

DIRKMICHAEL HENNRICH PAULOREYES ARTURROZESTRATEN
editors

THINKINGLANDSCAPE



THINKING LANDSCAPE

DIRKMICHAELHENNRICH PAULOREYES ARTURROZESTRATEN

editors



Universidade de São Paulo

Reitor: Prof. Dr. Carlos Gilberto Carloti Junior

Vice-Reitora: Profa. Dra. Maria Arminda do Nascimento Arruda

Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo

Diretor: João Sette Whitaker Ferreira

Vice-Diretor: Guilherme Teixeira Wisnik

cataloging-in-Publication:

Thinking landscape / editors Dirk Michael Hennrich, Paulo Reyes, Artur Rozestraten

-- São Paulo : FAUUSP, 2023.

311 p.

ISBN : 978-65-89514-37-4

DOI : 1011606/9786589514374

1. Arquitetura Paisagística (Filosofia) I. Hennrich, Dirk Michael, ed. II. Reyes, Paulo, ed. III. Rozestraten, Artur, ed. IV. Título.

CDD 712

Serviço Técnico de Biblioteca da Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo da USP

editors:

Dirk Michael Hennrich (UL)

Paulo Edison Belo Reyes (UFRGS)

Artur Simões Rozestraten (USP)

design layout and cover:

Gustavo de Oliveira Nunes (PROPUR/UFRGS)

Lucas Boeira Bittencourt (PROPUR/UFRGS)

cover images:

Photo of Elizabete Rocha, "A criação", Altiplano Boliviano (Andean Plateau), 2005 e 2006

english review:

Philip White

acknowledgments:

Centro de Filosofia da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa (CFUL); Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo da Universidade de São Paulo (FAUSP) e Portal de Livros Abertos da USP; Programa de Pós-Graduação em Planejamento Urbano e Regional da Faculdade de Arquitetura da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (PROPUR/FA/UFRGS); Grupos de Pesquisa: Praxis (UL), Poiese (UFRGS) e RITe (USP)

Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento do Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) e Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP)

Este trabalho é financiado por fundos nacionais através da FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal), I.P., no âmbito do projecto UID/FIL/00310/2019

Este trabalho é financiado pela CAPES pelo edital Professor Visitante (Sênior) no Instituto de Filosofia da Universidade Nova de Lisboa com Bolsa de Pesquisa – do Programa CAPES-Print - Cód. de Financiamento 001



Esta obra é de acesso aberto. É permitida a reprodução parcial ou total desta obra, desde que citada a fonte e autoria, proibindo qualquer uso para fins comerciais e respeitando a Licença Creative Commons indicada: Licença Creative Commons (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) Atribuição-NãoComercial-SemDerivações 4.0 Internacional.



INTRODUCTION

- 8 DIRKMICHAEL**HENNRICH** PAULOREYES On the transversality of landscape thinking today: an introduction

PERCEPTION AND ENGAGEMENT

- 17 LUCAVARGIU The beautiful landscape?
- 37 BODOROTT Un-taming the gaze
- 50 PAULOBORGES Connivance or observation? Rethinking landscape philosophy with François Jullien and Chinese thought
- 66 MAIKEMELLES When humans meet: Re-evaluating current trends in landscape anthropology The Case of the Spanish Dehesa

SENSITIVITY AND AFFECTION

- 91 MICHELEBANDIERA ENRICOMILAZZO The role of mimesis in the embodiment of landscape: Apulia at the time of Xylella
- 123 ARTHURCABRAL The enjoyment of landscape in contemporary cities: interstices, atmospheres and poetic images
- 136 SANDRARIBEIRO The landscape as a recognizable form of the human ethos: a dialogue between Scientific Psychology and Landscape Philosophy
- 158 LIGIAARANHA PEDROCARVALHO Transforming urban environments into landscapes: Contributions of Archetypal Psychology to the Philosophy of Landscape

REPRESENTATION AND DESIGNING

- 171 **VLADIMIRBARTALINI** Landscape and project in the contemporary urban environment
- 187 **PAULOREYES** Landscape... Landscaping From wild nature to domesticated nature, or not so much
- 200 **ARTURROZESTRATEN** **DIOGOPEREIRA** Unequal landscapes Metaphors, images and critical reflections
- 222 **ALESSANDROMATTA** Slums in Latin America Practices between self-construction and design
- 245 **SUSANALIMA** The “becoming” of landscape architecture Genius Loci and the concept of place
- 265 **VICTORMAITINO** Designing landscapes: Parque da Fonte in Morro do Querosene

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUTHORS

THE BEAUTIFUL LANDSCAPE?

LUCA VARGIU

The aesthetic prejudice

Discourses on the aesthetics of landscape are constantly dealing with a notion that, although unexpectedly, is still widespread even today: the notion that talking about the aesthetics of landscape means, first and foremost, talking about the beauty of landscapes and the pleasure felt by those who contemplate them with rapture and admiration. Landscape seems still to be regarded “as a scenery more or less pleasant to see, as a picturesque framework favourable for reverie and nostalgia, as though it were an amiability of the world”, to quote a consideration by Jean-Marc Besse (2018, 5; translation by the author). In this regard, by way of an example, I will, if I may, bring back a personal memory; I once asked a well-known Italian philosopher, who was contemplating initiating a project on landscape studies, whether he also intended to consider aesthetics. He replied, almost annoyed, distancing himself from me, raising his eyes to the sky and snorting: “Yes, but... the beautiful landscape...”

It is as if the point of view of aesthetics were made to coincide with the famous statement by Henri-Frédéric Amiel (1903, 65-66) “Every landscape is, as it were, a state of the soul” or, better still, with the subjectivist trivialisation that this statement has undergone, especially in everyday discourses. A trivialisation that, at various times, authors such as François Paulhan (1913, 73-74), Rosario Assunto (1994, 157-175), Andrei Pleșu (2018, 50) and Claude Raffestin (2005, 88) have already stigmatised.

Or it is as if one were to refer to Theodor W. Adorno’s considerations on the present destiny of the reflections on natural beauty, which have “a pedantic, dull, antiquarian quality” (Adorno 2002, 62), that is to say, which are always on the verge of falling into affectation and kitsch. A reference, however, made without taking into account the background of thought in which such considerations have their *raison d’être*, which lead, indeed, to a deeply philosophical reevaluation of natural beauty against its disqualification within Idealism (Figal 1977; Tepe 2001, 77-98; D’Angelo 2001, 55-57; Tafalla 2011; Matteucci 2012, 97-172; Serrão 2013, 24-25; Cook 2014).

Or again, it is as if one were to agree with the view, related to Pierre Bourdieu (1984) or other orientations generally referable to critical thought and cultural studies, that aesthetics, connected as it is to the rise of the bourgeois class in the West and not a secondary component of the education of the upper (male) classes (Shiner 2001, 79-98, 130-151), always denotes a social differentiation and, therefore, a dissimilarity in the access to culture, or even an attitude of power that reverberates in the relationships among social groups, genders and cultures (on landscape, see Cosgrove 1998, 1-2 and *passim*). All aspects that, as such, must be thought of not as a matter of agreement, but rather as a matter of deconstruction, both in general and in their application to landscape theories and to the policies of preservation (D’Angelo 2010, 39-40; 2011, 66; Zusman 2019, 289-291).

In short, it is as if aesthetics were considered something related to “beautiful souls” or false consciousness, incapable of starting incisive discourses on landscape, as though they were to be tolerated—where it happens—only by virtue of a certain nobility, a nobility recognised in its history or its past, but with the certainty that the important issues lie elsewhere and that its contribution is, after all, only ornamental. In this way, such views all end up replacing aesthetics, or the aesthetic attitude, with an “aesthetic prejudice”, if we want to adopt a suggestion of the geographers Isabelle Dumont and Claudio Cerreti (2009, 76). Such a prejudice, however, cannot be but a social construct with its own history: as such, it embodies an ideological sense and possesses a political weight that must also be highlighted and unmasked.

Aesthetics and beauty

To question this widespread conception and begin to make a step forward from a critical point of view, I shall start from an analysis aimed at deconstructing the link, which seems indissoluble, between aesthetics and beauty. If, in fact, this connection proves to be anything but inseparable, even the aesthetics of landscape will cease to be circumscribed to the “beautiful landscape”. In this regard, one of the strongest stances which has emerged in recent years is that expressed by the Italian philosopher Paolo D’Angelo. D’Angelo, in his 2011 book *Estetica*, speaks *apertis verbis* of the “misunderstanding of beauty” and argues: “Beauty is not a central concept of aesthetics, indeed beauty, in its current meaning, is, substantially, an extra-aesthetic value” (D’Angelo 2011, 125; translation by the author). In an article published the following year, as well as in a lesson addressed to the students of a high school in Rome, the philosopher raises, if possible, the stakes, naming both interventions *Contro la bellezza*, “Against

beauty” (D’Angelo 2012; 2014). He obviously does not want to deny that this notion has been central within the history of aesthetics for a couple of millennia (D’Angelo 2012, 119); rather, he intends to dwell on a real conceptual confusion which, in his view, continues to cause more than one misunderstanding. Hence the invitation to distinguish an evaluative or verdictive meaning and a descriptive meaning:

On the one hand [...], when I say that a work of art is beautiful, I mostly intend only to affirm that it is a successful work of art, which achieves its purpose, which has earned my approval. Here ‘beautiful’ has a value that [...] we can call verdictive: it gives a judgment on the artefact, it tells us that it aroused in us a positive reaction, which allowed us to accomplish an aesthetic experience; however, it does not tell us anything about the nature of the object and of our experience. It is a pure sign of approval, which could be replaced by any other sign (D’Angelo 2012, 119-120; translation by the author).

In the evaluative sense, therefore, “beautiful” simply means that “there is something that produces an aesthetic experience” (D’Angelo 2011, 126; translation by the author). The descriptive meaning is instead totally different:

When we use ‘beautiful’ in this descriptive meaning, we intend not only to praise the work in question, but to emphasise that it has the characteristics of pleasantness, loveliness, agreeableness, which are lacking in the works for which we would refuse to use ‘beautiful’ in the same sense (D’Angelo 2011, 127; translation by the author).

In the descriptive sense, we are therefore referring to a “value outside of art, to indicate what we would call beautiful in life” (D’Angelo 2014,

6; translation by the author). This implies that, according to this meaning, “beautiful” can be used in relation to certain artworks, but not to other ones: as exemplified by D’Angelo himself, Titian’s *Venus of Urbino* is beautiful, but not a male figure by Francis Bacon, a composition by Haydn is beautiful, but not *A Survivor from Warsaw* by Schönberg, a canonical staging of Tchaikovsky’s *Swan Lake* is beautiful, but not some performances of *La Fura dels Baus* (D’Angelo 2011, 127; 2012, 120).

