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Introduction

Landscape: Between Place and Space

ERIC HIRSCH

This Introduction and the essays that follow explore the concept of landscape from an anthropological perspective. Unlike 'exchange', 'ritual', 'history' and other concepts which have figured centrally in anthropological debates in recent years, landscape has received little overt anthropological treatment. In this respect landscape shares a similar status to the body in anthropology, that despite its ubiquity it has remained largely unproblematic: the majority of researchers have in effect simply "bracketed" it as a black box and set it aside (Lock 1993: 133). Yet landscape has a submerged presence and significance in anthropological accounts in two related ways. 'Landscape' has been deployed, first, as a framing convention which informs the way the anthropologist brings his or her study into view (i.e. from an 'objective' standpoint—the landscape of a particular people). Secondly, it has been used to refer to the meaning imputed by local people to their cultural and physical surroundings (i.e. how a particular landscape 'looks' to its inhabitants). The black box of landscape requires 'opening' and its contents themselves brought into view.

Dresch has recently commented on how the first of these uses of landscape functioned as a standard framing device in the classic monographs of the 'British school' of social anthropology. As he notes (Dresch 1988: 50) '[t]errain is woven into book after book', a convention Malinowski used to create a participatory effect in his monographs on the Trobriand Islanders ('Imagine yourself suddenly set down... alone on a tropical beach...') (Malinowski 1922: 4). The convention was reproduced by the subsequent generation of Malinowski's students, such as Firth and Fortes (Dresch 1988: 51-2). In each case, the people are portrayed initially as if seen in a recognizable landscape or picturesque view. But this 'objective' outsider's perspective is soon left behind in order to capture the native's point of view.

This second way in which 'landscape' has been used can also be illustrated by numerous examples drawn from recent ethnographies. Keesing (1982: 76) provides a relevant exposition midway through his monograph on the Kwaio when discussing the topic of ancestors:

The landscape of the Kwaio interior appears, to the alien eye, as a sea of green, a dense forest broken periodically by gardens and recent secondary growth, and an occasional
tiny settlement... To the Kwano eye, this landscape is not only divided by invisible lines into named land tracts and settlement sites, it is seen as structured by history.

There is thus the landscape we initially see and a second landscape which is produced through local practice and which we come to recognize and understand through fieldwork and through ethnographic description and interpretation.

A principal aim of this volume follows from these two related ways of considering landscape: the conventional (Western) notion of 'landscape' may be used as a productive point of departure from which to explore analogous local ideas which can in turn be reflexively used to interrogate the Western concept. As Parkin (1991: 7) has suggested, it is through this process of 're-casting cultural ideas and analytical concepts in terms of the light they may throw on each other' that anthropology can succeed in its widest goal as a comparative discipline.

The word landscape was introduced into the English language in the late sixteenth century as a technical term used by painters. It came from the Dutch landschap and was known in English for some time as 'landskip'. The painterly origin of the landscape concept is significant. What came to be seen as landscape was recognized as such because it reminded the viewer of a painted landscape, often of European origin. Keith Thomas has documented this development in England between the sixteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It was particularly during the eighteenth century that this appreciation took a self-conscious hold in the English context: 'The initial appeal of rural scenery was that it reminded the spectator of landscape pictures. Indeed the scene was only called a 'landscape' because it was reminiscent of a painted "landskip"; it was "picturesque" because it looked like a picture' (Thomas 1984: 265).

This ideal or imagined world as depicted in various genres of landscape painting (Poussin, Claude, Salvator Rosa) was linked to the perception of countryside scenery and its subsequent improvement (through landscape gardening, estate management, etc.): the goal was to achieve a correspondence between the pictorial ideal and the countryside itself. This tendency is reflected in the way the landscape concept is applied to an ever wider range of domains of social and cultural life. The late nineteenth-century development of the garden city is perhaps exemplary here. As Thomas (p. 253) noted: 'Ebenezer Howard drew on a long tradition when he proclaimed in the 1890s that "town and country must be married".'

The interest of Howard's call lies in its goal of unifying in a single place what are otherwise seen as mutually exclusive alternatives: an aspiration achieved by the suburban middle class during the nineteenth century and the working class during the twentieth century (Congreve 1984: 267–8). On the one hand there are the social and economic opportunities of the town (hard labour and material rewards) and on the other hand there is the country, offering the possibilities of an Arcadian, idyllic existence (cf. Cronon 1991: 368 for an analogous contrast but from the 'rural' perspective). As Thomas (1984) has documented in the English context, life in the first has long been seen as a way of realizing the potential embodied in the second; today this takes the form of the house with a garden, the allotment, the country cottage, the home in the suburbs, the retirement cottage. There is a relationship here between an ordinary, workaday life and an ideal, imagined existence, variably connected to, but still separate from, that of the everyday. We can consider the first as 'foregrounded' in order to suggest the concrete actuality of everyday social life ("the way we now are"). The second we can consider as a 'background', in order to suggest the perceived potentiality thrown into relief by our foregrounded existence ("the way we might be").

