

景观设计评论写作

WRITING LANDSCAPE DESIGN CRITICISM



朱莉娅·泽尔尼克
雪城大学建筑学院副院长、教授

Julia CZERNIAK
Associate Dean and Professor of the School of Architecture,
Syracuse University
Slocum Hall, Syracuse, New York, 13244, USA
jczernia@syr.edu

作为一名景观设计评论者，我的工作是什么？

我经常听到这样一个问题：“景观中不存在评论，是这样吗？”

我们当然知道答案一定是否定的。我一直以来都被景观写作者深深吸引。大多数人认为弗雷德里克·劳·奥姆斯特德只是一名设计师，其实他还是一位杰出的社会批评家。尽管他由于在设计方面做出贡献而被广为人知——特别是在19世纪和20世纪初推动了城市公园的出现——但从他的论著（如《一个美国农民在英国的漫步与谈话》^[1]和《德州之旅》^[2]）中可以发现，他是一位对土地和生活方式有着敏锐观察力的评论者。

文化地理学家约翰·B·杰克逊在其景观写作中对人类及人类在塑造土地的过程中的角色提出了质疑并进行了有争议的论述。而当谈及当代的景观设计评论作者，伊丽莎白·迈耶可能最先出现在我的脑海中。她的写作

对我们对于土地的认知和使用的标准及猜想提出了尖锐的质疑。此外，我也喜欢读其他人的作品，比如罗伯特·苏摩、杰里米·福斯特、丹尼斯·霍夫曼·布兰特、理查德·韦勒、迈克尔·雅各布、爱丽丝·特姆罗、塞巴斯蒂安·马洛特、安妮塔·贝瑞斯贝莎等，他们都不同程度地启发了我。

就我个人而言，我的关注对象包括已建成和未建成的、各种尺度的景观设计项目。根据具体的情况，我会写不同的评论。有时，我通过建立学科框架进行写作，并在这一框架下讨论设计师的工作（包括设计方案或建成项目）。然而在更多时候，我会通过其他人设计的项目，把写作当成一种探讨整个设计领域的方式。

除了建筑师和景观设计师的身份外，我认为自己同时也是一个可以进行写作的设计师，评论对我而言完全是一种进行设计研究的方式，因为文字和线条都是项目设计和思想表达的表现形式。

https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-20170604 | 收稿时间 RECEIVED DATE / 2017-12-11
中图分类号 / TU986
文献标识码 / B

摘要

在本文中，朱莉娅·泽尔尼克教授分享了景观设计评论写作过程中的经验与总结。其评论写作主要从三个层面进行：建立学科框架，并在这一框架之下评价设计师的设计方案或建成项目；通过评论他人的项目，思考整个设计领域；以及基于限定条件较少的设计空间撰写评论。在泽尔尼克教授看来，撰写评论的目的是传播有价值的学科知识。未来，她将通过策展、出版特刊等活动继续探索更多景观设计评论的可能。

关键词

景观设计评论；写作；学科知识；空间设计

ABSTRACT

In this article, Professor Julia Czerniak shares her opinions and experiences on landscape design criticism. Generally, she writes three types of criticism, including setting up disciplinary frameworks to examine designer's drawings or built artifacts, writing through design projects to think about design at large, and writing to project design into a space of less constraint. From her point of view, writing criticism is to invoke valuable disciplinary knowledge. Professor Czerniak will further focus on curating an exhibition and publishing a special issue to explore more possibilities in landscape design criticism.

KEY WORDS

Landscape Design Criticism; Writing; Disciplinary Knowledge; Spatial Design

译 田乐 王颖 田晓劼

TRANSLATED BY Tina TIAN Ying WANG Xiaojie TIAN

我为什么写评论?

我写作的目的是为了传递那些我认为有价值的学科知识，不仅因为我希望把那些概念性的、严谨而重要的知识传播给其他人，更因为我相信公共话语的力量，相信我们共享同一个知识库，还因为我坚信——尽管社交媒体的“速食”节奏使我们越来越难以长时间集中注意力——我们仍然需要阅读。大多数时候，写作都会激发我的想象力。

我为谁而写作?