To better understand the difference between the two meanings, D’Angelo refers to what the Italian philosopher Guido Calogero (1960, 125-128) called “Pygmalion’s Proof,” imagining, as in the well-known myth, that the painted or sculpted figures can come to life before us. The result will be the following:

Well, if the painting depicted a vase of flowers or a florid and smiling child, like Rubens’ children, you will continue to be happy, while you will be less happy if the painting represented a monster by Bosch or the corpse of a plague-stricken person, as in Poussin’s *The Plague at Ashdod* (D’Angelo 2012, 124; translation by the author).

He concludes that, in its descriptive meaning, beauty is *per se* an extra-aesthetic value, which maintains only “a relationship of tangency” with the aesthetic dimension (D’Angelo 2011, 129; 2012, 126). This means that when it migrates into the latter it must undergo a transformation:

‘Beauty,’ in a descriptive sense, is an extra-aesthetic value, [...] and it is a value that cannot shift from the extra-aesthetic domain, where it lives, to the aesthetic domain, for example, to the art world, without undergoing a very deep mutation, which turns it into a completely different thing, that is, into the success of an aesthetic organization of experience (D’Angelo 2011, 128-129; translation by the author).

Landscape experience and representation

The question that can be asked at this point is whether these considerations and distinctions can also be applied to the landscape experience. D'Angelo, as seen, refers to representations, artistic or not: it seems that only within the structure of representation is it in fact possible to distinguish the beauty of the subjects depicted or evoked (descriptive) from the beauty of their realization in images, sounds or words (verdictive).

At first glance, a difficulty seems to arise. If we consider the landscape experience as a direct experience, inasmuch as the manifestation of the landscape is not mediated by a representation, then in this experience there seems to be only room for the descriptive meaning of beauty, that is, for the extra-aesthetic one. However, this might not be D'Angelo's conclusion: recalling that he holds that in the verdictive sense "beautiful" means "there is something that produces an aesthetic experience", and that the aesthetic experience is configured as "the success of an aesthetic organization of experience", one can detect evidence of a more articulated way of thinking. In fact, were beauty in an aesthetic sense to be found only in experiences mediated by representations, then it would coincide with artistic beauty (meaning "artistic" in a broad sense). Regarding it this way, D'Angelo might end up falling back into positions similar to those he recognised—and criticised—for example in Mikel Dufrenne and Hans Robert Jauss, that is, positions which tend to assimilate the aesthetic experience with that which is related to works of art (D'Angelo 2010, 39; 2011, 65). For the Italian philosopher, in short, the aesthetic experience is configured as a "redoubling of the experience that normally appears", in which the characters of the common experience undergo "a different organization and finalization". Different finalization, because it "detaches

from the immediate purpose, without any identifiable goal to achieve”; different organization, because it is oriented upon itself, allowing “the nature of the experience to emerge with a certain force” (D’Angelo 2013, 10-11; see D’Angelo 2010, 43; 2011, 79). This configuration, therefore, overlooks the question of representation, so that we can speak—and *de facto* we do speak—of aesthetic experience, for instance, “with regard to a painting and a landscape, to a poem and a design object” (D’Angelo 2010, 39; 2011, 65; translation by the author).

These conceptual clarifications are not explicitly recalled when D’Angelo examines the problem of beauty. Anyway, *tertium non datur*: either we must think that such distinctions continue to be valid in the background, or, given that “beautiful” in this sense, as already seen, “does not tell us anything about the nature of the object and of our experience”, we must conclude that the discourse on beauty and the discourse on experience remain separate from each other. In the first case, as well as speaking of aesthetic experience, we can therefore also speak of beauty in verdictive terms in relation to experiences that are not mediated by representations or evocations: for example, about landscapes. In the second case, this is denied, and the only meaning of beauty at stake here is the extra-aesthetic one, typical of everyday language and experience. To speak of it in aesthetic terms would mean falling back into that misunderstanding from which D’Angelo made the moves.

It should be deduced that, in the case of landscape experience, in which it would seem to deal with a direct experience, the beauty involved is only that of descriptive order: a particular landscape is regarded as beautiful, ugly, sublime, picturesque, degraded, and so on, because this is how we live it, because this is how we experience it, without any mediation linked to representations: by simplifying, the landscape experience concerns life and not art.

The words used for this description, however, allow for some suspicion to emerge. In this regard, the term “picturesque” is exemplary. In the experience of nature emerging in this aesthetic theory in the 18th century, nature was regarded as similar to pictures and shaped on the works of painters who were particularly representative of the landscape genre: hence its link with the theories of ideal landscape (Pleşu 2018, 126-131). William Gilpin’s statement that the picturesque beauty is “that kind of beauty which would look well in a picture” (Gilpin 1808, 328; already 1802, xii) is quoted several times in this regard.

But even talking about degraded landscapes, whatever the social presuppositions and the vicissitudes of taste that led to making such a judgment about certain specific landscapes may be (Dumont and Cerreti 2009, especially 87-93; also Burckhardt 2015, 33-38; and Nogué 2016, 13), it nevertheless implies a reference to an ideal model—that of a landscape felt as beautiful, good, healthy, authentic, identitarian... Such a model, as an ideal, can only be a representation, created on the basis of canons and criteria that serve to show how that landscape should be were it not in a condition of degradation. Even in the case of a truly existing landscape taken as a model—what Assunto (1994, 219-245) considers as a process of institutionalization—the discourse does not change, as that landscape, in this context, would not be valid *per se*, but rather inasmuch as it is capable of bringing together such characteristics to the extent of becoming a model: it would therefore have value in representative terms. In short, the ideal model, whether or not it finds its correspondences in reality, always acts as a term of comparison and as an example to follow, not only, as obvious, in the issuing of judgments, but also in view of policies of protection and re-evaluation.

Incidentally, it goes without saying that this model can never be neutral with respect to social, ideological, political and aesthetic dynamics:

to deny it would mean surrendering to a false consciousness. Whereas Michael Jakob critically exemplifies that “all the corners of the world that survived industrial civilization must correspond to the Arcadian images that we make of them” (Jakob 2009, 106; translation by the author), Adorno (2002, 68) warns us:

Precisely nature that has not been pacified by human cultivation, nature over which no human hand has passed—alpine moraines and taluses—resembles those industrial mountains of debris from which the socially lauded aesthetic need for nature flees.

Landscape experience between immediacy and mediatedness

This observed, the question arises again: is the landscape experience really a direct experience or is it an experience mediated by a representation? In his precious small book, Jakob describes the history of landscape as characterised by a shift from an exclusivity of landscape as a picture—in paintings, drawings or engravings—to the coexistence, from the 18th century, between the “landscape as representation” and the “experienced landscape” (Jakob 2009, especially 73-85). However, he places both under the concept of representation, distinguishing between “pictorial representation” and “empirical representation”: the former equivalent to “a *make-visible*, a view of nature through image”, and the latter coinciding with “the possibility of making an image *in situ*” (Jakob 2009, 115; translation by the author). Indeed, from this point of view, Jakob additionally points out that it is impossible to reach a landscape experience “without reproducing, either consciously or unconsciously, pre-existing models or schemes”:

The experience in question, that of the ‘true’ landscape, will actually already be a representation of a representation,

and this up to infinity, given the number of landscape images lodged in our cultural memory (Jakob 2009, 28; translation by the author).

By way of an example, he reports an excerpt from *Fugaku Hyakkei* (“*One Hundred Views of Mount Fuji?*”), a novel by the Japanese writer Dazai Osamu, to show how representations condition the view of a landscape:

Fujiyama, the splendour of Japan: if foreigners find it wonderful, it is because they were talked to about it a thousand times: it has become a dream vision for them. But suppose we meet the Fuji without having been subjected to all this advertising campaign—therefore, naively, innocently, with the heart as a blank page: to what extent would we be able to appreciate it? Nothing is taken for granted. It’s a pretty small mountain. Yes: small in relation to its base. Given its width at the base, the Fuji should be one and a half times taller (Dasai 1993, 68; quoted in Jakob 2009, 28; translation by the author).

From the “disenchantment”, from the “real dismantling of the Fuji” made by Dazai, Jakob observes that even a fictitious innocent view, and the surprise that follows, denotes “a complex cultural construction”: the landscape, therefore, always reveals itself as “the artificial, non-natural result of a culture that perpetually redefines its relationship with nature” (Jakob 2009, 28-29; translation by the author).

The fact of being a social and a cultural construct is a feature of landscape which several scholars draw attention to not precisely from nowadays—we may say from Georg Simmel (2007) onwards. Anyway, in Jakob’s view, the landscape is better defined as a representational construction: physical, as in the case of the landscape painting, or mental, as in the case of what is considered direct experience. In the end, this view is not

so far from Alain Roger's theory of *artialisation*, according to which the way of considering landscapes and places always depends on art, not only in the direct interventions on sites, from gardening to land art (*artialisation in situ*), but also in the case of the perception of real landscapes, which is always guided by painted images (*artialisation in visu*—note the affinity and the difference with Jakob) (Roger 1997, 11-30; 2019).

A similar view also emerges from Lucius Burckhardt's writings (Licata 2016, 80). In an article significantly entitled *Why Is Landscape Beautiful?*, Burckhardt shows that he is aware of the difficulties inherent in the affirmation that the landscape

is oriented to the ideal of the 'locus amoenus', the 'charming place' upheld by painting and literature since the time of Homer and Horace, through that of Claude Le Lorrain and the Romantics and, finally, by our tourism brochures and cigarette advertisements (Burckhardt 2015, 32).

The way in which, in a seminar held in his city, Basel, he tested the relationship with painting is equally significant:

We painted landscapes, and noted how the very composition and structure of a painting help convey the message 'landscape'. If we painted a valley in the foreground, and allowed a mountain range to rise against the sky in the background, it was practically impossible not to produce a landscape. No colour, no drawing is so far removed from reality as to destroy the impression of a landscape. 'Non-landscapes' could be produced in any case, only by departing from conventional ways of composing or framing the image (Burckhardt 2015, 38).

His experiment only failed to produce "a single ugly landscape": a sign that not only, as Burckhardt himself notes, the landscape appears

“to be a construct comprised of conventional visual structures” (ibid.), but also that here “ugly landscape” can only be understood in a verdictive sense, that is, related to the pictorial composition. Instead, the conclusion of the Swiss scholar seems to go in the direction of an ugliness that reverberates on the directly experienced landscape, inasmuch as the pictorial composition, as a *mise-en-oeuvre* of the comparison between the ideal construct and the real landscape, plays, with respect to the latter, a litmus test function. As he points out:

To espy a landscape in our environment is a creative act brought forth by excluding and filtering certain elements and, equally, by rhyming together or integrating all we see in a single image, in a manner that is influenced largely by our educational background (Burckhardt 2015, 31).