Defined in this way, then, 'landscape' entails a relationship between the 'foreground' and 'background' of social life. This, after all, is what is achieved in the idealized world of the painted representation; the painted picture allows us to discern this within the painting itself and/or in the relationship between the viewer of the painting and the painted representation. The argument presented here suggests that the Western convention of landscape representation is a particular expression of a more general foreground/background relationship that is found cross-culturally. As we shall see, however, social life can never achieve the timelessness of a painting, although as the essays that follow show this is often what is striven for in particular cultural contexts (albeit in most cases, without the use of canvases as such).

This definition shares similarities, I think, with the argument recently advanced by Carter (1987). In The Road to Botany Bay, Carter takes issue with what he calls 'imperial history': the form of history which 'reduces space to a stage' upon which actors enact significant historical events such as those leading to Australia's 'discovery' and 'settlement'. In its place, Carter (p. xxi) advocates a 'spatial history'—a history of 'the spatial forms and fantasies through which a culture declares its presence'.

Carter's argument is that only mistaken teleology allows us to see early travellers to Australia as arriving in a land waiting to be 'discovered' and later settled. What a traveller (such as Cook) did was to 'bring into view' a land redolent with the European experience from which he had originated. One of the themes explored by Carter is the trouble such travellers continually had in bringing the country into focus: in constituting in new territory a recognizable conjunction between their 'here and now-ness' and a background or horizon to which this could be related. The way in which Australia was named and settled corresponded to this positing of a relationship:

It depended on positing a "here" (the traveller's viewpoint and orientation) and a 'there' (... the horizon). And where such viewpoints did not exist, they had to be hypoth­esised, rhetorically asserted by way of names ... Mountains and rivers were culturally desirable, they conjured up pleasing associations. But, more fundamentally, they signified differences that made a difference. They implied the possibility of viewpoints, directions... (Carter p. 48).
In Carter's account the relationship between a 'foreground' (here and now, place) and a 'background' (here and then, space) is not incidental to the history and narratives of Australia's colonization: it is central to the way it was conceived, enacted, and, as Carter stresses, is continually re-enacted in the present day. His argument applies not merely to the Europeans who named and settled Australia but also to the Aborigines who are so often peripheral or silent in the traveller's accounts. Although the 'journeys' of the traveller ('discovery' and 'settlement') and of the Aborigines ('the Dreaming') were predicated on different cultural logics, both involve positing a relation between a fore­ground actuality and a background potentiality. As Carter suggests, 'what he, the nomad, black or white, symbolised, when he wrote or danced or simply made tracks, was not the physical country, but the enactment of a historical space' (p. 349). What was continually re-enacted in these historically and geographically adjacent, but culturally different contexts, were the forms of relations thought to have brought the country into view in the first place (see Munn 1973a).

Although landscape has been singled out here as a distinct cultural idea and analytical concept it is in fact difficult to isolate it from a number of related concepts, including place and space; inside and outside; image and representation. Each of these related concepts, which themselves take on a local aspect, corresponds to one of the two poles of the notion of landscape outlined above. The two poles can be arranged in tabular form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>foreground actuality</th>
<th>background potentiality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inside</td>
<td>outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>image</td>
<td>representation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concepts on the left side of the table roughly correspond to what we would understand as the context and form of everyday, unreflective forms of experience (Bourdieu 1977), while the concepts on the right roughly equate to the context and form of experience beyond the everyday. These latter are often imagined as standing apart, as relatively separate and detached though never completely disconnected. I have referred to this as perceived 'potentially' ('the way we could be'). The purest form of potentiality is emptiness itself, and it is interesting that sacred sites and places are sometimes physically empty or largely uninhabited, and situated at some distance from the populations for which they hold significance.

Although the items in the table above have been arranged in two columns, it is important that they are not regarded as unconnected. They are, rather, moments or transitions possible within a single relationship, analogous to the experience of a person momentarily losing his/her way on a familiar journey before relocating him/herself by reference to an external perspective; or to the 'empty place' which periodically fills the 'foreground' experience before reced­
of landscape: a framework which has been lacking both in anthropology and in these related disciplines.

Nature into Landscape

The idea of 'nature', Raymond Williams argues, is probably one of the most complex in the English language (1972: 146). Much of his work has been concerned to clarify the social, political, and textual dimensions of the notion as it has changed over time in the English/British context. Together with the more recent writings of Keith Thomas (1984), Williams has done much to clarify the emergence of the appreciation of 'landscape' which, as noted, took hold throughout Europe between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries (see Leroi-Gourhan 1964: 15–16). It is, of course, during this same period that what we now refer to as anthropology had its origins, and anthropology draws on the same common intellectual background which led to the emergence of an explicit idea of landscape in the Western context. An anthropological study of landscape needs to be clear about this relationship.

Collingwood identified three relatively distinct periods in European conceptions of nature (1960: 1–13; see also Olwig 1984: 1–10). He argued that the idea of nature prevalent during these periods derived from analogies drawn from the realm of human society. Where the concept of nature that was prominent in medieval representations encompassed humanity—Nature was God's creation and humanity part of it—the place of humans was indeterminate in the conception of nature which came to prevail in the post-Renaissance period.1 That more secular and rational idea of nature depended on a new and singular abstraction—the abstraction of humans themselves (cf. Foucault 1970). And further, this abstraction was related to another set of processes—the increasing intervention of humans into what was imagined as 'natural' in the form of science, agricultural improvement, and the industrial revolution.