我写作是为了更好地投身于这一学科，所以我写给那些同样立志从事景观设计事业的人们。我写给自己、我的同事、年轻的景观设计师们，以及其他对景观感兴趣的人群。现在，相比起写给同行，我更期待通过写作接触到更多的普通读者，以增强他们对于景观设计师的工作，以及景观设计专业如何创造更多环境价值的文化理解。此外，通过景观写作让领导层、政策决策者、投资者以及那些能够支持景观项目并使之落地的人群了解景观的价值同样重要。

如何进行景观评论?

这个问题与我前文所述的为何而写作紧密相关。我将从三个简短的案例出发，详细阐述我所从事的三种不同类型的评论写作，以探讨景观评论的含义及可能性。

在进行评论写作时，我首先会构建大的学科框架，继而在这一框架之下讨论设计

师的作品（包括设计方案和建成作品）。例如，在《挑战图像思维：论当代景观实践》^[3]一文中，我以18世纪流行于英国的自然风景园为例，将设计过程中被广泛运用的用以界定景观图像化表达的技巧和观点设定为讨论框架，对记录了当代景观实践的三部著作——《丈量美国景观》^[4]《阿德里安·高伊策：West 8设计事务所景观设计作品集》^[5]和《哈格里夫斯景观设计作品集》^[6]进行了评论。

我撰写这篇文章的初衷是揭示人们所不愿意承认的设计过程中图像思维的局限性，鼓励他们从自然风景中汲取灵感。这一基于学科层面的探讨最终促进了景观都市主义的发展。

我的第二种评论方式是透过他人的设计作品来探讨整个设计领域，而非单纯地评论这些设计作品本身。具体而言，在我看来，引入某一设计作品中的理念和策略不仅可以重新定义该作品，更能够拓展思维，为已经存在于其他项目中的理念和策略的改进带来灵感。

在哈格里夫斯设计事务所出品的《哈格里夫斯：景观设计的魔力》^[7]一书我所撰写的章节《设计的代理作用》中，我重点阐述了城市公园是如何发挥催化作用的——它们加速了城市的发展与再开发。在这里，我所说的代理作用是指景观一改先前的被动状态，转而在设计策略的辅助下，为处于衰败境地的城市带来迅速而积极的变化。哈格里夫斯设计事务所通常在那些政治背景复杂、经济萧条低迷的城市开展实践，因而，我所聚焦的正是城市公园如何能够帮助改善后工业化时代背景下窘迫的环境状况。

我发现，不论尺度如何，通过构建连通性、鼓励公众使用以及营造独特性，这些公园不仅改善了城市环境，更促进了经济发展和社会繁荣。于我而言，该层面的评论不局限于对项目的正确解读，或是有意将读者引入错误的方向。反之，它鼓励对于同一设计作品做出多重解读，同时发现其潜在的非预期效果，以此为基础构想更多的实践方法与策略，进而在世界各地的其他项目中发挥自主性。这种评论方式既聚焦于所探讨对象的显性特征，更关注其潜在特性。

在这样的写作契机下，我最大的收获是，哈格里夫斯设计事务所的项目为我提供了探寻景观作品独特性的平台。为推动城市的复兴，公园需具备鲜明的特性，以有别于其所处的环境，同时鼓励公众使用、提升社会效益。在公园的设计过程中，哈格里夫斯设计事务所极少关注于公园的呈现效果（直观的外表），而强调其独特性（经历时间考验而形成的独特气质）。而这一独特性主要通过公园的配置、形态和规模等外形特征，与场地有形或无形的关联，以及瞬时与永恒的关系来体现。

对于位于美国肯塔基州的路易斯维尔河滨公园，曾有设计师做出了这样的描述：“它将河流这一开放空间引入了城市”，它不仅将城市网络延伸到了河滨区域，更通过景观自身独特的外形与功能，构建了强烈的身份特征。一个个“入河口”在不同尺度上将陆地与河流紧密相联，犹如注入路易斯维尔这一大都市中的涓涓细流，为人们呈现了河流的形成过程。而其中主要的入河口——海港入河口，则可供船只停泊，这也标志着

曾盛极一时的水上货运活动正悄然向市中心转移。

然而，更有趣的是南部的小河口。公园建成数年后，这个河口已经成为了一片湿地，一处广受欢迎的观鸟胜地，以及一个随着俄亥俄河的水流、淤泥堆积与自然形成的植物群落而不断演化的区域。这同样是公园的一种设计策略，在这里，景观既是具象的（包括河流的形态和所发生的活动），也是不断变化的（事实上它也被河流演进的过程所改变）。通过这种方式，路易斯维尔滨河公园的身份特征由稳定的、有意义的参照系统组成，这一参照系统对景观媒介的不确定性亦有所回应。我们可以推广这种设计策略，并用之来构想其他景观。这就是文字的力量。

