

The Forms of Landscape

Raffaele MILANI

Landscape is an art of the world and the earth. Nature, its beating heart, is an infinite living sculpture that is then modified by the efforts of man who is always ready to mold the environment to his needs. Landscape is linked to the continually renewed design of man's doings, according to the intentions of the viewer, the intentions of the architect, and those of the botanist. Together, this creates a system of forms that transform and replace themselves through history. Landscape is dynamic, polyphonic, and transcultural. Moreover, it manifests itself both in reality and in the imagination so that man perceives, admires and ameliorates his object. Architects, landscape architects, naturalists, and students of landscape study its forms in order to produce new ones. In this sense we can say that the landscape is an adventure both to look at and to produce.

These observations arise from the fact that nature modified by man also lives, its materiality notwithstanding, in the realm of metaphor and symbolism. Thus appears the central importance of a *second image*, one capable of opening the horizons of contemplation, but also those of planning and production. Aesthetics could define these activities in terms of cultural value and interior mental significance, because it is in the mind that the symbolic act takes place with its analogous paradigms. Historically, the civilizing force of art has fostered the landscape and made it natural so that it has become an irreplaceable aspect of the world around us. It's the gaze of this same civilization that favors the art of producing and ameliorating as the very fruit of human intentionality.

By intentionality I mean a directive will that focuses on the position of the subject. Models and ideals are thought of and put into practice by the pragmatic advancement of artistic ideation. This ideation is understood as a *donnée* filled with potential and complexity; it is understood as a sign of concretized processes. In sum, intentionality is profoundly involved in the phase of the reception of the *donnée*, and at the same time it has a hand in the completion of the project in the very place where object and subject meet. Ideas, thoughts, skills, and intentions sustain an activity directed by a lively consciousness. Intentionality is in fact a plan that creates continuous intensely fertile presentations, calling the presence of precise objectives from the void. It is therefore a way of seeing that does not separate itself from life but immerses itself in it.

The *second image* and the intentionality mutually summon one another and call forth

realizations and visions. The *second image* is at the heart of many symbolic transpositions that we see, for example, in temples when vegetal or floral motifs are placed in a sacred context. On the other hand, at times intentionality becomes negative when man systematically destroys entire territories. Regarding the first case we can call to mind, for example, that in certain Gothic churches the architectural restriction of the altar-area around which one turns to return to the lateral naves encourages a spiritual meditation and a tender maternal image, as if we found ourselves beneath the tresses of the Madonna's hair. The slender arches that delineate the sacred setting, as in the cathedral of Genova, translate the mystical radiance in an analogous symbolic structure with a vegetal theme. Architectural landscapes may be covered with displays that evoke plants and flowers in order to allude to the exchange between nature and the divine. The second case, concerning the destructive spirit linked to a perversion of intentionality, is more than obvious and is placed before the eyes and sensibilities of all of us. Let us not forget that Huizinga, one of the greatest historians of the 20th century, in his last work *De Wetenschap der Geschiedenis*, spoke of the decline of landscape, recalling the intact nature that once surrounded human habitation almost everywhere. It would be a grave error, he affirmed, to think that it is a case of a disappeared beauty being replaced by a different kind of beauty. Instead we are speaking of a destruction of civilization; the earth is unable to accommodate real civilization from the moment it becomes subject to the exploitation and production of an ever greater number of useful products.

There exists, we must admit, a certain inevitability of destruction. We have ample proof of it since the time of the Greeks. Nevertheless, quantity now dictates law, and it is quantity that devastates vast territories. It is quantity –brutal and aggressive – that undermines the millennial principle of harmony and grace that had favored the world in the form of an immense living sculpture.

Our judgments live in the aura of memory which establishes categories of recognition. Memory is an affective condition of the human soul in the moment in which we decide that we want to convey certain images, thoughts, or events as if they were linked to secrets produced by creativity and by our perceptive participation. It is a reconstruction of what we have seen, or what others have told us about or left us. It is an intimate journey, both ethical and nostalgic. It belongs to the single person, but also to a whole people, to all men. It draws upon myth, culture, history. The example of the Treasury of Atreus, or of the cave of the Pythia at Delphi demonstrates the principle: from perception to feeling, from feeling to “reasoning.” Faced with the fragments of memory that are scattered through the landscape, we feel as if we have been called to a ritual of union. What is erased, forgotten, or abandoned returns to our mind so it may be conserved. Memory is the ability to conserve determinate information, reflecting it in a set of psychic functions. With the help of these it is able to bring to life impressions or facts of the past. It is a path of testimonies, breadth, moments of excitement or of happiness. It is not a mere mechanism of

repetition; it consists most of all in the magic of what cannot be repeated. The aura of the past lives in the beauty of the memory.