One concomitant of the process of ever-increasing intervention in nature was the simultaneous generation of new ideas of separation, such as that between subject and object. It was around these new ideas of separation that the Western idea of landscape emerged. This has been observed by art historians on one hand, and by geographers focusing upon spatial and material change on the other. In Chapter 1, Nicholas Green examines a particular historical example of this process in early- and mid-nineteenth-century France (cf. Green 1990). Green argues that the growing appreciation of the countryside which he describes for nineteenth-century Paris cannot be accounted for either by the opening up of the countryside or by changes to it—although these factors were undoubtedly significant. What Green argues to have been more important, rather, was the contemporary proliferation in Paris of landscape pictures, tours guides, advertisements for houses in the country, and a more general desire for immersion in the countryside. As he suggests: 'It was the material conditions and the cultural developments germane to the capital that generated those vocabularies of looking which were capable of bringing nature into visibility as a significant form of social experience'.

Green's analysis foregrounds two intersecting ideologies which impinged on the everyday experience of Parisians during this period: a concern over the unhealthy state of Paris after the cholera epidemic of the 1830s, and the proliferation of 'views' such as arcades and dioramas in strategic parts of the city. The 'potentiality' thus brought into focus was the health-giving benefits of immersion in the countryside and the 'landscape' itself as a key form of spectacle, particularly as portrayed in the dioramas (see Crary 1990), which themselves fostered a particular kind of looking. What was stressed, particularly in the guides and advertisements for the countryside, was less the 'picture as text' and more a way of seeing that was structured by various domains of metropolitan life in Paris. Green's chapter is an elegant plea to art historians, geographers, and anthropologists alike to abandon their traditional attitude towards the pictorial: 'It is time to have done with a common sense that claims the visual as the primary property of pictures'.

The rise of landscape painting as a distinctive genre predates the period dealt with by Green by several centuries. A theme highlighted by accounts of the genre's emergence, which Green also brings out, is the manner in which a positive relationship is constructed between the experience of a viewing 'subject' and the countryside as a desirable 'object' to behold. As the place of humans in nature became more open to question than it had previously been, the relationship between 'foreground' and 'background' in visual representations of this period was gradually transformed.

Gombrich (1966: 108–9) has proposed an institutional explanation—as opposed to this stylistic one—to account for the rise of the landscape genre. He suggests that landscape painting arose out of the merging of two cultures of visualization and the forms of representation valorized by each. As we shall see below these traditions of visualization are deployed differently in the artworks produced during European exploration and colonization in the Pacific; historical developments that importantly shaped the subsequent use of the landscape idea in anthropology and related disciplines (see Smith 1985: ix–x).

Gombrich's argument is useful to summarize here as it has been influential in debates about landscape in the neighbouring discipline of geography (cf. Cosgrove 1984: 22–5). Art historians have long noted the proliferation of landscape paintings in early modern market cities such as Antwerp. To account for this development they suggested that in such market-dominated contexts artworks were no longer produced primarily for individual commissions but through anonymous demand. Instead, Gombrich traced the conceptualization
of 'landscape' to the aesthetic theories of Alberti and his foundational text Renaissance visual representation, the Ten Books on Architecture.

Alberti had canonized the idea of art as an autonomous sphere of human activity, which should be treasured for its psychological effects. One of the ways in which such effects could be generated was through the depiction of pleasing 'sights' such as the countryside. This formulation can be linked, in turn, to the Albertian definition of the picture as a framed surface or pane situated at a certain distance from the viewer who looks through it at a second substitute world or 'stage'. In contrast to this 'southern' tradition, there existed a 'northern' tradition of visualization, an 'art of describing' (see Alpers 1989). This latter tradition is not predicated on an Albertian 'pane'; instead, the emphasis is placed more on the craft of empirical representation. The prevalence of maps, map-like representations, and pictures with a 'realist' quality are expressive of this visual culture.

Gombrich suggested, then, that landscape as a genre with widespread popularity arose as a consequence of a dominant 'northern' aesthetic theory appropriating the products of 'northern' realism (Gombrich 1966: 114). However, this trend, and the emergence of the notion of landscape only became possible when the individual subject came to be envisaged, following Alberti, as drawing delight from pleasing sights in a self-conscious manner (cf. Williams 1973: 121). The emergence of the idea of landscape is further connected to the central importance that would henceforth be attached to picturing, mapping, mirroring, representing the world as the only reliable way of knowing it (see Alpers 1989).

Place and Space

It would be mistaken, however, to see these developments associated with the Renaissance (particularly the rediscovery of linear perspective (Coxgrove 1985) and the profusion of map-making) as heralding a radical and inseparable break with previous forms of experience. 'The value placed on viewing the world in Cartesian terms (i.e. 'non-subjective', geometric space) is part of a project of making explicit what had previously, and in other cultural contexts, been more implicit and not necessarily separated out as a distinct way of imagining oneself as placed in the world.'

An analogous contrast between an emphasis on the particularities of place as seen from a specific (subjective) vantage point and an emphasis on the study of space, divorced as much as possible from a subject-position, has been of central concern to the way the concept of landscape has been taken up in geography and anthropology (Lievengood 1992: 296-300). The work of the American geographer Sauer, especially his monograph The Morphology of Landscape (1963), is a particularly clear example.