Every landscape is therefore intended as the result of a creative construction dependent upon cultural processes, in which individual and historical knowledge is sedimented (Henrich 2019, 54): as Burckhardt (2013, 175) also says, there is an “unpainted landscape” in our minds. If this is the case, then the judgment of beauty or ugliness seems not to be merely descriptive, as it refers not only to the landscapes experienced directly, but also, and even foremost, to the mental image that acts as a benchmark, not just ideal but also formal, for such a landscape; therefore, it is a judgment that, if the landscape were correlated only with a direct experience, would fall back into the conceptual confusion from which D’Angelo started.

To take a step forward in the argument, it should be observed that Jakob’s and Burckhardt’s conceptions share not only the strengths but also the weaknesses of Roger’s theory and of similar views, such as Ernst Gombrich’s, according to which it is not natural beauty that inspired art, but rather the opposite, so that—note Gilpin’s implicit reminiscence—“we call a scenery ‘picturesque’ [...] if it reminds us of paintings we

have seen” (Gombrich 1966, 117).

On the one hand, the strengths consist of emphasizing that the perception of landscapes is always conditioned and mediated, educated by images and previous representations, cultural sedimentations, conceptual prejudices and convictions of various nature, which are deposited in the memory and in the personal and collective imaginary. From this point of view, all the above-mentioned authors would agree with the following statement by Adorno (2002, 68): “Natural beauty is ideology where it serves to disguise mediatedness as immediacy”.

On the other hand, to highlight the weaknesses, we can refer to some points of criticism directed by D’Angelo at Roger and Gombrich, and by W. J. T. Mitchell just at Gombrich, and try to extend such points also to Burckhardt and Jakob. Let us return to the example of Mount Fuji: were we to affirm that the experience of it is always mediated by its representations, to the extent that, if one could look at it free from prejudice, perhaps it would not appear so appreciable, we would end up being unable to understand how those representations, by means of which we admire the mount as *wonderful*, were born. As D’Angelo writes,

if we can appreciate nature only if we have seen it transfigured by art, it becomes impossible to understand how the first artistic representation of it has been produced (D’Angelo 2001, 155; translation by the author).

In fact, we should at least admit that there existed a first beholder or a first artist who has looked at his own object in new forms, previously non-existent. From the point of view of the history of landscape painting, Mitchell (1995, 111) argues that “it is hard to see how landscape painting can take priority over landscape perception, when paintings themselves could not be seen as landscapes until the 16th century”.

So, despite Gombrich's clarification that "such questions of priority cannot be settled empirically" (Gombrich 1966, p. 117), the reversal of the relationship between painting and experience ends up, according to Mitchell (1995, p. 111), leading to "a very tiny and vicious circle, governed by a 'chicken and egg' relation between painting and vision". Or better still, following D'Angelo's (2001, 156) criticism, it risks falling into a *regressus ad infinitum*—a representation mediated by representations mediated by representations...: a regression that, as we have seen, Jakob explicitly accepts. However, it makes more sense to think of a circularity between experience and images rather than advancing the thesis of a one-way influence: as Martine Joly points out, "all, in reality, know that we are constituted of both memories of images, to which the experience refers, and of memories of experiences, to which the images refer" (Joly 2008, 185; translation by the author).

But, in addition to this, we must also suppose that the discourse made so far is also valid for the question of experience and aesthetic judgment: without an appreciation, or without Fuji being considered susceptible of appreciation, no artist would have represented it or no writer would have spoken of it in terms of admiration. The imbalance between its basis and its height is not then something that is noticed only when one tries to free oneself from convictions, from the representations sedimented in our mind and from the advertising campaign, and that makes one take a step back to its aesthetic appreciation. Rather, the proportionality between the parts is evidently not a sufficient element to judge beauty, as was the case, in an exemplary way, within the "Great Theory" of beauty—from ancient Greece to the 18th century (Tatarkiewicz 1980, 125-129). Otherwise, it would remain difficult to explain why Fuji, despite being disproportional, has been made the object of so many representations and evocations. It is true that these representations invest not only or not just the aesthetic

dimension, but rather other dimensions, which concern the historical, mythical and religious significance of the mountain for Japanese culture. If this is the case, however, the argument presented by Jakob on the basis of Dazai's passage, which has entirely to do with the aesthetic appreciation, ends up failing or, more simply, it must be recognised that the example is not completely fitting.

And again, even though we continue to admit that the presumed direct landscape experience is equally mediated by representations, as is the experience of landscape in painting, this does not imply an equality between the two kinds of experience, neither in terms of experience, nor in terms of representation. Above all, this is because, as D'Angelo points out, "the experience we have in the real landscape [is not] the same, or even only of the same species, of the experience we have before the painted landscape" (D'Angelo 2001, 158; translation by the author). The example chosen is that of the Sainte-Victoire mountain:

I believe that no reasonable person would affirm that seeing one of the reproductions of the Sainte-Victoire mountain painted by Cézanne is an experience of the same type as that which takes place by going to Provence and contemplating the mountain, or better still, observing it from afar and then approaching it, eventually climbing it (ibid.; translation by the author).

D'Angelo states that this equivalence would only be possible "by reducing the landscape to a view", as a correlative of a "panoramicistic" attitude, as he calls it (ibid.; translation by the author). Even in this case, however, the role of the visual experience of landscape should require to be rethought—leaving aside here some ethical issues (Nogué 2010)—within a more articulated ontology and anthropology of the visual (Nogué 2016, 19; Zusman 2019, 279n2). Incidentally, from this point of view,

Claude Raffestin's attempt to bring the landscape theory into dialogue with Hans Belting's anthropology of images is worth noting (Raffestin 2005, 61-63). Such an ontology would show that the equality between the direct experience and the experience of landscape painting is not convincing even from the point of view of a comparison based on the common dependence of both kinds of experience on the presence of representative structures, least of all on the presence of common formal-compositional structures.

Some ideas for landscape aesthetics

With all this, the problem concerning the role of representative structures in the landscape experience is obviously far from having found a solution. The considerations I have just made simply had the intent of shedding some light on some points on this topic. A step forward should consist of a thematization that frees terms such as “representation” and “image” from ambiguity—even when it recognises their unavoidable indeterminacy (Boehm 2009)—and tries to elaborate an ontology of images not exclusively linked to a representational paradigm (Purgar 2019). And yet, in any case, it should also be noted that the question of beauty occupies only a marginal place in it. In fact, even if one were to consider the landscape experience as always mediated by representations, and if one were to go as far as to distinguish, in this case, too, an evaluative-verdictive notion, related to the representation, and a descriptive notion, related to the subject represented, the conclusion to be reached by following D’Angelo should already appear clear: from a verdictive point of view, beauty is “a pure sign of approval”, which, as such, “does not tell us anything about the nature of the object and our experience”. On the other hand, were the landscape susceptible to an experience not mediated by representations,

then the only beauty of which one should speak in this case would be that which is intended in its descriptive meaning, that is, the one which is *per se* an extra-aesthetic value, which maintains only “a relationship of tangency” with the aesthetic dimension.

In both cases, therefore, given the initial assumptions, speaking of “beautiful landscape” implies the use of a concept that is not at all central to aesthetics. To reduce landscape aesthetics to a discourse on the “beautiful landscape”, or even to admit that such a discourse occupies a prominent place within it, means to understand the discipline in a way in which its key concepts are not adequately focused.

What, then, about landscape aesthetics? What does it do? What are the discourses in which it is involved? The way Burckhardt worked in the above-mentioned seminar, and in general the way in which, together with his wife Annemarie, he has always intended his educational and activist role to be, should already provide some answers. He has elaborated a performative discipline that culminates in stressing the boundaries between art and politics (Hennrich 2019, 54): the “strollology” or “Promenadologie”: a *sui generis* science of strolling, which is to be defined as a “minor subject” that “examines the sequences in which a person perceives his surroundings” (Burckhardt 2015, 9, 225). The group strolls and on-foot explorations organised by the Burckhardts contain a knowledge and a didactic value, even when they assume the aspect of an artistic performance which betrays a possible reference to the situationist legacy (Besse 2018, 104). Indeed, the purpose of ‘strollology’ resides in promoting an integration between the bodily experience made during walking and a process of landscape awareness, in the belief that “one sees that which one has learned to see” (Burckhardt 2015, 267; Hennrich 2019, 55). Its focus lies in deconstructing the preconceived formulations inherent in our landscape experience, showing the role played by these conventional formula-

tions in our perception. Consequently, it helps reconstruct our notion of landscape and reshape our relationship with the places we live. It is as if the Burckhardts wanted to claim that the first lesson we learn by the intentional practice of walking is that “the landscape, the space, is still to be discovered”, as in fact Besse has pointed out (Besse 2018, 104; translation by the author; Hennrich 2019, 54-55).

Hence, ‘strollology’ favours a reconsideration of landscape aesthetics, not only questioning, as we have already seen, the relationship between experienced landscape and represented landscape, but also deconstructing and reconstructing various other issues: for example, (i) the history, which is anything but linear, of the relationship between landscape and the garden, (ii) the different problems connected to planning and safeguarding, (iii) the investigation of the links between aesthetics and the history of landscape and tourist experiences, (iv) the criticism of the post-modern landscape—identified significantly by Burckhardt not only in Disneyland or in theme parks, but also in the supermarket and in the preserved historical city centre (see especially Burckhardt 2015, 87-101)—and finally (v) the way in which ecological discourses, even the most radical ones, are imbued with considerations linked to landscape aesthetics (on this last point, see especially Burckhardt 2015, 61-73; on all questions, see the whole Burckhardt 2015).

Further issues can be added here. To name just one more, landscape aesthetics can help unmask the way in which the discourses on aestheticization lead, in certain cases, the policies of landscape preservation to act as a mechanism of social exclusion and promotion of elites (Duncan and Duncan 2001). But, at the same time, it avoids that such a criticism against aestheticization ends up being a criticism against the aesthetics of landscape as such, thus throwing, as they say, the baby out with the bathwater. In summary, it is a matter of dismantling what, with Dumont and Cerreti,

we have defined as “aesthetic prejudice”, which plays a role as much in the everyday experience and in the common taste as in urban planning and landscaping. By means of the deconstruction of the prejudicial aspects in which the aesthetic dimension has been reduced, it is thus possible to understand that crisis under whose sign we often read the vicissitudes of landscape in the contemporary world, and of which the diffusion of the notion of Anthropocene is also a sign: a crisis that, even before the landscapes, involves interpretative categories, paradigms and reference values (Dumont and Cerreti 2009, especially 80-84; on Anthropocene, see at least Ellis 2018).

From the point of view of the reflection on landscape, the more general purpose towards which aesthetics as a whole is being directed is thus confirmed—a purpose aimed at no longer conceiving the discipline as philosophy of beauty or art in the traditional sense. In this perspective, the Italian philosopher Gianluca Garelli, in his volume dedicated to the question of beauty (*La questione della bellezza*), considers D’Angelo’s stances “largely acceptable”, to the extent that

they seem to recommend not so much a tout court exclusion from philosophy of the problems posed by the theme of beauty, but rather an opportune historiographical relativization of the link between beauty and ‘aesthetics’, and perhaps even a certain reciprocal emancipation of the two terms (Garelli 2016, 13; translation by the author).