For the Greeks, *Mnemosyne*, the mother of all the Muses, leads men to great feats and depicts them as heroes. The poet, the artist, and we travelers too, feel ourselves held by the force of memory. We are inspired by origins, by long ago times, by the mysteries of the beyond. Memory looks to us like an initiation gift. In ancient times, poetry itself was identified as memory, a love of knowledge and of science. For Homer, to be a poet was to remember. The pleasure of memory therefore lives inside us in a continual play of instability – between the field of cosmology and that of eschatology, between the marks of history and those of neglect – as it tries to understand man's destiny. Images of the landscape are directly involved in this affective process of memory as it thinks, in history's time, about the ideal of absolute time. Our aesthetic taste and our imagination allow our memory to live as an art of experience that exists between places and their representations. Reason, sensibility, and imagination are also sources of identity for nature and landscape where what is universal becomes united with what is specific.

We understand that every place on earth belongs to man, to his activity, to his liberty, like the allegory and the symbol which, in their representations are the rhetorical expression of these places in a free connotative language. We can say that images articulate forms in memory, and also, precisely, they *articulate* them in a language. In this sense we can understand how the itinerary of visible forms is combined with a moral gaze. Wordsworth in *The Prelude* declares that a moral life is attributed to every natural form – rocks, fruits, flowers, stones – when we associate them with a feeling or when we see emanating from them an intimate meaning. One learns from the tree, the flower, or the blade of grass, in a flow of revelations. It is a path that leads to profound analogies, either suggested by long consideration or by sudden flashes of consciousness: “the great mass [of nature] lay bedded in a quickening soul, and all that I beheld respired with inward meaning.” It is a teaching that comes from the enchanted gaze in the memory of the rose of Shiraz, in the gardens of Persia narrated by Gobineau in the middle of the 1800s, or in dreaming of ancient Athens perfumed with violets as Pindar spoke of. We feel, according to Wordsworth “attentive like waters to the changing sky.” And already here, before the representations that other artists will create, we enjoy the peonies painted by Manet, Van Gogh's portraits of sunflowers, water lilies seen by Monet, skies represented by Constable, and waves interpreted by Courbet.

The present disfigurement of the countryside calls to our minds the indignation of many writers and intellectuals. Of these, already in 1886, in the wake of John Ruskin's defining his position, Thomas Hardy in his novel *The Mayor of Castorbridge* observed that many industrial cities appear to us with violence: “foreign bodies set down, like boulders on a plain, in a green world with which they have nothing in common.” This image of extraneous weight is diffused and propagated

throughout the 20th century. Regarding this vision of things we are always asking ourselves, while we walk, how much the contemporary landscape has changed with respect to the previous one or to the ancient one. Faced with places, with their changes and their prior states, we also ask ourselves if a living panorama of various useful beauties still exists and how it might be made manifest. Beauty and utility make up a frame of values to conserve, and they invite us to think of the right criteria for observing and re-organizing the natural or urban object. There was a time when the real art of landscape was united with represented landscape, but this time has not completely ended or been destroyed. The landscape needs us, needs our choices and our balanced intervention in order to become alive and present again. The degradation and malaise of globalization, the phenomenon of urban spread, all the elements of the current terrible distortion of character can be newly dominated by an organizing intelligence, an intelligence of protection and planning.

To read the landscape means to understand the nature, the history and the culture of a place. The recognizable forms of a landscape reveal the pages of a long, drawn-out event, one that spans from tradition to modernity. Indeed, because they are both modern and ancient at the same time, landscape and culture compose an inseparable pairing. Ability and knowledge, together with the collective activity transmitted across generations, form the system of traditional knowledge. As Pietro Laureano affirms regarding this question, no traditional practice is an expedient for resolving a single problem, instead, it is always a developed method, often multifunctional, that helps bring about the integration of society, culture, and economy. Furthermore, each practice is linked to a conception of the world that is based on the accurate management of local resources. For example, terracing is useful as a way of protecting a hillside, reconstituting the soil, catching water, and creating a refuge for animals, to say nothing of other functions. In these practices one finds an intrinsic, aesthetic quality operating at the center of the social organization and value system that sustains it. Ancient societies lived in balance between resources and their productive use. In the Mediterranean basin, specifies Laureano, in its islands and peninsulas, in Syria, Lebanon, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Arabia, and North Africa – places of the most ancient civilization in which the flowering fields and gardens are now abandoned – the continual worsening of the environment is not so much due to natural or climactic causes as it is to the indiscriminate pressure exerted on natural resources.

