of Landscape Anthropology. *Journal of Guangxi University for Nationalities*, (4), 44-59.
- [27] Fox, J. (1997). Place and landscape in comparative Austronesian perspective. In J. Fox (Ed.), *The Poetic Power of Place: Comparative Perspectives on Austronesian Ideas of Locality* (pp. 1-21). Canberra: Department of Anthropology, Australian National University.
- [28] Morphy, H. (1995). Landscapes and the reproduction of the ancestral past. In E. Hirsch, & M. O’Hanlon (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape : Perspectives on Place and Space* (pp. 184-209) Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [29] Toren, C. (1995). Seeing the ancestral sites: Transformations in Fijian notions of the land. In E. Hirsch, & M. O’Hanlon (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Landscape : Perspectives on Place and Space* (pp. 163-183). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- [30] Anderson, A. (2011). *Landscapes of Relations and Belonging: Body, Place and Politics in Wogeo, Papua New Guinea*. New York: Bergahn Books.
- [31] Satomi, R. (2016). Landscape as problem: From the study of Asi from Malaita Island in Solomon Island. In H. Kawai (Ed.), *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality* (pp. 117-143). Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [32] Santos-Granero, F. (1998). *Writing History Into the Landscape: Space, Myth, and Ritual in Contemporary Amazonia*. *American Ethnologist*, 25(2), 128-148.
- [33] Feld, S. (1982). Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics, and Song in Kaluli Expression. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- [34] Feld, S., & Basso, K. H. (Eds.). (1996). *Senses of place*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- [35] Layton, R. (1997). Representing and translating people’s place in the landscape of northern Australia. In J. Allison, J. Hockey, & A. Dawson. (Ed.). *After Writing Culture: Epistemology and Praxis in Contemporary Anthropology* (pp.122-143). London: Routledge.
- [36] Stewart P. J., & Strathern A. (Eds.). (2003). *Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Pluto.
- [37] Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (A. Sheridan Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- [38] Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (D. Nicholson-Smith Trans.). Oxford, UK; Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- [39] Küchler, S. (1993). Landscape as memory: The mapping of process and its representation in a Melanesian society. In B. Bender (Ed.). *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives* (pp. 85-106). New York: Berg.
- [40] O’Sullivan, A. (2001). Crannogs: Places of resistance in the contested landscape of early modern Ireland. In B. Bender, & M. Winer (Eds.). *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place* (pp. 87-102). Oxford; New York: Berg.
- [41] Smith, A. (2003). Landscape representation: Place and identity in nineteenth-century ordnance survey maps of Ireland. In P. J. Stewart, & A. Strathern (Eds.). *Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives* (pp.71-88). London: Pluto.
- [42] Green, N. (1995). Looking at the landscape: Class formation and the visual. In E. Hirsch, & M. O’Hanlon (Eds.). *The Anthropology of Landscape: Perspectives on Place and Space* (pp. 31-42). Oxford; New York; Tokyo: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press.
- [43] Berger, J. (1972). *Ways of seeing*. London; Harmondsworth: British Broadcasting Corporation; Penguin.
- [44] Steinitz, C. (2001). *Landscape Planning: a history of idea — Speech in Peking University*. *Chinese Landscape Architecture*, 17(6), 82-90.
- [45] Kawai, H. (2013). Subject of Landscape Anthropology: Representation and Revitalization of the Urban Environment in Guangzhou, China. Tokyo: Fukyo-Sha.
- [46] Chen, Z. (2015). (Review) Subject of Landscape Anthropology: Representation and Revitalization of the Urban Environment in Guangzhou, China. *Hakusan Review of Anthropology*, 18, 123-127.
- [47] Liu, Z. (2016). The significance of landscape: Discussions about the subject of Landscape Anthropology. *Journal of Guangxi University For Nationalities*, 01, 86-91.
- [48] Bender, B. (2001). Introduction. In B. Bender, & M. Winer (Eds.). *Contested Landscapes: Movement, Exile and Place*. Oxford; New York; Berg.
- [49] Tsubaki, A. (2016). Migrants and the landscape of migrants. In Kawai, H. (Ed.). *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality* (pp. 39-66). Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [50] Doi, K. (2016). Landscape of pedestrian: place, moving, knowing. In Kawai, H. (Ed.). *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality* (pp. 67-86). Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [51] Iwada, K. (2016). Placenessbron from communication. In Kawai, Hironao (Ed.), *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality* (pp. 167-193). Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [52] Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- [53] Relph, E. C. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London: Pion.
- [54] Yasuda, S. (2006). Landscape produced by Selfie. In Kawai, H. (Ed.). *Landscape Anthropology: Body, Politics, Matirality* (pp. 147-165). Tokyo: Shin-yo-sha.
- [55] Okamoto, K. (2012). A study of characteristics of tourists in information society from tourism sociology approach. Retrieved from <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/naid/500000557619>
- [56] Okamoto, K. (2015). Thinking the Concept of Space from Content Tourism: the Style of Tourism about Reality, Information, Virtual Space. *Thiri*, 6(06), 20-28.
- [57] Kjaersgaard, M. G. (2013). (Trans)forming knowledge and design concept in the design workshop. In W. Gunn, T. Otto & R. C. Smith (Eds.). *Design Anthropology: Theory and Practice* (pp. 51-67). London: Bloomsbury.