Sauer's notion of landscape derived from European trends in geography which took shape during the late nineteenth century (especially in relation to the emerging field of sociology). The debates between geography (as represented by the German Ratzel) and sociology (as represented by the Frenchman Durkheim) focused on what has come to be known as the 'society-milieu' relationship. Sauer's monograph, a combination of insights and criticisms of the German and French schools, argued that culture shaped the natural landscape to produce a 'cultural landscape'. 'The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result' (Sauer 1963: 343).

The force of his argument was against environmental determinism (associated with Ratzel), but he considered that his attempt to formulate an objective procedure for the study and comparison of landscape could never succeed in eliminating the intrinsically subjective element, 'there remains an aspect of meaning in landscape which lies beyond science', the understanding of which cannot be reduced to formal processes (Coxgrove 1984: 17). There is thus a tension evident in the relationship between the subject-position of place and the non-subject-position of space in the way landscape has been taken up as an analytical concept. This is especially explicit in geography.

Gow's Chapter 2, on the Piro of Amazonian Peru, exemplifies the tension between these perspectives. The cultural shaping of Amazonia by indigenous peoples is hard to discern for people from temperate climates, since a distant horizon does not recede away from a point of observation. It is only when the forest has been extensively cut down and roads constructed that a relationship between place and distant space can be discerned by those unaccustomed to such surroundings.

By contrast, what the Piro 'see' when they look at the land is kinship. Gow describes how the Piro produce themselves as people through the production, circulation, and reciprocal sharing of food. He notes that just as kinship is produced in this manner, so the vegetation pattern that surrounds villages is seen as 'loci of kinship'. An important theme highlighted in this chapter and echoed in several others is that kinship and the land are mutually implicated (see Munn 1986; Cronon 1983). It is through the processes of implication that Piro notions of place and space emerge. This is made apparent to the Piro themselves through the endless stories that recount these implicating processes, a point also developed in Toren's chapter. Through situated narration, the 'here and now-ness' of place expands to a more distant horizon, constituted by past and ongoing relationships such as garden-making and home-building. At the same moment this enables the place of narration to have features of a distinctive vantage point or perspective on the horizon which encompasses these relations: features, in short, of 'space'.

But there is also an ambiguity in the relation between living humans and the land. The Piro must constantly make use of regenerated forest and new
portions of the river. These spaces, however, are the source of sickness and death, embodied in the Piro concept of the 'bone demon'. From the 'foreground' of specific places, then, humans depend on those uninhabited spaces for potential gardens, villages, etc. The Piro shaman, by contrast, is able to enter these river and forest spaces through the use of the drug ayahuasca and to perceive them as filled with people. The shaman is thus able to see what other men and women cannot in their everyday experience, and to return from his shamanic voyaging with the knowledge required to cure the sick. The shaman bridges the relationship between proximate place and distant (largely invisible) space.

At first sight the situation described by Bloch in Chapter 3 on the Zafimaniry of Madagascar could not be more different. Among the Zafimaniry it would seem that it is the very presence of the trees which is the problem. Chopping the forest down is part of the process through which the Zafimaniry attempt to transcend the precariousness of their everyday life and to inscribe themselves more permanently on the land. In so doing, they attempt to take on some of the qualities of their ancestors. But despite the Zafimaniry's deforestative preferences there is a significant similarity between them and the Piro. In both instances there is an attempt to achieve a relationship with a background potentiality—to overcome the perceived precariousness of their everyday, situated existence. In the Piro context, this is through an enduring invisible space (regenerated forest), approached via the agency of the shaman who perceives it as a place filled with people; among the Zafimaniry, it is through a space which is temporarily occluded by forest until the latter is cleared to make way for visible villages filled with people. In both contexts the relationship between place (here in the sense of livelihood) and space (now in the sense of regenerative life) is accomplished through particular conceptions of mortality and immortality (see Bloch and Parry (eds.) 1982).

At marriage the Zafimaniry construct a house, and if the couple are fecund, the house itself becomes the focus of an increasingly large and clearly visible village. Bloch goes on to describe how Zafimaniry notions of altitude, clarity, permanence, legitimate political power, and genealogical seniority are all interconnected. Over time, the initially impermanent materials that are used to construct the house of such a founding couple are replaced by harder woods, immortalizing marital reproduction. After a period following their death, though, another material form takes shape, expressive of the rivalry between marriage and siblingship: stone megaliths are erected outside the boundaries of the village, immortalizing unchanging, static siblingship. And the dead themselves, in becoming an increasingly anonymous part of the surroundings, take on for their descendants that uncaring permanence which, in life, they had sought to transcend. More recently, the land has come to take on an even more fixed aspect as it becomes usable only for irrigated rice cultivation, and not the transient form of slash and burn agriculture which depends on regenerated forest.