Nowadays, more than ever, faced with the cultural, political and social challenges of the third millennium, aesthetics is aimed at rethinking its own disciplinary paradigm, imagining new epistemic configurations, certainly rereading its own past and indeed drawing new lymph from it. However, as noted by Luigi Russo, while not omitting

to credit modern aesthetics with the huge historical merit of having happily reorganised the ancient tradition within the frame of Modernity, likewise, it does not fail in its disciplinary duty to contribute to the interpretation of current times (Russo 2013, 300; translation by the author).

Hence the conception of aesthetics as inclined to rethink itself as a philosophy of *aisthesis*, according to the etymology of the word, directed to a philosophy of feeling or sensibility, in the sense of a philosophy of perception or a philosophy of experience, capable of taking into consideration all those moments of life imbued with aestheticity, starting with everyday life.

Should we wish to observe, this is already a suggestion emerging from Simmel's philosophy—a philosophy which also refers to the highest sphere of *aisthesis*, given that, if it is true that relations with artistic objects play a decisive role or even an exemplary role in it, these relations do not exhaust the interest in the wide range of objects, experiences and relationships that characterise the various forms of human life (Smitmans-Vajda 1997, 17-18; Pinotti 2009, 120; 2017, 22-23). It is therefore a philosophy that, as has been highlighted, above all, by Ingo Meyer, can be placed under the formula "*Jenseits der Schönheit*"—"beyond beauty", taken from the title of a juvenile writing by the German thinker himself (Meyer 2008; also 2017; with reference to Simmel 2005). It is not then an accident that, in Simmel's seminal text on the philosophy of landscape, the words "beautiful" and "beauty" do not appear even once.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acosta, R. 2002. *Los Entramados de la Diversidad. Antropología Social de la Debesa*. Badajoz: Diputación de Badajoz.
- _____. 2008. *Dehesas de la sobremodernidad. La Cadenica y el Vértigo*. Badajoz: Diputación de Badajoz.
- Adegbeye, O. 2017. "Who belongs in a city?" Filmed 2017 at TEDGlobal. Video 12:04. https://www.ted.com/talks/oluti-mehin_adegbeye_who_belongs_in_a_city/details
- Adorno, T. 2002. *Aesthetic Theory*. London: Continuum.
- Agamben, G. 2017. *O uso dos corpos (Homo sacer, IV, 2)*, São Paulo: Boitempo.
- Alcaldía de Medellín. n.d. *Del miedo a la esperanza. Alcaldía de Medellín 2004–2007*. <https://acimedellin.org/wp-content/uploads/publicaciones/del-miedo-a-la-esperanza-2014.pdf>
- Amiel, H. 1903. *Amiel's Journal: The Journal intime of Henri-Frédéric Amiel*. New York: Macmillan.
- Anderson, K. 2007. *Race and the Crisis of Humanism*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Appleton, J. 1996. *The experience of landscape*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Aprile, M. 1998. *Dal Giardino al paesaggio – annotazioni sul giardino, sulla città, sulla campagna*. Palermo: Flaccovio Editore.
- Aravena, A. 2011. "Elemental. A Do Tank." *Architectural Design*, May/June.

- _____. 2013. “Il magnete e la bomba.” Lotus International, March.
- _____. 2014. “My architectural philosophy? Bring the community into the process.” Filmed 2014 at TEDGlobal. Video, 15:50.
https://www.ted.com/talks/alejandro_arena_my_architectural_philosophy_bring_the_community_into_the_process
- Aristóteles. 1974. *La Métaphysique*, I. Paris: J. Vrin.
- Arnheim, R 1997. *Art and Visual Perception*, Berkeley.
- Associação Águas Claras do Rio Pinheiros. 2019. “Rio Pinheiros - Sua História e Perspectivas” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ZDFLJ2BuW4>. Accessed in October 2019.
- Assunto, R. 1994. *Il paesaggio e l'estetica*. Palermo: Edizioni Novecento.
- _____. 2005. *Il paesaggio e l'estetica*. Palermo: Edizioni Novecento.
- _____. 2011. “Paisagem, Ambiente, Território. Uma tentativa de clarificação conceptual”, in SERRÃO, Adriana Veríssimo (coord.). *Filosofia da paisagem. Uma antologia*. Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- _____. 2011. “A paisagem e a estética”. In. *Filosofia da Paisagem – uma antologia*. Adriana Serrão (coord.). Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Augé, M. 1994. *Não Lugares. Introdução a Uma Antropologia da Supermodernidade*. Campinas: Papirus.
- Bachelard, G. 1942. *L'eau et les songes: essai sur l'imagination de la matière*. Paris: José Corti.
- _____. 1949. *La Psychanalyse du Feu*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 1964. *The Psychoanalysis of Fire*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- _____. 1978. “A poética do espaço”. In: _____. Os pensadores – Gaston Bachelard (1884 – 1962). São Paulo, Abril Cultural.
- _____. 1983. *Water and Dreams: an essay on the imagination of matter*. Dallas: The Pegasus Foundation.
- _____. 2001. *O ar e os sonhos: ensaio sobre a imaginação do movimento*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- _____. 2002. *A água e os sonhos: ensaio sobre a imaginação da matéria*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- _____. 2008. *A Psicanálise do fogo*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- _____. 2013. *Lantréamont*. Goiânia: Ricochete.
- _____. 2018. *A água e os sonhos: ensaio sobre a imaginação da matéria*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.
- Baltrusaitis, J. 1978 “Le miroir”, Essai sur une légende scientifique - Révélations, science-fiction et fallacies. Paris: Seuil.
- Bandiera, M. 2020. “Biosicurezza nella Puglia del disseccamento”, in *Geotema*, Supplemento. https://www.ageiweb.it/geotema/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Geotema_Suppl2020_09_Bandiera.pdf (accessed October 27, 2021)

- Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Barcellos, G. 2018. “A alma na cidade”. In *Atas do Colóquio Cidade e Alma*, organized by Acaci de Alcântara et al, 9-17. São Paulo: FAUUSP.
- Bartalini, V. 2018. “A Alma úmida de São Paulo”. In *Atas do Colóquio Cidade e Alma*, organized by Acaci de Alcântara et al, 19-35. São Paulo: FAUUSP.
- Barrell, J. 1980. *The Dark Side of the Landscape: the Rural Poor in English Painting, 1730-1840*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press
- Belting, H. 2012. „Florenz und Bagdad“, München.
- Bender, B. 1993. “Introduction. Landscape – Meaning and Action.” In *Landscapes. Politics and Perspectives*, edited by Barbara Bender, 1-18. Providence and Oxford: Berg.
- Benedicto, M. and Mônica Marli 2018. “10% da população concentram quase metade da renda do país” *Agência IBGE de Notícias*. April 11, 2018. agenciadenoticias.ibge.gov.br/agencia-noticias/2012-agencia-de-noticias/noticias/20844-10-da-populacao-concentram-quase-metade-da-renda-do-pais (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Benevolo, L. 2014. *Storia dell'architettura moderna*. Bari: Editori Laterza. Reprint, Rome: Editori Laterza.
- Benjamin, W. 2006. *A Modernidade*. Lisboa: Assírio & Alvim.
- _____. 1931. “Small History of Photography” in *On Photography* edited by Esther Leslie. London: Reaction Books Ltd.
- Bennett, J. 2010. *Vibrant Matter. A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Berleant, A. 2014. “O significado Mutável da Paisagem” in Adriana Serrão (coord.). *Filosofia da Paisagem. Um Manual*, Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Bernard, G. 2018. “Préface”, in LYOTARD, Jean-François, *L'Inhumain. Causeries sur le temps*. Langres: Klincksieck.
- Berque, A. 1998. “Paisagem-marca, paisagem-matriz: elementos da problemática para uma geografia cultural”. In *Paisagem, tempo e cultura*, organized by Roberto Lobato Corrêa & Zeni Rosendahl. Rio de Janeiro: EDUERJ.
- _____. 2000. “Urbs dat esse hominil (la trajectivité des formes urbaines)”. In *Paisagem e arte / Paysage et art / Paisaje y arte / Landscape and art*, coordinated by Heliana Angotti-Salgueiro, São Paulo: Brazilian Committee of Art History.
- _____. 2003. *Lieu. EspacesTemps.net, Livres*, 19.03.2003. <http://espacetemps.net/articles/lsquolieursquo-1/> Accessed in October 2019.
- _____. 2011. A ecúmena: medida terrestre do Homem, medida humana da Terra. In. *Filosofia da Paisagem – uma antologia*. Coordenação: Adriana Veríssimo Serrão. Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.

- _____. 2012. "A Chôra em Platão". In *Filosofia e Arquitetura da Paisagem: um manual, organized by Adriana Serrão*, Lisboa: CFUL.
- Besse, J. 2018. *La nécessité du paysage*. Marseille: Parenthèse.
- _____. 2009. *Le goût du monde. Exercices de paysage*, Arles: Actes Sud / ENSP.
- Besse, J. "As cinco portas da paisagem". In: Bartalini, V. (org.), *Paisagem Textos 3*, São Paulo, FAUUSP, 2016.
- Boa Mistura. n.d. "Crossroads. El arte como herramienta de cambio." Accessed May 13, 2020. <http://www.boamistura.com/#/crossroads>
- _____. n.d. "Somos Luz." Accessed May 13, 2020. <http://www.boamistura.com/#/project/somos-luz-2>
- Boehm, G. 2009. "Indeterminacy: On the Logic of the Image." In *Dynamics and Performativity of Imagination: The Image between the Visible and the Invisible*, edited by Bernd Hüppauf and Christoph Wulf, 219–229. London: Routledge.
- Böhme, G. 2010. *Atmosfera, estasi, messe in scena. L'estetica come teoria generale della percezione*. Milano: Christian Marinotti Edizioni.
- Borges, J. 1974. *Obras completas 1923 – 1972*. Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores.
- Borges, P. 2019. "Abertura da consciência e mudança da civilização. Repensar a Natureza, a Terra e Eros a partir de Hesíodo". In *Ethos humano e mundo contemporâneo*, organized by Sandra M. P. Ribeiro, São Paulo: Baracoa.
- Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourgeault, C. 2016. *The Heart of Centering Prayer. Nondual Christianity in Theory and Practice*. Boulder: Shambhala.
- Braudel, F. 1987. *Il mediterraneo*, Milano: Bompiani.
- Braverman, I. 2009. *Planted Flags: trees, land and laws in Israel/Palestine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, G. 2017. "Barrio Pablo Escobar: where Colombia's most infamous drug lord lives on." *Colombia Reports*, October 16, 2017. <https://colombiareports.com/barrio-pablo-escobar-medellin/>
- Burckhardt, L. 2013. *Der kleinstmögliche Eingriff*. Berlin: Martin Schmitz.
- _____. 2015. *Why Is Landscape Beautiful? The Science of Strollology*. Basel: Birkhäuser.
- Burckhardt, J. 2013. *A cultura do Renascimento na Itália: um ensaio*, trad. Sérgio Tellaroli, São Paulo: Companhia de Bolso.
- Bureau of indian affairs 2014. *The Walla treaty council of 1855*. Peoria: Cosmoline Press.
- Calogero, G. 1960. *Estetica*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Carchia, G. 2009. "Per una filosofia del paesaggio", in Paolo D'Angelo (org.), *Estetica e paesaggio*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Carmona Ruiz, M.1998. *La Ganadería en el Reino de Sevilla durante la Baja Edad Media*. Seville: Diputación de Sevilla.