我做的第三件事就是通过撰写评论，在那些没有那么多限定条件的空间中引入设计。通过参与其中，我发现这类项目大多是公共领域的混乱空间，资金支持有限，且管理层流动性大。通过撰写评论，我可以更好地理解我们所做的事情。

在《累积》^[8]一文中，我引用了城市理论家罗杰·谢尔曼“激进增量主义”这一提法，他将之视为一种设计策略，即“将积累作为一种塑造特质和特色的手段加以利用”来代替总体规划，通过这种概念演化、设计讨论和改进的途径，为我们在纽约州雪城市的一条长约3.2km的交通廊道及城市设计项目“纽带走廊”提供设计策略。谢尔曼阐述了如何借由这种策略促进标准的使用，以此来创造意象性，并营建突出的城市形象和和谐的城市氛围。所以我在这篇文章中设问：城

市中层层累积的色彩本身怎样才能具有一致性？在像雪城这样发展受限的城市中，对城市中色彩的积累（例如铺装、设施、灯光、标牌等元素）进行设计似乎成为了一种能够激发积极变化的行之有效的策略。

在此意义下，评论写作不仅试图阐释那些我们已经在做的事情，还可以对未来的决策加以引导。

接下来我会做什么？

有两件事情。一是，由长木花园和罗马美国学院联合发起的“水之设计”国际会议将于2018年秋天召开，而我将作为首席策展人。我计划召集园艺设计和历史、景观设计、建筑、城市设计，以及地理学、生态学和水文学领域的专家，将从园艺景观单体设计到综合性的区域系统设计等多个尺度层面上，讨论如何推动水设计的理念和策略发展。因为我认为水是21世纪最重要的热点设计议题。水不仅仅是生命之源或创建美景之元素，其在社会、文化和象征意义等方面都至关重要，更不用说对于所有生命系统来说，水都是必不可少的。然而，包括干旱、洪涝、水污染在内的水问题让我们感到痛心疾首，而这些亟待解决的问题需要我们的共同努力。

第二件事是，作为《景观设计学报》期刊的客座编辑，我策划了一期特刊——没错，正是以“景观设计评论”为主题的。除了项目评论外，我和编辑们还计划通过一种特别的方式来呈现一些批评性的声音，以解读景观设计评论的形式（景观设计评论是什

么）和效力（景观设计评论为什么重要），以及景观设计评论是如何完成的。这些文章可能会侧重于特定学科的实践、理论或专业框架，或者探索不同的写作模式；讨论的主题既包括当下的议题，也涉及历史和未来。

除了这些以“思考”为主题的、短小精悍的文章外，特刊还会呈现一些针对重新利用或改造设计类的建成项目的评论文章。这些作者不仅会以各自的方式全新阐释“景观再生/重新利用”这一议题，还会着眼于如何使他们的阐释框架清晰明确——我把这部分内容的主题设为“评论进行时”。而“思考之眼”和“书评”两个栏目也将对这个主题进行探讨——对于撰稿作者我在此暂时保密，但一定会令读者感到惊喜。敬请关注！LAF

As a landscape design critic, WHAT do I do?

I have to begin with a question I often hear, which is: “There is not criticism in landscape, is there?”

Which of course we know the answer is a resounding “YES.” I have always been fascinated by landscape writers. Most people think of Frederick Law Olmsted as just a designer, but he was also an amazing social critic. Although he is most commonly known for his design contributions to emerging 19th and early 20th century cities in the form of parks, in books such as *Walks and Talks of an American Farmer* (1852)^[1] and *A Journey through Texas* (1857)^[2] he was a keen observer and commentator on the land and the lifestyles it sponsored.

In his landscape writings, cultural geographer John B. Jackson raised questions and presented controversial statements in reference to humans and their role in shaping the land. Elizabeth Meyer is probably the most likely person to come to mind of a contemporary writer of landscape design criticism. Her writings provocatively question norms and assumptions about our perception and use of the land. But I also love reading so many others, such as Robert Somol, Jeremy Foster, Denise Hoffman Brandt, Richard Weller, Michael Jakob, Alice Twemlow, Sebastian Marot, Anita

Berrizbeitia and others. They inspire me.