We have emphasized the importance of the ancient landscape, of its image, perception, and feeling. If we think of the Greeks, we follow the analysis of Dario Del Corno. In this consideration we find that city and country come together to construct the basis of the ancient economy to which was added, as a third factor, the sea. The natural environment of the *terra firma* included immense areas that spread beyond the territory occupied by men. During journeys, hunting parties or military expeditions, the Greeks, says del Corno, traversed these open spaces that appeared to

them as “the seat of a spontaneous vitality: they faced these unknowns, these dangers, but they had learned to consider them an essential part of reality that was gathered into a complete image of the world. The countryside was identified, by contrast, as the environment that man had subjugated to his own necessities, intending to use it for the production of means of sustenance, that is, agriculture and farming. Nevertheless, on the other side of the opposition with the city, if you will, there were panoramas that presented relationships of affinity and difference with the natural space of the countryside.”

The awareness of such a complex reality is very ancient, so much so that traces of it can already be found in the *Odyssey*. In the fifth book of the poem, in verses 63-75, Hermes arrives at Calypso’s island and stops to admire the forest that surrounds the grotto of the goddess, a marvel of nature untouched by man. Another instance occurs when Odysseus contemplates Alkinoos’ garden (*Odyssey* 7, 112-32). He ascribes its extraordinary fertility to a divine gift. Both instances, Del Corno observes, take part in a common descriptive typology that could be defined as “naturalistic.” Moreover, they differ from the fundamental swerve that places spontaneous vegetation in opposition to planned vegetation. The two passages of the *Odyssey* are a testament to the presence of this double model of the “natural” environment at the birth of Greek culture. Even if it is not necessarily possible to identify an exact lexical correspondence with the idea of the “environment” and the idea of “nature” in the way these words are commonly used. Still, it can more or less be claimed that, in whatever culture, the lack of specific vocabulary for a notion is not necessarily the equivalent of a lack of the idea itself, or at least of a climate of ideas with an affinity to it. In the Greek world there exists a kind of foreseeing of the model that we express with the formula “natural environment” and yet such a model is relegated to the margins of an explicit definition supplanted by the centrality that the Greek mind confers on man’s acts and on his history. From these observations of del Corno on the countryside and on the natural, spontaneous environment emerge the two models that will hold until the beginning of the 20th century in our culture, and at the same time, the origin of Western feelings towards landscape and nature is clarified. We find another important step in the antithesis between the city and the natural environment in Plato’s *Phaedrus* (230 A-E). We could say that Socrates seems struck by a sensation he has never experienced before that moment: the perception of landscape as a source of emotion or excitement. From here we can trace the origin of man’s wonder at the world which is at the basis of the aesthetic appreciation of nature and of the reasons that historically allow landscape to be defined as an art.

Man and landscape share the same adventurous destiny: the continual process of change. For man it is work that leads him to the realm of the transformation that he himself causes and furthers. For the landscape on the other hand, it is the nexus of mutations that organizes the panorama of its evolving signs. Both seem to recount something. The one with an entirety of given

material dispersed throughout the territory through a superposition and connection of forces, the other with a system of works, descriptions, images, and feelings. The landscape is constructed by values that are partly changing and partly illusorily stable. Moreover the transformations in landscape appear slow or brusque. These transformations demonstrate the evolution of territory and cause its own story to encounter the one narrated by men. It is the result of memory and is connected to the central theme of the identity of places, as one can easily understand from the so-called "Mediterranean identity." For identity is always a composite. The Mediterranean is in fact produced by centuries of transformations and yet there are those who speak of a Mediterranean identity. We use this expression, even if it is not really appropriate, to affirm the value invested with the heterogeneity of becoming.

Beyond the themes of identity and memory, the landscape presents itself to our eyes as an aesthetic object, an object to admire, to contemplate – acts which are distinct from doing. In my mind I can produce images of the landscape according to models offered by Western civilization, or I can admire the beauty of its forms independent of these models. Landscape, and with it the garden, fit out, for the human mind, natural representations. The art of landscape is, in a certain sense, already completed even if it is transforming. It follows the laws of the physical modification of the territory, but follows also the laws of man's intuition and invention (cultivation, arrangement, etc.).