- CatComm. n.d. "Morar Carioca." Accessed May 13, 2020. <http://catcomm.org/morar-carioca/>
- Chartier, Pierre and Marchaisse, Thierry (ed.). 2005. *Chine/Europe. Percussions dans la pensée à partir du travail de François Jullien*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Chelangat, S. 2019. "Cities With The Most Income Inequality". *World Atlas*. July 18, 2019. <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/cities-with-the-most-income-inequality.html> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Cheng, F. 2009. *Le Livre du vide médian*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Clément, G. 2012. *El jardín en movimiento*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.
- Coccia, E. 2018. *The Life of Plants: A Metaphysics of Mixture*, Cambridge: Polity Press
- _____. 2016. *Sensible life. A Micro-ontology of the Image*, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Cohen, K. in Miles-Yépez, Netanel (ed.). 2015. *Meditations for Interspiritual Practice. A Collection of Practices from the World's Spiritual Traditions*. Boulder: Albion Andalus.
- Collella C., Roberto Carradore and Andrea Cerroni. 2019. "Problem Setting and Problem Solving in the Case of Olive Quick Decline Syndrome in Apulia, Italy: A Sociological Approach", in *Phytopathology Review*, 109(2): 187-199.
- Colvin, B. 1970. "Science and Art Related in Landscape Design" (Chapter 7) in *Land and Landscape: Evolution, design and control*. 2nd ed. (1st ed. 1947) London: J. Murray
- Cook, D. 2014. *Adorno on Nature*. London: Routledge.
- Corbí, M. 2007. *Hacia una Espiritualidad Laica. Sin creencias, sin religiones, sin dioses*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Cork, R. 1988, 'Frank Auerbach: An Interview by Richard Cork', *Art & Design*, vol. 4, nos 9 and 10.
- Cosgrove, D. 1998. *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape. With a new Introduction*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 1985. "Prospect, Perspective and the evolution of landscape idea" in *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 10(1): 45-62.
- _____. 2006. "Modernity, Community and the Landscape Idea." *Journal of Material Culture* 11, no. 1-2: 49-66. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183506062992>.
- Costa, L. 1940. "Considerações sobre a arte contemporânea". in COSTA, Lúcio. 1995. *Lúcio Costa, Registro de uma vivência*, São Paulo: Empresa das Artes.
- Criolo. 2011. "Não existe amor em São Paulo". Intérprete e Compositor: Criolo. In: *Nó na Orelha*.
- Csordas, T. 1997. *The Sacred Self. A Cultural Phenomenology of Charismatic Healing*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Damisch, H. 1987. *L' Origine de la Perspective*, dt. „Der Ursprung der Perspektive", Zürich 2010.

- D'Angelo, P. (org.). 2009. *Estetica e paesaggio*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- D'Angelo, P. 2001. *Estetica della natura: Bellezza naturale, paesaggio, arte ambientale*. Rome: Laterza.
- . 2010. “Tre modi (più uno) d'intendere l'estetica.” In “Dopo l'Estetica,” edited by Luigi Russo, *Aesthetica Preprint: Supplementa* 25: 25–49.
- . 2011. *Estetica*. Rome: Laterza.
- . 2012. “Contro la bellezza.” *Studi di estetica* 46 (2): 115–142.
- . 2014. “Contro la bellezza.” *Liceo Giulio Cesare* (website), February 2, 2014, http://www.liceogiuliocesare.it/public/documenti/DANGELO_CONTR0_BELLEZZA.pdf.
- Dardel, E. 1990. *L'Homme et la Terre. Nature de la réalité géographique*. Paris: CTHS
- Dasai, O. 1993. *Cent vues du Mont Fuji*. Paris: Piquier.
- Davis, M. 2006. *Il pianeta degli slum*. Translated by Bruno Amato. Milan: Feltrinelli.
- De Filippi, F. 2009. “Slum[e]scape. A Challenge for Sustainable Development Project.” In *Slum[e]scape: a Challenge For Sustainable Development Projects. Echoes from the XXIII ULA Congress of Architecture Torino 2008*, edited by Francesca De Filippi, 9-10. Città di Castello: Genesi Gruppo s.r.l.
- Deleuze, G. 1965. *Nietzsche - sa vie, son oeuvre, avec un expose de sa philosophie*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1968. *Différence et Répétition*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1981. *Spinoza - Philosophie pratique*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- . 1991. *Qu'est-ce que la philosophie?* Paris: Minuit.
- . 2002. *L'île déserte - Textes et entretiens 1953-1974*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Deleuze, G. and Félix Guattari. 1980. *Mille plateaux - Capitalisme et schizophrénie*. Vol. 2. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- . 2017. *Millepiani. Capitalismo e Schizofrenia*, Napoli-Salerno: Orthotes Edizioni.
- Deleuze, G. and Felix Guattari 1992 “Tausend Plateaus“, Berlin: Merve Verlag.
- Deleuze, G. and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- De Martino. 1961, *La terra del rimorso. Contributo a una storia religiosa del Sud*, Milano: Il Saggiatore.
- Dos Santos, L. 2007. “Kant e a Ideia de uma Poética da Natureza”. In: *Philosophica*, n° 28, Lisboa, 2007.
- Dumont, I. and Claudio Cerreti. 2009. “Paesaggio e democrazia.” In *Paesaggi e sviluppo turistico: Sardegna e altre realtà geografiche a confronto*, edited by Giuseppe Scanu, 75–96. Rome: Carocci.
- Duncan, J. and Nancy Duncan. 2001. “The

- Aestheticization of the Politics of Landscape Preservation.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 91 (2): 387–409.
- Ecolmeia. 2019. “A marcha a ré do rio Pinheiros”. <https://old.ecolmeia.org.br/a-marcha-a-re-do-rio-pinheiros/>. Accessed in October 2019.
- Edgerton, S. Y. 1975. *The Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*. New York.
- Ellis, E. 2018. *Anthropocene: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Esposito, A, and Giovanni Leoni. 2005. *Fernando Távora: opera completa*, Milano: Electa.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1940). *The Nuer: A description of the modes of livelihood and political institutions of a Nilotic people*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falga, P. 2015. “Rhône: où vivent les riches, où vivent les pauvres” *L'Express*. December 11, 2015. https://www.lexpress.fr/region/rhone-alpes/rhone-ou-vivent-les-riches-ou-vivent-les-pauvres_1743175.html (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Farinelli, F. 2009. *La crisi della ragione cartografica*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. 1986. *Miti, emblemi, spie. Morfologia e storia*, Torino: Einaudi.
- Favela Painting. n.d. “Favela Painting, Community Art for Social Change.” Accessed May 13, 2020. <https://favelapainting.com/>
- _____. n.d. “Praça Cantão.” Accessed May 13, 2020. <https://favelapainting.com/PRACA-CANTAO-FP>
- Fernandez, S. 1988. *Percorso: architettura portuguesa: 1930-1974*. Porto: Faup Publicações.
- Ferriolo, M. 2006. *Paesaggi rivelati. Passeggiare con Bernard Lassus*. Milano: Guerini e Associati.
- Figal, G. 1977. *Theodor W. Adorno: Das Naturschöne als spekulative Gedankenfigur; Zur Interpretation der “Ästhetischen Theorie” im Kontext philosophischer Ästhetik*. Bonn: Bouvier.
- Foucault, M. 1966. *As Palavras e as Coisas. Uma arqueologia das ciências humanas*. Lisboa: Portugália Editora.
- _____. 1983. *Histoire de la sexualité II - L'usage des plaisirs*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 2002. *Le courage de la vérité*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Franke, W. 2018. *Apophatic Paths from Europe to China. Regions Without Borders*. New York: State University of New York.
- Freud, S. 2006. “Leonardo da Vinci and a memory of his childhood.” In: complete works by Sigmund Freud. Vol. XI Rio de Janeiro: Imago.
- Garelli, G. 2016. *La questione della bellezza: Dialettica e storia di un'idea filosofica*. Turin: Einaudi.
- Giedion, S. 1941. *Space, Time & Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition*, Harvard University Press.
- Gilpin, W. 1802. *An Essay upon Prints*. London.
- _____. 1808. *Observations on the Western Parts of England, Relative Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty*. London.

- Gombrich, E. 1966. "The Renaissance Theory of Art and the Rise of Landscape." In *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*, 107–121. London: Phaidon.
- Grant, R. et. al. 2015. "Changes in animal activity prior to a major (M=7) earthquake in the Peruvian Andes". *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, parts A/B/C*, vol. 85-86: 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pce.2015.02.012>.
- Green, N. 1995. "Looking at the Landscape: Class Formation and the Visual." In *The Anthropology of Landscape. Perspectives on Place and Space*, edited by Eric Hirsch and Michael O'Hanlon. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gross, M. 2007. "The Unknown in Process: Dynamic Connections of Ignorance, Non-Knowledge and Related Concepts", in *Current Sociology*, September 2007, 742-759
- Guattari, F. 1989. *Les traits écologiques*. Paris: Galilée.
- LEVI-STRAUSS, Claude. 1962. *La pensée sauvage*. Paris: Plon.
- Guzmán Álvarez, J. 2016. "The Image of a Tamed Landscape: *dehesa* through History in Spain." *Culture & History Digital Journal* 5, no. 1: 1-17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/chdj.2016.003>.
- Haas&Hahn. 2014. "How painting can transform communities." Filmed 2014 at TEDGlobal. Video, 11:24. https://www.ted.com/talks/haas_hahn_how_painting_can_transform_communities/up-next
- Haraway, D. 2008. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- _____. 2015. "Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin." *Environmental Humanities* 6, no. 1:159-165. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3615934>.
- Haraway, D. et al. 2016. "Anthropologists Are Talking – About the Anthropocene." *Ethnos* 81, no. 3: 535-564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2015.1105838>.
- Harries, K. 2000. *The Ethical Function of Architecture*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Harvey, D. and Timothy J. Wilkinson. 2019. "Landscape and Heritage. Emerging Landscapes of Heritage." In *The Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies. Second Edition*, edited by Howard, Peter, Thompson, Ian, Waterton, Emma and Mick Atha, 176-191. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Heidegger, M. 1999. "Building, dwelling, thinking." In *Rethinking architecture*, edited by Neil Leach, London: Routledge.
- Hennrich, D. 2019. "Landscape as a Forthcoming Paradigm." In *Philosophy of Landscape: Think, Walk, Act*, edited by Adriana Veríssimo Serrão and Moirika Reker, 49–65. Lisbon: Centre for Philosophy at the University of Lisbon.
- _____. (Ribeiro S. e Giancarlo Aguiar.) 2019. "Entrelaçar as paisagens na cidade: reflexões sobre corpo e alma a partir da obra de James Hillman." In *Cidade e Alma: perspectivas*, organized by Acaci de Alcântara; Arthur S. C. Cabral; Catharina P. C. S. Lima; Gustavo Barcellos; Vladimir Bartalini - São Paulo: FAUUSP, 2018 (pp. 36:46) / ISBN: 978-85-8089-151-5 / DOI:

- 10.11606/9788580891515 <http://www.fau.usp.br/cidadealmaperspectivas/>
- Hillman, J. 1990. *Anima: anatomia de uma noção personificada*. São Paulo: Cultrix.
- _____. 1992. *Psicologia arquetípica: um breve relato*. São Paulo: Cultrix.
- _____. 1993. *Cidade & alma*. São Paulo: Studio Nobel.
- _____. 2010. *Re-vento a Psicologia*. Petrópolis-RJ: Editora Vozes.
- Hirsch, E. 1995. "Introduction. Landscape: Between Place and Space." In *The Anthropology of Landscape. Perspectives on Place and Space*, edited by Eric Hirsch and Michael O'Hanlon, 1-30. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hirsch, E. and Michael O'Hanlon, ed. 1995. *The Anthropology of Landscape. Perspectives on Place and Space*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hockney, D. 2001, "Secret Knowledge", "Geheimes Wissen, München.
- Horkheimer, M. and Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno. 2002. *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hoskins, W. 1955. *The Making of the English Landscape*, in J. Appleton 1996. *The experience of landscape*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Howarth, D. 2014. "Brazil's FIFA World Cup 2014 stadiums photographed by Leonardo Finotti," *Dezeen*, June 12, 2014. <https://www.dezeen.com/2014/06/12/brazil-fifa-world-cup-2014-stadium-photographs-leonardo-finotti/>
- Index Mundi. "GINI index (World Bank estimate) - Country Ranking". <https://www.indexmundi.com/facts/indicators/SI.POV.GINI/rankings> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Inter-American Development Bank and Prefeitura da Cidade do Rio de Janeiro. n.d. "Favela-Bairro. 10 anos integrando a cidade." Video, 2:56. <https://vimeo.com/10393226>
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística. n.d. "Alteraciones de los municipios en los Censos de Población desde 1842: Siruela." Accessed July 29, 2020. <https://www.ine.es/intercensal/intercensal.do?search=1&cmbTipoBusq=0&textoMunicipio=Siruela&btnBuscarDenom=Consultar+selecci%F3n>.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística. n.d. "Nomenclátor: Población del Padrón Continuo por Unidad Poblacional a 1 de enero: Siruela." Accessed July 29, 2020. <https://www.ine.es/nomen2/index.do?accion=busquedaDesdeHome&nombrePoblacion=siruela&cx=6&y=10>.
- Ingold, T. 1993. "The Temporality of the Landscape." *World Archaeology* 25, no. 2: 152-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00438243.1993.9980235>.
- _____. 1998. "From Complementarity to Obviation: On Dissolving the Boundaries Between Social and Biological Anthropology, Archaeology and Psychology." *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 123, no. 1: 21-52. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25842543>.

- _____. 2007. "The Trouble with 'Evolutionary Biology'." *Anthropology Today* 23, no. 2: 13-17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8322.2007.00497.x>.
- _____. 2013. *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2017. "On Human Correspondence." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 23, no. 1: 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9655.12541>.
- _____. 2016 "From science to art and back again: The pendulum of an anthropologist", in *Annuac. Journal of the Italian Society of Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 5, n. 1, giugno, pp. 5-23.
- _____. 2018. "One World Anthropology." *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 8, no. 1-2: 158-171. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/698315>.
- IPEA Instituto de Pesquisa Econômica Aplicada, "Extrator de Dados IPEA". <https://www.ipea.gov.br/extrator/bases.html> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Jackson, J. 1984. *Discovering the vernacular landscape*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jakob, M. 2009. *Il paesaggio*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- _____. 2016. *Qui fabrique, qui décide du paysage? Par Michael Jakob*, Youtube Video, <https://youtu.be/4RBD7zsb3j8> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Jammer, M. 1960, "Das Problem des Raumes", Darmstadt
- Joly, M. 2008. *Introduzione all'analisi dell'immagine*. Turin: Lindau.
- Jullien, F. 1989. *Procès ou Création. Une Introduction à la Pensée des Lettrés Chinois*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- _____. 2012a. *Entrer dans une Pensée ou Des Possibles de l'Esprit*. Gallimard: Paris.
- _____. 2012b. *L'Écart et l'Entre. Leçon inaugurale de la Chaire sur l'altérité*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- _____. 2014. *Vivre de Paysage ou l'Impensé de la Raison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 2015. *De l'Être au Vivre. Lexique Euro-Chinois de la Pensée*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. 2011. *Obras completas, volume 6: Tipos Psicológicos*. Petrópolis: Vozes.
- Kahatt, S. 2011. "PREVI-Lima's Time. Positioning Proyecto Experimental de Vivien-da in Peru's Modern Project." *Architectural Design*, May/June, 2011.
- Kant, I. 1998. *Crítica da Faculdade do Juízo*, (1st ed. 1790) Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda, Lisboa.
- Klein, N. Entrevista concedida a do semanário alemão der Spiegel. Translated by Daniella Cambaúva for Carta Maior. Available at: <<http://cartamaior.com.br/?/Editoria/Meio-Ambiente/-A-mudanca-climatica-foi-causada-por-nosso-sistema-capitalista-/3/33068>>. Acesso em 9 maio 2019.

- Lacan, J. 1999. The seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book 5: the formations of the unconscious. Rio de Janeiro: Jorge Zahar.
- La Repubblica. 2014. "Caracas, sgomberata la 'Torre di David': il grattacielo trasformato in favelas." July 23, 2014. https://www.repubblica.it/es-teri/2014/07/23/foto/caracas_sgomberata_la_torre_di_david_il_grattacielo_trasformato_in_favelas-92221882/1/#1
- Latour, B. 1993. *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- _____. 2017. *Il culto moderno dei fatticci*. Roma: Meltemi.
- Lefebvre, H. *Il diritto alla città*. Verona: Ombre Corte.
- Lerner, J. 2014. *Urban Acupuncture*. Washington DC: Island Press.
- Lettieri, G. 2016. "Un'eredità ebraico-cristiana in Nietzsche e in Derrida", in *Psiche: rivista di cultura psicoanalitica*, no.1 (January): 89-130, Bologna: Il Mulino,
- Lévi-Strauss, C. 2011. *A outra face da Lua. Escritos sobre o Japão*, trad. Rosa Freire d'Aguiar, São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- L'Express. "Plusieurs familles de Roms expulsées d'un squat à Lyon". *L'Express*. July 10, 2013. https://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/societe/plusieurs-familles-de-roms-expulsees-d-un-squat-a-lyon_1265353.html (accessed October 16, 2021).
- Licata, G. 2016. "È un paesaggio?" In Marcella Aprile, Giuseppe Guertera, Gaetano Licata, *Paesaggio e strutture urbane*, 77-99. Palermo: Caracol.
- Lima, S. 2012. *Fernando Távora e o Espaço Público Português*. Master dissertation. University of Porto: Faculty of Architecture (FAUP).
- Lorimer, J. 2012. "Multinatural Geographies for the Anthropocene", in *Progress in Human Geography*, 36 (5): 593-612.
- Lotus International. 2013. "Cosa viene per primo?" March, 2013.
- _____. 2013. "Lo spazio condiviso." March, 2013.
- Low, S. and Denise Lawrence-Zúñiga. 2003. *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Luccioni, G. et alii. 1977. *A atualidade do mito*, São Paulo: Duas Cidades.
- Lyotard, J. 2018. *L'inumain. Causeries sur le temps*. Langres: Klincksieck.
- Mastrolia, Franco. 1983. "Olivicoltura e tecniche estrattive in Terra d'Otranto nei secoli XVIII e XIX attraverso gli studi del Presta e del Moschettini", in *Annali del Dipartimento di Scienze Storiche e Sociali*, no. 2: 245-258.
- Matteucci, G. 2012. *L'artificio estetico: Moda e bello naturale in Simmel e Adorno*. Milan: Mimesis.

- Maturana, H. 1988. Ontology of observing. In *Conference Workbook: Texts in Cybernetics, American Society For Cybernetics Conference, Felton, CA* (Vol. 17).
- McGuirk, J. 2011. “PREVI. L’utopia metabolista.” *Domusweb*, April 21, 2011.
<https://www.domusweb.it/it/architettura/2011/04/21/previ-l-utopia-metabolista.html>
- _____. 2014. *Radical Cities: Across Latin America in Search of a New Architecture*. US: Verso.
- Meinig, D. 1979. “The Beholding Eye: Ten Versions of the Same Scene.” In *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays*, edited by Donald William Meinig and John Brinckerhoff Jackson. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Melo Neto, J. 1994. *Selected Poetry 1937-1990*. Hanover (NH): Wesleyan University Press.
- Mendes, M. 2008. “Terra Quanto a Vejas, Casa Quanto Baste”. In AAVV *Só nós e Santa Tecla*. 2008 Porto: Dafne.
- _____. 2015. *Sobre o projeto de arquitetura de Fernando Távora: Fernando Távora: minha casa / org. coord. Manuel Mendes; textos Fernando Barros.[et al.]*. – Porto : FIAJMS.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. 2015. *O olho e o Espírito*. São Paulo: Cosac Naify.
- Mesquita, A. 2007. *O melhor de dois mundos: A Viagem do arquiteto Távora aos Estados Unidos e Japão: Diário 1960*, Master Dissertation. Departamento de Arquitectura Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia da Universidade de Coimbra, Coimbra, 2007.
- Metzger, M. 1975/2008, *Gesetze des Sehens*”, Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp Verlag
- Meyer, I. 2008. “‘Jenseits der Schönheit’: Simmels Ästhetik – originärer Eklektizismus?,” foreword to *Jenseits der Schönheit: Schriften zur Ästhetik und Kunstphilosophie*, by Georg Simmel, 399–437. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- _____. 2017. *Georg Simmels Ästhetik: Autonomiepostulat und soziologische Referenz*. Weilerwist: Velbrück Wissenschaft.
- Mingyur Rinpoche and Swanson, Eric. 2009. *The Joy of Living. Unlocking the secret and science of happiness*. London: Bantam Books.
- Mitchell, W. 1995. “Gombrich and the Rise of Landscape.” In *The Consumption of Culture 1600–1800: Image, Object, Text*, edited by Ann Bermingham and John Brewer, 103–118. Routledge: London.
- Mooney, J. 1896. *The ghost-dance religion and the Sioux outbreak of 1890* (Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1892-1893, Part II). Washington: Washington Government Printing Office.
- Morphy, H. 1993. “Colonialism, History and the Construction of Place: The Politics of Landscape in Northern Australia.” In: *Landscapes. Politics and Perspectives*, edited by Barabra Bender, 205-243. Providence and Oxford: Berg.