Eric Hirsch

Introduction

The Picturesque

The Zafimaniry's delight in the 'good views' which deforestation opens up brings to mind an ambivalent set of Western attitudes. On the one hand, radical alterations of the land such as deforestation are seen as a form of environmental degradation. Places appear to lose their individual character, with no prospect of future regeneration. On the other hand, such alterations can, from an alternative Western perspective, be seen as transforming 'nature' so it conforms to a pre-existing but positive image: making it appear picturesque (or alternatively, 'productive' (Thomas 1984: 267)). Both perspectives coexist in an uneasy tension, each creating the conditions for the other. Certainly, the idea of the picturesque proved to be a powerful framing device for the way in which non-Western cultures came to be perceived, represented, and colonized. Since the pioneering work of Bernard Smith and his analysis of the artistic works produced by Europeans during voyages in the South Pacific, we have come to appreciate in much clearer terms the close relationship between landscape (picturesque) representation and early forms of ethnographical description (Smith 1985: ch. 7).

An important finding in Smith's work is that European conventions of representation (both visual and textual) were transformed as a result of the encounters with peoples and places in this region. His work also exemplifies the tension in representational techniques mentioned in the previous section: between a picturesque mode premised on neo-classical ideas of Italian origin and a 'descriptive' mode associated with observation, empirical record-making and experimentation. It is the latter mode which predominated, for example, in the drawings of individual plants and animals (Smith 1985: 112). However, when it came to rendering the local inhabitants and their surroundings, the picturesque, Albertian mode was more to the fore. This reflected the attempt to represent 'native' peoples in terms of several predefined conventions associated with notions of Arcadia, Eden, primitivism, and 'savagery' (Smith 1985: ch. 7).

Smith argues that the tension between the convention of romantic depiction and more 'scientific' ethnological information resulted in the emergence of what he calls 'typical landscapes': representations that would evoke the sense of people and place characteristic of the area. What became explicit during this period was the notion that each country had its own peculiar type of landscape: a certain natural physiognomy, as Humboldt came to refer to it. In anthropology this was a view with which Boas subsequently aligned himself (Livingstone 1992: 291).

This transformation in representational emphasis, and the colonization of peoples of the region, play off one another in significant ways. It is possible to see the initial debate among the 'theorists of the picturesque' (Gilpin, Payne Knight, Price) as anticipating in microcosm the colonizing tendencies that were to be such a feature of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, the picturesque was theorized as 'passive' and bound by rules for viewing (as experienced by the
powerless traveller). On the other, and subsequently, the picturesque was theorized as 'active' (as enacted by the powerful colonials). The first position is associated with the ideas and writings of Gilpin. The second arose in debates between Payne Knight and Price on the one hand and Repton on the other around the nature of landscape 'improvement' (Michaev 1992).

The debate surrounding notions of the picturesque in Britain was a reaction both to the idealized landscapes painted by Claude, Poussin, and Salvador Rosa and to the then prevailing convention of the Grand Tour to which these paintings gave visible expression. In this sense, the debate concerned English/British 'national identity'. \(^{13}\) At the same time the debate about the picturesque in Britain anticipated a number of subsequent developments in the evaluation of the countryside (see Thomas 1984: 262).

As Smith (1985: 200–2) shows, Cook’s voyages to the South Pacific were also having a profound effect on the English and European imagination at this time. As earlier suggested, people were coming to think not only that each region had its own peculiar type of landscape, but that the convention of the Grand Tour itself was geographically far too limited: '[th]e possibility of adventures in distant colonies and the prospect of painting scenes never painted before, held more attractions than the visit to Italy'. In this regard, voyages to the Pacific often formed the prelude to world travel; India became a key destination for many. \(^{14}\)

Pinney’s Chapter 4 considers how the colonial tradition of the picturesque and picturesque painting in India became transformed into the visual form of the oleograph ('calendar art'). He explores the relationship between what is represented in oleographs and the industrial town of Nagda where his fieldwork was conducted and where many such oleographs are sold and 'consumed'.

In certain oleographs, the relationship between foregrounded place as representing traditional dimensions of existence exists in an uneasy, often disjoined space and place, coalesce momentarily.’ Pinney shows that this tension is not just a feature of the representational realm but is part of the lived experience of inhabitants of Nagda. In other oleographs, particularly those incorporating Hindu deities, a unified relationship between what is perceived to exist inside the representation and what outside. What is also highlighted in this context is the uneasy relationship between what the local people of Nagda perceive as inside their local ‘landscape’ and what the large industrial estate views as the boundaries of its domain.

Inside and Outside

Raymond Williams has been much cited as pointing out that it is ‘outsiders’—estate owners, improvers, industrialists, artists—who have recourse to the notion of landscape, not those who actually live in the area in question. In The Country and the City (1973), Williams suggested that the conventional use of the landscape idea made apparent this ambiguity between inside(r) and outside(r). It is this ambiguity, for example, that prompted geographers to banish landscape from the vocabulary of geography in the post-World War 2 period (Livingstone 1992: 308). \(^{20}\) More recently, Cosgrove (1984) has discerned in this ambiguity the ideological nature of the concept of landscape.

However, Williams’ sharp distinction between ‘insiders’ who ‘live’ their landscape and ‘outsiders’ who entertain an objectified concept of it, is difficult to sustain. With its implications that the first are rooted in nature while the second have an understanding based exclusively on commercial/possession-valuing (see Berger 1972), it savours of romanticism. Like ‘place’ and ‘space’, notions of ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ are not mutually exclusive and depend upon cultural and historical context.