So what do I do? I write about built and unbuilt landscape design projects at multiple scales. I write different kinds of criticism, depending on the circumstance. Sometimes I write by setting up disciplinary frameworks in which I examine designer’s work (drawings and / or built artifacts). More often, however, I write through — not about — the design projects of others as a way to think about design at large.

I am both an architect and landscape architect and think of myself as a designer that writes, so criticism for me in all cases is a form of design research, both the “word” and the “line” are forms of representation to develop projects and express thoughts.

WHY do I write?

I write to invoke what I find to be valuable disciplinary knowledge and because I would like to impart to others a conceptual rigor important to the field. I also write because I believe in public discourse; that we have a shared knowledge base. I write because I really do believe — despite social media and shrinking attention spans — that we still read. Mostly I write to imagine.

WHO do I write for?

I write to participate in the discipline.

So I write for whoever is willing to engage. I write for myself, my colleagues, for the next generation of landscape architects and others interested in the designed landscape. More and more, I am less interested in talking to my peers through writing, and aspire to reach more general audiences as a way to enhance the cultural understanding of what designers do and how it brings added value to our environments. It is also important to reach leaders, policy makers, funders and donors and all those that support our projects and can make them happen.

HOW do I work?

Well this is related to why I write, so I can give three brief examples — each a form of what I do — that can perhaps contribute to the conversation of what landscape criticism is and can be.

The first thing I do is write criticism by setting up larger disciplinary frameworks in which I examine designer’s work (drawings and / or built artifacts). So in essays such as *Challenging the Pictorial: Recent Landscape Practice*^[3] I used the pervasive techniques and attitudes that define and delimit landscape’s pictorialization, including the early force of the 18th century English landscape garden, as a framework then to read three books — *Taking Measures across the American*

Landscape^[4], *Adriann Geuze: West 8 Landscape Architecture*^[5] and *Hargreaves Landscape Works*^[6].

This piece, I hope, contributed to a discussion we were all having and work we were doing that was unwilling to affirm pictorial limits and embrace, instead, an alternative view of nature. This collective disciplinary discussion eventually led to landscape urbanism.

The second way I work is to write criticism through, not about, the design projects of others as a way to think about design at large. More specifically, the concepts and strategies I both find in and bring to a design project not only reframes it, but opens up ways to extend what is already present to other circumstances.

So in my chapter *Agency by Design* in Hargreaves book *Hargreaves: The Alchemy of Landscape Architecture*^[7], I looked at ways urban parks are catalysts — agents that accelerate change or recovery — to the development and redevelopment of cities. “Agency” here suggests a shift in landscape’s perceived passive role (as previously described), supplemented now by design strategies that set in motion, even accelerate, positive change in the decaying cities in which they are located. Hargreaves Associates projects are often built in a context of complex politics and tough economics, and I looked at ways that parks help to change distressed de-industrialized environments.

What I found was that, across scale, by foregrounding connectivity, impassioned use, and strong identity, these parks transform not only their physical environments but also the economic and social realities of the city. This sort of writing for me is not about getting it “right” nor was it about purposeful misreading. It was about reading a body of work differently, seeing potentials that were perhaps unintended effects, and naming a set of operations and strategies and in doing so, putting them in the world as another form of the project that has a sort of autonomy. It is about looking at what it is simultaneously with what it can be.

In this example, Hargreaves Associates projects provided, most significantly for me, a platform to speculate on the identity of landscape works. Parks as agents in urban revitalization require strong identities to make them distinct from their contexts and generate use, publicity, and revenue. When designing parks, Hargreaves Associates are less concerned with their park’s image (the immediacy of its look) than with its identity (its distinguishing character that accrues over time), evident through form (organization, shape, and size), relationship to site (physically and referentially), and relationship between the temporal and the permanent.

At Louisville Waterfront Park in Kentucky, what the designers refer to as “pulling the open space of the river into

the city” — and not simply extending the city grid to it — sets up the framework for the park’s powerful identity based on how a landscape both appears and performs. The interlocking of land and water at different scales through “inlets,” which appear as an abstraction of a local stream network that drains into metropolitan Louisville, provides a stage for visitors to interact with river processes. The primary one, called the Harbor Inlet, allows watercraft to dock and thereby signals the return of once thriving river-related activity to the downtown core.