The landscape presents itself to our perception and imagination as an aesthetic object. It appears as an immense, cosmic sculpture or architecture, a boundless visual expression of lines and borders, an incessant dance or rhythm of forms, an immense poetic language of signs, or a marvelous theater without prologue or epilogue. The full aesthetic valorization of the landscape arises, in the consciousness and to feeling, from an intentional exhibition of the natural object longed for as an ideal place of action or imagination. The critique of landscape as a pure and simple natural object finds its justification, according to Assunto, in man's production. It is a production aimed at giving to the arrangement of places a precise aesthetic configuration mirroring the ideals of culture and of society or else a production aimed at the expression of sensibility and imagination.

In the evolution of the art of landscape there's always an involvement of creative ideas. From the beginning, starting with Ancient Greece, the free contemplation of all nature is the domain of philosophy. But in the course of time this totality dies. Landscape separates itself from the theory of the cosmos, and nature is perceived according to the human representation that this process of separation brings into being. It is a loss under the sign of laceration and regret that then informs much of the aesthetic of romantic poetry. The landscape, starting with the end of the Renaissance, is lived as an invention or a substitute for nature.

Natural beauty, which characterizes the universe marked by harmony, order, and serenity is divided into a variety of types. Specific aesthetic areas unfold that are different from beauty in a strict sense. In particular, in the 1700s, after a long process of the transformation of taste, we observe an evolution of reflections on the sublime and grace, to qualifications of the picturesque and of gothic revival.

As Cassirer expresses in his work *An Essay on Man*, referring to the special orientation of the function of perception, beauty must be defined in terms of an activity of the spirit. It does not consist in a process that is simply subjective; on the contrary, it is one of the conditions for the intuition of an objective world. The artistic eye is not a passive eye that aims at mere recording. It is a *constructive* eye that can enhance the beauty of things. The sense of beauty derives from an identification with the dynamic life of forms, a life that can be grasped only by means of a corresponding dynamic process that takes place within us. This polarity has caused diametrically opposite interpretations. On the one hand, the discovery or extraction of beauty in nature, on the other, the negation of the existence of any relationship between the beauty of nature and the beauty of landscape. Croce, in his essentialism, associated the aesthetic appreciation of a ruin or a tree with a rhetorical function, not with the universal theory of intuitive expression. Perhaps, says Cassirer, the contradiction can be resolved by distinguishing organic beauty from aesthetic beauty. The aesthetic beauty perceived in the works of a great landscape architect is different from the beauty that I can perceive without the mediation of art. It is a useful distinction, if only as an opportunity for understanding what is perceived, given that the process of perception as has been said up to now, is a continual mutation of the two conditions: an immediate pleasure for the senses and the imagination on the one hand, and a pleasure mediated by artistic culture on the other. It is risky to attach the aesthetic beauty of landscape exclusively to the painterly treatment of landscape and to the emotive world that inspires it. Cassirer says: "I can walk and feel the fascination of the landscape. I can enjoy the mildness of the air, the freshness of the fields, the variety and liveliness of the colors, the fragrance of the flowers. But then I feel a sudden change coming over my spirit. From that moment I see the landscape with the eye of an artist. I begin to make a picture out of it. I have entered a new realm, no longer the one of existent things, but one of "living forms." I have abandoned the immediate reality of things and I live now in the rhythm of spatial forms, in the harmony and contrast of colors, in the balance of light and shadow. The aesthetic experience consists in this absorption of self in the dynamic aspect of form."

Now a last observation on forms, materials, characteristics. Ruskin illustrated for us the truth of the earth, the sky, the water, and the vegetation. There exist for the earth, he observes, laws of organization as precise as those that govern the structure of animals; to violate these laws would be unpardonable. In a study of landscape, they are the foundation of every aesthetic discovery. For Ruskin the truth of the earth is the faithful representation of the forms of the ground, bare of

vegetation or the action of water. In every “sublime” composition of nature and of art, he clarifies, this anatomy must be seen in its pure nudity. The ground in particular, for the student of landscape, is similar to the human body. For example, the mountains are, for the rest of the earth, what violent muscular action is for the human body. There is an analogy between muscles and tendons, passions and tensions, convulsive energy and the articulation of territory. Moreover, the spirit of the high ground is action, that of the plains stillness; between the two there is the varying of movement and stillness. The description of territory from an aesthetic or artistic point of view extends from this foundation. It is the contemplation, affirms Ruskin, not the mere description or a simple state of being, that fixes this vision, this theory of nature in landscape.