- National*. 2016. "Why Rio's City of God neighbourhood is far from blessed." August 10, 2016. <https://www.thenational.ae/world/why-rio-s-city-of-god-neighbourhood-is-far-from-blessed-1.164203>
- Nazarea, V. 2006. "Local Knowledge and Memory in Biodiversity Conservation", in *Annual Review of Anthropology*, no. 35: 317-335.
- Nietzsche, F. 1966. *Der Wanderer und sein Schatten. Werke I*. München: Carl Hanser Verlag.
- _____. 1973. Beyond good and evil - Prelude to a philosophy of the future [Jenseits von Gut und Böse - Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft]. London: Penguin.
- _____. 1974. *La Naissance de la Philosophie à l'Époque de la Tragédie Grecque*. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- _____. 1974. *The gay science - With a prelude in German rhymes and an appendix of songs [Die Frohliche Wissenschaft]*. New York: Vintage Books.
- _____. 1992. *Ecce homo - How to become what you are [Ecce homo - Wie man wird, was man ist]*. Oxford World's Classics. London: Penguin.
- _____. 2005. *Thus spoke Zarathustra - A book for everyone and nobody [Also Sprach Zarathustra - Ein Buch Für Alle Und Keinen]*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nogué, J. 2010. "El retorno al paisaje." *Enrahonar* 45: 123-136.
- _____. 2016. "El paisaje como constructo social." In *La construcción social del paisaje*, edited by Joan Nogué, 11-24. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- _____. 2019. *El paisaje en la cultura contemporánea*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- Norberg-Schulz, C. 1966. *Intentions in Architecture*. Oslo: Allen & Unwin.
- _____. 1986. *Genius Loci: paisaje, ambiente, architettura*. Milano: Electa.
- Obra Negra. n.d. "Colegio Antonio Derka." Accessed May 13, 2020. <https://www.obranegra.com/colegio-santo-domingo>
- Observatoire des inégalités. "Pauvreté en France: une population inquiète pour l'avenir". *Analyses*. July 18, 2019. <https://www.inegalites.fr/Pauvrete-en-France-une-population-inquiete-pour-l-avenir> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Olwig, K. R. (1996), "Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape", *Annals of American Geographers*, 86 (4): 630-653.
- _____. 2002. *Landscape, Nature and the Body Politic. From Britain's Renaissance to America's New World*. Madison. University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 2005. "Representation and Alienation in the Political Land-scape." *Cultural Geographies* 12, no. 1: 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.1191%2F1474474005eu321oa>.
- _____. 2011. "The Earth is not a Globe: Landscape versus the 'Globalist' Agenda." *Landscape Research* 36, no. 4: 401-415.

- <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2011.582940>.
- _____. 2013. "Heidegger, Latour and the Reification of Things: the Inversion and Spatial Enclosure of the Substantive Landscape of Things – the Lake District Case." *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 95, no. 3: 251–273. <https://doi.org/10.1111/geob.12024>.
- _____. Dalglish, Chris, Fairclough, Graham, and Peter Herring. 2016. "Introduction to a Special Issue: the Future of Landscape Characterisation, and the Future Character of Landscape – Between Space, Time, History, Place and Nature." *Landscape Research* 41, no. 2: 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2015.1135321>
- Orofino, A. 2014. "It's our city. Let's fix it." Filmed 2014 at TEDGlobal. Video, 15:16. https://www.ted.com/talks/alessandra_orofino_it_s_our_city_let_s_fix_it
- Pächt, O. 1989, „Van Eyck“, München
- Palumbo, F. and Magalí Buj. 2012. "Tupac Amaru. Algo Está Cambiando." Video, 1:05:30.
- Panofsky, E. 1964, „Die Perspektive als Symbolische Form“, Berlin.
- Paone, S., Agostino Petrillo, and Francesco Chiodelli. 2017. *Governare l'ingovernabile. Politiche degli slum nel XXI secolo*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.
- Parvin, A. 2013. "Architecture for the people by the people." Filmed 2013 at TED2013. Video, 13:08. https://www.ted.com/talks/alastair_parvin_architecture_for_the_people_by_the_people/details
- Pascoaes, T. 1965. *Belo. À Minha Alma. Sempre. Terra Proibida*. Lisboa: Livraria Bertrand.
- _____. 1987. *Os Poetas Lusíadas*. Lisboa: Assírio & Alvim.
- _____. 1988. *A Saudade e o Saudosismo (dispersos e opúsculos)*. Lisboa: Assírio & Alvim.
- Paulhan, F. 1913. *L'Esthétique du paysage*. Paris: Alcan.
- Pessoa, F. 1986. *Obras*, II. Porto: Lello & Irmão – Editores.
- Piccarolo, G. 2017. "Le due città." *Lotus International*, July, 2017.
- Pierron, J. 2012. "Poétique de l'arbre et de la forêt. Une lecture bachelardienne de l'œuvre de Jean Giono". In *Altre Modernità – Bachelard e la plasticità de la matéria*. Milão: UNIMI.
- Pinotti, A. 2009. "Nascita della metropoli e storia della percezione: Georg Simmel." In *Filosofie della metropoli: Spazio, potere, architettura nel pensiero del Novecento*, edited by Matteo Vegetti, 119–152. Rome: Carocci.
- _____. 2017. "Simmel filosofo della città," foreword to *Roma, Firenze, Venezia*, by Georg Simmel, 7–30. Milan: Meltemi.
- Pintus, S. and Pasquale Mistretta. 2017. *Gli slum e l'urbanistica negata*. Cagliari: CUEC Editrice.
- Platão. 2012. *Fedro*. São Paulo: Edipro.

- Plato. 1932. *The Platonic epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plesu, A. 2018. *Pittoresco e malinconia: Un'analisi del sentimento della natura nella cultura europea*. Pisa: Ets.
- Purgar, K. 2019. *Pictorial Appearing. Image Theory after Representation*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Raffestin, C. 2005. *Dalla nostalgia del territorio al desiderio di paesaggio: Elementi per una teoria del paesaggio*. Florence: Alinea.
- Ribeiro Dos Santos, L. 2014. “Kant e o regresso à Natureza como paradigma Estético” in Adriana Serrão (coord.). 2014. *Filosofia da Paisagem. Um Manual*. Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Ribeiro, S. 2015. “Preâmbulo”. In *Paisagem, imaginário e narrativa*, organized by Sandra M. P. Ribeiro & Alberto F. Araújo, São Paulo: Zagodoní.
- _____. 2018. *Lições preliminares para o estudo do ethos humano contemporâneo*. [doi:10.11606/T.47.2019.tde-05042019-100757]. Tese (Livre-Docência – Departamento de Psicologia Social e do Trabalho). São Paulo: Institute of Psychology of the University of São Paulo. Available at: <http://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/livredocencia/47/tde-05042019-100757/pt-br.php>
- Ricchini, M. 2019. “Milagro Sala condenada a 13 anni di reclusione. Il caso della leader sociale continua a dividere.” *Gauchonews*, January 15, 2019. <https://www.gauchonews.it/politica/milagro-sala-tupac-amaru-condanna/>
- Richardson-Ngwenya, P. 2012. “A Vitalist Approach to Sugar-Cane Breeding in Barbados: In the Context of the European Union Sugar Reform.” *Geoforum* 43, no. 6: 1131-1139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2012.07.005>.
- Ritter, J. 1997. *Paysage. Fonction de l'esthétique dans la société moderne*, Besançon: Les Éditions de L'Imprimeur.
- Rodrigues, J. 2013. *O mundo ordenado e acessível das formas de arquitetura: tradição clássica e movimento moderno na arquitetura portuguesa – dois exemplos*. Porto: FIMS.
- Rodrigues, J. M; et al. 2013-a. Fernando Távora: minha casa: figura iminente da U.Porto / coord. José Miguel Rodrigues, Manuel Mendes, Rui Ramos. Porto: FIAJMS.
- _____. 2013-b. *Fernando Távora: minha casa: da organização do espaço: da harmonia do nosso espaço: da harmonia do espaço contemporâneo: uma porta pode ser um romance* / coord. José Miguel Rodrigues, Manuel Mendes, Rui Ramos. Porto: FIAJMS.
- Roger, A. 1997. *Court traité du paysage*. Paris: Gallimard.
- _____. 2019. Vida y muerte de los paisajes: Valores estéticos, valores ecológicos. Translated by Maysi Veuthey. In Nogué 2019, 67–85.
- Rosen, P. v 2005., „Michael Heizer- Inside and Outside the White Cube“, München.

- Russo, L. 2013. "Neoestetica: Un archetipo disciplinare." In "Verso la Neoestetica: Un pellegrinaggio disciplinare." *Aesthetica Preprint: Supplementa* 30: 289–301.
- Santa Cruz Grau, J. 2010. *Urbanizzazione in America Latina, alcuni elementi per una cornice teorica*. Rome. https://www.academia.edu/2584801/Urbanizzazione_in_America_Latina_alcuni_elementi_per_una_cornice_teorica
- Sauer, C. 1963. "The Morphology of Landscape" (1925) in *Land and Life; a Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sassen, S. 2016. *Expulsões. Brutalidade e complexidade na economia global*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- Secchi, B. 2013. *La città dei ricchi e la città dei poveri*. Bari: Gius. Laterza & Figli.
- Serrão, A. 2013. *Filosofia da Paisagem. Estudos*, Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- _____. *Filosofia da Paisagem. Um Manual*, Lisboa: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa, 2014.
- _____. 2013. "A paisagem como problema da filosofia." In *Filosofia da paisagem: Uma antologia*, edited by Adriana Veríssimo Serrão, 13–35. Lisbon: Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Serres, M. 1997. *Nouvelles du Monde*. Paris: Flammarion.
- _____. 2019. "Le progrès est un paysage". Interview by Thierry Keller and Blaise Mao. *Usbek & Rica*, June 3, 2019. <https://usbeketrica.com/article/michel-serres-\le-progres-est-un-paysage> (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Shiner, L. 2001. *The Invention of Art: A Cultural History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Simmel, G. 2005. "Jenseits der Schönheit." In *Gesamtausgabe*, vol. 17, *Miszellen, Glossen, Stellungnahmen, Umfrageantworten, Leserbriefe, Diskussionsbeiträge 1889–1918, Anonyme und pseudonyme Veröffentlichungen 1888–1920; Beiträge aus der "Jugend" 1897–1916*, edited by Klaus Christian Köhnke, 353–356. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- _____. 2005. "The metropolis and mental life". *Mana*, 11(2): 577-591. Paper originally published in 1903.
- _____. 2005. "As grandes cidades e a vida do espírito". In *Revista MANA* vol. 11 (2). Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ.
- _____. 2007. "The Philosophy of Landscape." Translated by Josef Bleicher. *Theory, Culture & Society* 24 (7–8): 20–29.
- _____. 2013. "Filosofia da paisagem". In Bartalini, V. (org.). *Paisagem Textos 1*. São Paulo: FAUUSP.
- Sluyter, A. 2002. *Colonialism and Landscape: Postcolonial Theory and Applications*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Smitmans–Vajda, B. 1997. *Die Bedeutung der bildenden Kunst in der Philosophie Georg Simmels*. Aachen: Schaker.