Selwyn’s Chapter 5, on the Israeli landscape, shows how ideas of inside and outside can shift radically in the context of national and wider geopolitical events. There is an interesting parallel between the interests of the nineteenth-century Zionists and Williams’ concern of the ‘insider’ on the land, portrayed as closer to ‘nature’ and engaged in more ‘authentic’ forms of work. As Selwyn points out, Zionism was less a revolutionary movement and more a socialistic redemptive process grounded in physical life and work on the land. The Zionists hoped to transform Jewish life from being based on a form of hollow commercialism in Europe (as outsider) to being a new and ‘normal’ set of relations between men, women, nature, and work on the land, based in Palestine (as insider).

Crucial to this transformation were the country’s existing denizens, the Arab ‘fellah’ and the Bedouin. They were generally seen as ‘authentic residents of the Bible’ and some scholars claimed they were descendants of the biblical patriarchs. The image of inhabitants evoked by the Arabs, as a legacy of the Hebrew past, was one that earlier settlers hoped to re-enact through their entry to Palestine. The possibility of religious and national coexistence was sketched out by men such as Bober with these images in mind. But as Selwyn subtly shows, the centrality of landscape to Israeli ideas of the nation has, particularly since
By examining the role of shamans in different societies, we can see how their presence challenges the modern understanding of inside and outside. The shamanic mode, characterized by its emphasis on the spiritual realm and the access shamans have to this realm, is in contrast to the modern, consumerist society where the division between inside and outside is more clearly defined.

In the contemporary Israeli context, the tension between inside and outside is heightened by the presence of Bedouin and Arab populations in close proximity to the Israeli settlement. The Israeli landscape is imagined to be ‘good’ and the Bedouin landscape is imagined to be ‘bad’. This is exemplified in the way competing notions of agency are made visible by the landscape, with the Israeli landscape being seen as more stable and predictable, whereas the Bedouin landscape is perceived as more fluid and unpredictable.

However, the shamanic mode, with its emphasis on diversity and difference, offers an alternative perspective on the relationship between inside and outside. This mode is characterized by its ability to transcend the homogenizing effects of modern consumerism. It is a mode that celebrates diversity and difference, and it is not one that is easily subsumed into the modern, consumerist world.

In conclusion, the shamanic mode offers a way of thinking about the relationship between inside and outside that is more nuanced and complex than the modern, consumerist perspective. It is a mode that is inherently resistant to the homogenizing effects of modern consumerism, and it offers a way of understanding the world that is more in tune with the spirit of the cosmos.
come to render various Western institutions so that they conform to local ideas about the relationship between inside and outside: how precolonial ancestral powers (mana) inherent in the land and the cash-cropping and Christianity which accompanied colonialism, cohere in a single 'landscape'. It would be incorrect to view the former as more 'inside' and the latter as more 'outside'. Rather, Christianity and capitalist market relations are now encompassed by the spatiality of Fijian village life. Toren shows how this is revealed both through the Fijian practice of routinely remarking on the most ordinary events of village life and through more specific narratives.

Her chapter includes an account of the foundation of an ancestral chiefly house (yaca). The yaca lies outside the movements of ordinary village life, but its outsideness is perceived as a potential of mana, one that finds living embodiment in the person of the paramount chief. It is in a similar manner that mission Christianity and capitalist cash-cropping are seen as potentialities to be brought within the Fijian relationships of inside and outside as construed through narrative. To view one as more 'traditional' and the other as more 'modern' and imposed from outside would be to ignore local processes of transformation. Thus the horizon and spatiality of village life has expanded to encompass both State and Christian ideology. But at the same time these changes continue to be expressed through local narratives and imagery which emphasize that such changes are 'in the way of kinship', 'in the way of the chiefs' and 'in the way of the land'.

Image and Representation

The Fijian example draws our attention to how narratives continually bring into focus the relationship between the foreground of place and 'insiderness' and space and 'outsideness'. It is this recurrent, emergent process—expressed through imagery and metaphor—which a number of recent writers have seen as the central feature of local constructions of landscape (Basso 1985; Weiner 1991). The narrative dimensions of the Fijian example can also be counterposed to another tradition for analysing how people are seen to be related to their surroundings.

It is significant that 'culture' is sometimes described as a map, it is the analogy which occurs to an outsider who has to find his way around in a foreign landscape and who compensates for his lack of practical mastery, the prerogative of the native, by the use of a model of all possible routes. The gulf between this potential, abstract space, devoid of landmarks or any privileged centre... and the practical space of journeys actually made, or rather of journeys actually being made, can be seen from the difficulty we have in recognising familiar routes on a map or town-plan until we are able to bring together the axes of the field of potentialities and the 'system of axes linked unalterably to our powers' (Greek topos = place). This term is chosen because these identities give rise to 'commonplaces', i.e. to shared moments in a flow of social activity which afford common reference, and 'sensory' because they are moments in which shared feelings for already shared circumstances are created (ibid.). In contrast to the Cartesian tradition of knowledge and language, that of Vico might be referred to as the 'language of involvement'.

The Cartesian view aims for a form of absolute positivitly. The specifics of place are not of central concern, as the goal is to achieve clear and distinct map-like representations. The Vichian view is more relativistic, giving a priority to images and plcasedness. At one level these two viewpoints appear to be irreconcilable. However, underlying the apparent difference is a link which can be highlighted by reference to the almost taken-for-granted practice of everyday movement, way-finding, and navigation. In fact, Gell (1985) has discerned a relationship between absolute and relative positions (between attachment to place and more detached space, between a sense of inside and an external vantage point, between images and representations). Gell develops this idea with respect to an important critique which Bourdieu makes of 'objectivism'.