What I found more interesting, however, is the smaller inlet to the south. Years after the park’s completion, this inlet has become a wetland and a favorite place for birding, an evolution dependent on the flows of the Ohio River, silt infill, and emergent plant communities. It also suggests strategies for park design where landscape is both representational (it refers to river forms and past activities) and performative (it actually changes by engaging river processes). In this way, Louisville Riverfront Park is a powerful example of a park’s identity being constituted by stable and meaningful references that are also responsive to the fluxes of the landscape medium. We can generalize this example and use it to imagine other landscapes. This is the power of words.

The third thing I do is to write criticism to extend and project design

into a space of less constraint. In this case design work, of which I am a part, comes first in the messy space of the public sector, conservative funding streams, and shifting leadership. I can make better sense of what we are doing by writing about it.

So in my essay *Accumulations*^[8], I use what urban theorist Roger Sherman calls Radical Incrementalism, what he describes as a design strategy “that utilizes accumulation as a means of producing character and identity” across an urban field in lieu of masterplanning as a way to conceptualize, discuss, and advance our urban design strategy for a two-mile transportation corridor / urban design project we were then working on in Syracuse, New York called the Connective Corridor. He describes how this strategy can promote the use of norms and as a means of creating imageability and building strong identity and coherence across an urban field. So I asked in this essay, what about the coherence of accumulate color itself? In a city like Syracuse New York where growth is not an option, it seemed accumulation of color (of elements like paving, furnishing, lighting and signage) is a viable and potent strategy for positive change.

Writing this way tries to make sense of something we were already doing, as well as to reinforce a decision armature for the future.

What is next, what am I working on?

Well, two things. I am the chief curator of an international conference scheduled for next fall called *Designing Water*, co-sponsored by Longwood Gardens and the American Academy in Rome. The idea is to gather experts in garden design and history, landscape architecture, architecture and urban design, as well as geography, ecology and hydrology to advance concepts of and strategies for designing water from the scale of a singular garden feature to integrated regional systems. Because I think water is the most compelling and consequential design matter of the 21st century! Not just a life source or a source of beauty, water has crucial social, cultural and symbolic functions and plays an essential role in all living systems. Yet the urgent issues surrounding water are alarming, from drought to flooding to contamination. The topic needs our concentrated attention.

I am also guest-editing a special issue of *JoLA (Journal of European Landscape Criticism)* on — you guessed it! — landscape design criticism. I think the editors and I have come up with an interesting structure for the issue. In addition to the call for project reviews, we are inviting a number of critical voices to produce a one-page spread of text that addresses their read of forms of landscape architecture design criticism (what it is)

the effects it has (why it matters), as well as how it is done. These articles might focus on the use of specific disciplinary, philosophical or professional frameworks, or explore different modes of writing. They might also be focused on what is happening today, what might happen, or conversely, be retrospective.

In addition to these short essays, which I theme “Thinking It,” there will be a number of texts examining built projects that are about reuse. These authors will not only frame “landscapes of reuse” in fresh ways, the intention is that they will make their interpretative frameworks explicit. I call this section of the journal “Doing It.” The Thinking Eye and Book Review sections will also explore the theme. I cannot tell you the contributors; it will ruin the surprise. But they are great. Stay tuned! **LAF**

REFERENCES

- [1] Olmsted, F. L. (1852). *Walks and talks of an American farmer in England*. New York: G.P. Putnam.
- [2] Olmsted, F. L. (1857). *A Journey through Texas*. New York: Time-Life Educational.
- [3] Czerniak, J. (1997). Challenging the Pictorial: Recent Landscape Practice. *Assemblage*, (34), 110-120.
- [4] Corner, J., & MacLean, A. S. (1996). *Taking Measures across the American Landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- [5] Geuze, A. (1995). *Adriaan Geuze: West 8: Landscape Architecture*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers.
- [6] Ito, M., Fujimaki, Y., Minamiguchi, C., & Kanasashi, K. (1996). *Hargreaves: Landscape Work*. Tokyo: Process Architecture.
- [7] Czerniak, J. (2009). *Agency by Design*. Hargreaves: the Alchemy of Landscape Architecture (pp. 164-169). New York: Thames & Hudson.
- [8] Czerniak, J. (2011). *Accumulations*. In G. Doherty (Ed.), *New Geographies, 3: Urbanisms of Color*. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Design.