- Stabile 2008, "Sapor-Sapientia: Tatto e gusto tra cultura agraria, medicina e mistica", in *Natura Scienze e Società medievali*: 287-344, Sismel Edizioni, Firenze
- Stallard, B. 2015. "Animals are still the best earthquake warning system we've got". *Nature World News*, March 30, 2015.
- Standing Bear, L. 1933. *Land of the spotted eagle*. Boston/New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Stewart, P. and Andrew Strathern, 2003. *Landscape, Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. London and Stirling, Virginia: Pluto Press.
- Sussman, E. 2007, *Gordon-Matta-Clark- You are the Measure*, Connecticut
- Tafalla, M. 2011. "Rehabilitating the Aesthetics of Nature: Hepburn and Adorno." In *Environmental Ethics* 33 (1): 45–56.
- Tatarkiewicz, W. 1980. *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Taussig, M. 1980, *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press
- _____. 1993, *Mimesis and Alterity: A Particular History of the Senses*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. 2009, *What colour is the Sacred?*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- _____. 2019, "L'urlo dell'asino", in *Epidemia 02: L'urlo dell'asino di Michael Taussig ed altre storie da Taranto*, maggio 2019: 20-48
- Távora, F. 1986. "O convento de Santa Marinha da Costa", *Revista Arquitectura* n° 261, Madrid, 1986 Julio-Agosto.
- _____. 2000. "A propósito da Estrada como obra de arte" in *JA – Jornal Arquitectos*, "A cidade e as Serras" n° 195 Março /Abril.
- _____. 2002. "Fernando Távora. Travel Drawings, Projects". Macrom.
- _____. 2012. *Diário de bordo / Fernando Távora*. Porto: Associação Casa da Arquitectura.
- _____. *Da organização do espaço*, (1st ed. 1962) FAUP, Porto.
- Tepe, C. 2001. *Ästhetik als Freiheitsdenken: Essays über das Schöne*. Marburg: Tectum.
- Thomas, J. 1993. "The Politics of Vision and the Archaeologies of Landscape." In *Landscapes. Politics and Perspectives*, edited by Barbara Bender, 19-48. Providence and Oxford: Berg.
- Tilley, C. 1994. *A phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- Tilley, C. and Kate Cameron-Daum. 2017. *An Anthropology of Landscape: The Extraordinary in the Ordinary*. London: UCL Press. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/1537609/1/An-Anthropology-of-Landscape.pdf>.
- Tostões, A. 1994. *Os verdes anos na Arquitectura Portuguesa dos Anos 50*. Porto: Faup publicações.
- Toussaint, M. 1992. *Casa de Férias em Ofir, Fernando Távora 1957-1958*. Lisboa: Blau.
- Treib, M. 2005. *Settings and Stray Paths Writings on Landscapes and Gardens*, Routledge.
- Trigueiros, L. 1993. *Fernando Távora*. Lisboa: Blau.

- Tse, Lao. 2010. *Tao-Te-King*. Lisboa: Relógio D'Água.
- Tsing, A. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World. On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- UN–Habitat. 2012. *State of Latin American and Caribbean Cities 2012. Towards a New Urban Transition*. Naples: United Nations Humans Settlements Programme. <https://unhabitat.org/books/state-of-latin-american-and-caribbean-cities-2/>
- . 2016. *World Cities Report 2016. Urbanization and Development. Emerging Futures*. n.p.: United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN–Habitat). <https://unhabitat.org/books/world-cities-report/>
- United Nations. 2017. *New Urban Agenda*. n.p.: United Nations. <http://habitat3.org/wp-content/uploads/NUA-English.pdf>
- Vieira, T. 2017. “Inequality ... in a photograph”. Interview by The Guardian. *The Guardian Cities*. November 29, 2017. theguardian.com/cities/2017/nov/29/sao-paulo-injustice-tuca-vieira-inequality-photograph-paraisopolis (accessed October 16, 2021)
- Vinci, Leonardo da, “Trattato della Pittura”/ ‘Traktat von der Malerei, München 1989
- Wittgenstein, L. 2009. *Philosophical investigations*. Translated by Anscombe, Backer and Schulte, John Wiley & Sons. Cichester, UK.
- Yusoff, K. 2017. *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Zevi, B. 2002. *Saber Ver a Arquitectura*. São Paulo: Ed. Martins Fontes.
- Žižek, S. 1996. *Uma Mapa da Ideologia* Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto.
- . Unbehagen in der Natur. In: Em defesa das causas perdidas. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.
- Zusman, P. 2019. “Epílogo: Perspectivas críticas del paisaje en la cultura contemporánea.” In Nogué 2019, 275–296.

AUTHORS

AUTHORS

ARTUR ROZESTRATEN

Architect and Urban Planner, Lecturer in representation of the architectural project, Post-doctorate in Sociology at the Centre Max Weber, Université de Lyon, Professor and Researcher at the Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo - FAUUSP, Brazil.
artur.rozestraten@usp.br

DIRK MICHAEL HENNRICH

Philosopher, Researcher in Philosophy of Nature and Environment, PhD in Philosophy (Lisbon/Portugal), MA in Philosophy, German History and Literature (Basel/Switzerland). Full Member of the Center of Philosophy of the University of Lisbon (CFUL). Visiting Professor at the Institute of Agronomy of the University of Lisbon, (ISA - Landscape Architecture), University of Lisbon (UL)
dh@letras.ulisboa.pt

PAULO REYES

Architect, Post-Doctorate in Philosophy, PhD in Communication Sciences, Master in Urban Planning. Professor and Researcher PROPUR, Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul - UFRGS, Brazil.
paulo.reyes@ufrgs.br

ALESSANDRO MATTA

Architect, Master Degree in Architecture. Architect at Alessandro Matta Architettura.
italyalessandromatta1@gmail.com

ARTHUR SIMÕES CAETANO CABRAL

Architect and Urban Planner. Doctor and Master in Architecture and Urbanism.
Professor and researcher UFG-CG Federal University of Goiás - Campus Goiás
Brazil
arthur.cabral@ufg.br

BODO ROTT

Visual artist, lives and works in Berlin.
Lectureships at the Bauhaus University Weimar and Universität der Künste Berlin and
from 2011-2019 academic assistant at the Department of Fine Arts at the Brandenburg
Technical University.
mail@bodorott.de
<http://bodorott.de/>

DIOGO MONDINI PEREIRA

Researcher, PhD Student, M.Sc. architect and urban planner, Faculty of Architecture and
Urbanism University of São Paulo (FAUUSP), Brazil.

ENRICO MILAZZO

PhD Student in Anthropology at DiSSGeA - Historical, geographical and
anthropological studies. University of Padua, Verona and Venice.
enrico.milazzo@phd.unipd.it

LIGIA BRUHN DE SOUZA ARANHA

Psychologist (PUC-SP), Master in Social Psychology (USP), Post-graduate in Marketing
(FAAP-SP). Clinical psychologist and researcher
ligiaaranha@gmail.com

LUCA VARGIU

Aesthetologist, PhD in Aesthetics and Theory of Arts, specialization in Art History, degree in Philosophy, Associate professor of Aesthetics, Department of Pedagogy, Psychological Sciences and Philosophy, University of Cagliari, Italy.
luca.vargiu@unica.it

MAIKE MELLES

Social and cultural anthropologist, PhD candidate, Master's degree in Peace and Conflict Studies, Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany.
melles@em.uni-frankfurt.de

MICHELE BANDIERA

PhD Student in Geography at DiSSGeA - Historical, geographical and anthropological studies. University of Padua, Verona and Venice.
michele.bandiera@phd.unipd.it

PAULO BORGES

Philosopher, PhD in Philosophy in Portugal, MA in Philosophy in Portugal. Researcher at the Center of Philosophy of the University of Lisbon (CFUL). Assistant Professor at the Department of Philosophy of the Faculty of Letters (FLUL), University of Lisbon (UL), Portugal.
pauloeborges@gmail.com
<https://paulo-borges.com/>

PEDRO TEIXEIRA CARVALHO

Psychologist, PhD candidate in Social Psychology at the Psychology Institute of the University of São Paulo. Participant of LAPSI - Laboratory of Studies in Social Psychology and Contemporary World: Paradigms & Strategies (PST - IPUSP).
pedro.teixeira.carvalho@usp.br

SANDRA MARIA PATRÍCIO RIBEIRO

Psychologist, associate professor at the Institute of Psychology at the University of São Paulo (IPUSP). Professor of undergraduate and graduate courses at IPUSP, in the Concentration Area of Social Psychology. Coordinator of LAPSI - Laboratory of Studies in Social Psychology and Contemporary World: Paradigms and Strategies.

SUSANA MELEIRO LIMA

Architect, PhD student in Architecture: Theory, Project and History, Master in Architecture, Faculty of Architecture of the University of Porto (FAUP), Portugal.
susana.meleiro.lima@gmail.com

VICTOR MAITINO

Architect and Designer graduated from FAUUSP, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism, University of São Paulo, Brazil.
victormaitino@gmail.com

VLADIMIR BARTALINI

Architect, associate professor at the School of Architecture and Urbanism of the University of São Paulo (FAU-USP). Professor of undergraduate and graduate courses at FAU-USP, in the Area of Concentration Landscape and Environment. Researcher at the Laboratório Paisagem, Arte e Cultura - LABPARC, of FAU-USP.
bartalini@usp.br

Thinking Landscape in the frame of Philosophy of Landscape understands landscape not only as a modern representation of the intersection between Nature and Culture, but in a much wider and less abstract manner: the intersection of vertical and horizontal needs and demands, as the indiscernible interaction between transcendence and immanence, in which neither immanence means only the earthly, physical or material, nor transcendental stands solely for the atmospheric, metaphysical and immaterial. Landscape is not simply the environment because it has always surpassed any environment and because in it one can find the most diverse environments. Neither it is just a political or ethnical territory, but the versatile surface of the Earth, the sensual space of all forms of life, the multiple face of nature, subject to its own changes and dispositions, and a shelter for the multiplicity of organic and inorganic phenomena, which all have the right to be preserved.