Bourdieu states:

It is significant that 'culture' is sometimes described as a map, it is the analogy which occurs to an outsider who has to find his way around in a foreign landscape and who compensates for his lack of practical mastery, the prerogative of the native, by the use of a model of all possible routes. The gulf between this potential, abstract space, devoid of landmarks or any privileged centre... and the practical space of journeys actually made, or rather of journeys actually being made, can be seen from the difficulty we have in recognising familiar routes on a map or town-plan until we are able to bring together the axes of the field of potentialities and the 'system of axes linked unalterably to our powers', and carried about with us wherever we go, which structures practical space into right and left, up and down, in front and behind (Bourdieu 1977: 2).
Gell suggests that in defining a map it is first important to distinguish between relative, subject-centred forms of knowledge (which he calls indexical) and absolute, non-subject-centred spatial knowledge (non-indexical). According to this distinction a map may be defined as "any system of spatial knowledge . . . which takes the form of non-[ . . . ] indexical statements about the spatial locations of places and objects" (Munn 1973b: 278). Images, by contrast, are indexical forms of knowledge, in that they always have a sensory form. Thus, images "are perceptually based beliefs about what is where in relation to a percipient subject" (p. 280). In contrast to Bourdieu, then, Gell argues that it is only on the basis of non-indexical knowledge (maps) that indexical knowledge (images) about current locations and objects are established.

For analytical purposes, while it is important to be able to distinguish between images and maps, in practice, as Gell (pp. 278–80) suggests, images and maps flow one into the other in mutually related ways. This is brought out with particular subtlety in a number of recent studies of Australian Aboriginal peoples which have drawn inspiration from Munn's study of the Walbiri (Munn 1973a). Her analysis of Walbiri graphic representations reveals how they are "ways of depicting different spatial distributions of locales" and are thus sometimes referred to as 'maps' (Munn 1973a: 136). Morphy's Chapter 8 highlights this intrinsic relationship of image and map in the Yolngu context as it comes to be focused around the primacy of place. His chapter also presents an interesting variation of the Mongolian case discussed by Humphrey. In the Mongolian context diversity and change are related to the shamanic landscape while 'unchanging' structure results from the ascendancy of the chiefly form. In the Yolngu case, by contrast, contingent change is recurrently incorporated into ancestral, unchanging structure. The focal point of this process is local notions of place.

Much of Morphy's account is devoted to describing the manner in which conception of place has precedence over time in Yolngu ontogeny. This is evident in the structure of language where notions of 'emplacement' are particularly prominent—alleged to the more familiar process of ancestral beings continually turning into place. However, this ordered and frozen world of the ancestral past is only re-created in personal experience through the movements made by persons and collectivities between places. Morphy speaks of the tracks created by ancestral beings, before they became transformed into place, as a 'mythological map'. "The notion of 'map' should be noted here. It is a form of representation at once distant from the everyday field of experience of Yolngu men and women, but which is continually brought into this representational field through narratives, songs, marriage practices, and ritual. Like a more conventional, artefactual map it is drawn upon for the purposes of orientation and action: when to marry or not to marry, what to hunt and what not to hunt. Morphy describes how this sense of orientation and action is also a product of kinship. As we have seen in a number of the essays discussed above, kinship and the land are involved in a process of mutual implication. In this Australian instance everyday images and the ancestral, mythological map 'flow' one into the other in what is conceptualized as a lifelong 'journey'. This is established at birth, reinforced at marriage, and completed during mortuary ritual. At birth the 'soul', a manifestation of ancestral power, is inside the person and at the death the soul returns to the ground, taking a unique route across Arnhem Land. Morphy quotes Munn (1973b: 199), who notes: 'In this sense, the Dreaming [ancestral past] is continually coming out of the ground and being re-embodied as a living entity, as well as continually returning to the ground in death.' (Image as lived experience) and map (as the marks on the land indicating potentialities for the life-course as well as its objectification at death) continually re-create each other.

In Arnhem Land then, birth, marriage, and death are particular moments in which what we refer to as the landscape of the Yolngu is made temporarily visible (as 'images') only to become part again of the invisible background of everyday practice (as ancestral map). These same processes are evident in the Western Desert, but as Layton makes clear in his Chapter 9, we find them differently articulated in this cultural context. This is a consequence of a different ecological situation (seasonal water in Northern Australia vs. irregular water supplies in the Western Desert). It is this ecological context which impinges on the distinctive style of Western Desert discourse on which Layton focuses. His engagement with this discourse occurred while working on a land claim for Anangu people of Uluru (Layton 1986). The stance he adopts in his chapter arises from the problem of translating Western Desert discourse into legal or anthropological discourse. As in the Yolngu context, the land of the Western Desert is thought of as having been created by ancestral beings during the tjukurpa, which Layton translates as the 'time of law'. When those local conceptions are brought under the scrutiny of the white Australian legal system its form as it is specified by rights and boundaries, unanswerable questions arise: "How wide is a dreaming track?" is, for instance, a non-sensical question which was posed at an earlier land claims hearing.'