In a complex morphology of changing natural beauties, the theme of contemplation as an aesthetic theory of landscape always returns. A faithful representation of the information of the cosmos is impossible. Therefore, the suggestion of the English critic is as follows: one must look far, look deeply, begin with the fact that there does not exist a pond, or a well by the roadside, or a strip of cloud inside which cannot be found a landscape as complex as the one that spreads out around us. Only in this way will the relationship between the influence of the light and the quality of the material appear to our eyes and mind. Whoever has not made a profound study of nature will not be able to see. Only thus will we find grace and evanescence together with transparency, obscurity, and perception of the elements according to light and color. Vegetation – such as that given by tree foliage – also belongs to these truths; first the trunks, the branches, then the leaves the sprouts, the buds, etc. We must keep in mind the variety of nature. Natural forms and the forms of art mirror each other. In this middle realm, the spontaneous landscape succeeds in enunciating, in its presentation to us as form, a real poetics that is then appropriated by man’s art. Nature, when it shows itself, makes an integral whole with its being and is then interpreted differently according to styles and artists.

At the center of the formal problem is the model. What models does the landscape offer? We identify them in the forms that allow the space to live, in the forms that are the space. The model implicates a being that is organized in an order either precedent to or parallel with the perception of a visual *donnée*. This model is then capable of providing not so much stability but coherence, unity, and multiplicity. In this way the silhouettes, outlines, and border lines designate figurations, arabesques of things according to regularity or irregularity. Form, in these observations, is not a canon, but a plot line created by elements in transformation. Form can be identified precisely in a morphology that intersects with sensibility, emotion, intuition, and in which are seen to converge *données*, allegories, and symbols. But the form as morphology lives its own aesthetic life. It does not matter whether it is the cypress, the olive tree, the almond tree, the oak, a certain kind of earth or rock; at the origin of the enchantment, together with the myth, there’s a phenomenology of elements.

Form regards the appearance of one thing in particular: outlines, prominent parts, shape, structure. When we speak of natural forms, we speak of forms in mutation, both rock outcroppings as well as plants. A seed placed in the earth sprouts, flowers, gives fruit, makes up an object, an edge of the landscape in a vision, an arabesque of lines. A rock, exposed to the erosion of time, creates new configurations. The place is not made of abstract geographical situations, but of a whole of things made of form, texture, color, flowering, growth, deformation. It lives within a changing architecture of vegetal, physical, and atmospheric elements. Form is a totality made up of parts that are not linked by relations of juxtaposition or contiguity, but are linked by intrinsic laws that hold the whole together. Indeed, this stands out against a relatively indifferent background and appears as a unity. Its perceptive field is a dynamic field that tends towards structure. The condition of arrangement and the relationship between elements allow visual forms to emerge to sight. The relationships are those of resemblance, proximity, symmetry, enclosure, continuity of direction and their opposites.

The materials are the whole of matter: rock, earth, sand, etc. All of this corporeal substance composes the organization and articulation of the art of landscape. There are not, as in art in the strict sense, rich or poor materials. The splendor of the sand can surpass that of a vein of gold. The materials are the exterior, palpable aspect of the physical elements. The observer directs and re-creates the intrinsic directives within these elements. The landscape brings to light sensitive material that points back to itself as both the presence and the essence of things simultaneously. An aesthetic of aesthetic does not spring from a feeling linked to the consumerist beauty established by the media. It does not distance the object in an indifference of judgment. Otherwise, as has actually occurred in the current collective reception, we're faced with the disaster of banality and of generalized kitsch. Behind the discovery of the problematics between ethics and aesthetics there is a process of change that is forwarded in favor of an eventual paradoxical reversal or overturning: the promotion of ancient times as the future. In such a direction, man can pursue the dream of becoming, himself, an artist. He would be the artist as active observer, the interpreter of the exchange between the beauty of art and that of nature.

Note

Translated from the Italian by Sarah Stickney.

References

- Adorno, T.W. (1970), *Ästhetische Theorie*, Frankfurt, Suhrkamp, trad. it. *Teoria estetica*, a cura di E. De Angelis, Torino, Einaudi, 1975.
- Assunto, Rosario, *Il paesaggio e l'estetica* (1973), Palermo, Novecento 1994. Si vedano anche: *Ontologia e teleologia del giardino*, Milano, Guerini 1988; *Giardini e rimpatrio. Un itinerario ricco di fascino, in compagnia di Winckelmann, di Stendhal, dei Nazareni, di D'Annunzio*, Roma, Newton Compton 1991.

- Cassirer, E., *An Essay on Man*, trad.it., *Saggio sull'uomo*, 1944, a cura di C. D'Altavilla, Roma, Armando 1968, pp 263-64.
- Dario del Corno, *Paesaggio ed ecologia nel mondo greco e romano*, in "Parametro", nella raccolta da me curata insieme a Andrea Morpurgo, *Mutazioni del paesaggio*, "Parametro" n. 245, Bologna 2003, pp. 33-35; *L'ambiente naturale nel mondo greco: funzione economica e qualità estetica*, "In forma di parola", in corso di stampa. Sul sentimento della natura presso gli antichi si veda: Dario del Corno, *L'uomo e la natura nel mondo greco*, in *L'uomo antico e la natura*, Atti del Convegno omonimo, a cura di R. Uglione, Torino, Celid, 1997, pp 93-104. Sulla natura "abitata" dagli uomini e dagli dei nel mondo antico si veda anche E.R. Curtius, *Letteratura europea e MedioEvo latino*, 1948, trad. it. di A. Luzzatto e M. Candela, a cura di R. Antonelli, Firenze, La Nuova Italia 1952, p.211 passim.
- Carus, C.G., *Neun Briefe uber Landschaftsmalerei* (1815-24), trad. it. *Nove lettere sulla pittura di paesaggio*, in *Paesaggi dal Nord*, a cura di A. Sbrilli, Roma, Officina 1985, pp. 179-197.
- Clark, K., *Landscape into Art*, London, 1949, II ed. 1976, trad. it. *Il paesaggio nell'arte*, a cura di M. Valle, A. Chiodi e G. Dalmat, Milano, Garzanti, 1985.
- Dufrenne, M., *L'expérience esthétique de la nature*, "Revue Internationale de Philosophie" n. 31, 1955, pp. 98-115; si veda anche *Arte e natura*, in M. Dufrenne e D. Formaggio, *Trattato di estetica*, 2 vol., Milano, Mondadori 1981, pp. 25-48.
- Hardy, Thomas, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, 1886, trad.it. di Luigi Berti, *Il Sindaco di Casterbridge*, Milano, BUR, 1984, p.72.
- Huizinga, J., *Lo scempio del mondo*, a cura di L. Villari, Milano, Bruno Mondadori 2004, pp. 105-109.
- Laureano, Pietro, *Fine della tradizione, scomparsa del paesaggio*, in AA.VV., *Mutazioni del paesaggio*, "Parametro" n. 245, p.68.
- Leopardi, Giacomo, *Zibaldone*, commento e revisione del testo critico a cura di Rolando Damiani, Milano, Mondadori, 1997, pp. 2977-2078 .
- Merleau Ponty, M., *Phénoménologie de la perception*, Gallimard, Paris 1945.
- Ruskin, J., *Modern Painters*, 1843-80, trad.it. *Pittori moderni*, 2 voll, a cura di G. Leoni e A. Guazzi, Torino, Einaudi 1998.
- Rousseau, J.J., *Les rêveries du promeneur solitaire* (1782), Flammarion, Paris 1964.
- Schopenhauer, A., *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, trad.it. *Il mondo come volontà e rappresentazione e Supplementi*, a cura di G. De Lorenzo, Bari, Laterza, 1986.
- Simmel, G., *Philosophie der Landschaft* (1912-13), ed.it., *Filosofia del paesaggio*, in *Il volto e il ritratto. Saggi sull'arte*, a cura di L. Perucchi, Il Mulino, Bologna, 1989.
- Starobinski, J., *Paysages orientés*, in AA.VV., *Il paesaggio. Dalla percezione alla descrizione*, Venezia, Marsilio 1999.
- Straus, E., *Vom Sinn der Sinne. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung der Psychologie*, Springer, Berlin 1956/2.
- Turri, E., *Il paesaggio come teatro*, Venezia, Marsilio, 1998. Si vedano anche, *Viaggio verso Atopia*, in AA.VV., *Paesaggio perduto*, Quattroventi, Urbino,1996; *La conoscenza del territorio*, Marsilio, Venezia, 2002.