Such a question reflects the Australian State's attempt to render local knowledge in a particular form: to imagine that a 'track' is a cartographic category than it is possible to specify its 'width'. It is not that the inhabitants of the Western Desert do not have recourse to non-indexical maps of the kind Gell describes, it is just that they would not ordinarily separate out such image-based knowledge into legalistic 'objects' of discourse. Layton's chapter can thus be read at two levels. At one level it is an attempt to demonstrate a problem of referential meaning: the manner in which the meaning of a word or phrase is shaped by the contexts of its production. This is a debate which goes to the core of current concerns about the limitations of post-modernism. He advocates a view of language where it is seen to have
Sight is so often obscured by forest and views so rare), then iconicity is a pervasive feature of language. Specifically, Gell suggests that in cultural/environmental contexts where a sort that the Umeda inhabit imposes a 'reorganization of sensibility', different in kind from that which develops in more 'open' environments. Language here as many directions as possible (along ancestral tracks). The idiom of siblship through which this is achieved. The day-to-day experience ('images') of access pole possible tracks that might be held. The Western Desert map is one based on the accumulation of relationships in contrast to the replication of a pre-existing pattern.

Although the differences between Western and Northern Australia have been stressed here, what is common to both regions is the high degree of visibility. A cultural value is placed on visuality, which is given iconic expression in the graphical symbolism analysed by Munn (1973a) in the Western Desert and in Arnhem Land by Morphy (1991). It is pertinent that anthropologists working in the forest environments of Papua New Guinea have drawn comparisons and contrasts with, for example, the Walbiri ethnography. Weiner, who worked with the Foi people of Papua, has recently commented on such parallels, focusing in particular on the inscriptive activities of men and women in their everyday movements, and in relation to the tracks of their 1991: 196–7). Central to both cultural contexts is the prevalence of iconicity: in the Walbiri context this is articulated graphically, in the Foi context, linguistically. The underlying basis of this difference is the point of departure for the final chapter by Gell, which draws upon his fieldwork among the Umeda people of New Guinea.

Among the Umeda, the relationship between everyday 'images' and the sense of a more encompassing representation ('map') is not engendered primarily through the use of sight. Gell argues that a dense forest environment of the in kind from that which develops in more 'open' environments. Language here takes on a salience additional to that which it possesses in more visual cultures. Specifically, Gell suggests that in cultural/environmental contexts where a sight is so often obscured by forest and 'views' so rare), then iconicity is a pervasive feature of language.20

In this highly audible world nothing that we would understand as a (visible) landscape is present—only partial glimpses (compare Gow's chapter). There is no central vantage point from which a synoptic view can be obtained. In the Umeda context which that is visible is by definition that which is physically close. Haddness takes the form not of invisibility but of insubility. The landscape that the Umeda inhabit is thus one of 'articulation', as Gell calls it:

This landscape is constructed out of the interface between two kinds of experience; distally it comprises a codification of ambient sound, that is, a soundscape, proximally it comprises the basic unifying armature of the body as a sounding cavity, sensitive to sounds, and, through the autonierically sensed experience of verbal and mimetic vocalization, productive of sound.

Gell describes the schemata in Umeda language which encode these two forms of experience. Through his description we are able to understand how the soundscape of the Umeda is bounded conceptually. At one physical extreme there is the 'vertical fence', made up by a tall local ridge, which suggests a background horizon. Phonologically this is encoded through rounded but constricted sounds suggestive of encircling limits. At the other physical extreme there is the proximate village knoll; phonologically this is encoded so as to express this opposite physical extreme. The encoding of these linguistic features is analogous to the physical movements through which the Umeda traverse their surroundings. In other words, the linguistic features have to be understood as arising from transient sounds and articulations: they have to be understood dynamically, as movements.

What Gell's chapter highlights is that the relationship between indexical 'images' and non-indexical 'maps' is one which is not restricted to visual forms. The auditory map of Umeda finds its physical manifestation in spoken language; the map is in a sense re-created through these auditory means. Through their speech, Umeda men and women express in language what they constitute through movement and through practical and ritual action: the most distant (least visible) and most proximate (most visible) dimensions of the Umeda landscape.

Gell's contribution thus brings us back to Green's discussion of nineteenth-century France presented above: the argument against the common-sense claim that the visual is the primary property of landscape pictures. Rather, the visual articulates differentially with the other sense modalities, depending on the precise social and historical context. In the French context it was developments associated with the metropolitan centre of Paris that created the conditions for bringing the countryside into view in a distinctive way. In a sense, as with the Umeda, it was the lack of spatial views (in urban Paris), together with other factors that stressed the experience of commercially produced spectacle, which facilitated the emphasis on visualizing nature as 'landscape'. In each context, landscape emerges as a form of cultural process.
Conclusion: Landscape as Cultural Process

The model of landscape developed in this Introduction is one predicated on the idea of landscape as process. The individual essays draw out this process ethnographically. More generally, it has been suggested that this process is one which relates a ‘foreground’ everyday social life (‘as the way we are’) to a ‘background’ potential social existence (‘as the way we might be’). It is a process that attains a form of landlessness and fixity in certain idealized and transcendent situations, such as a painted landscape representation, but which can be achieved only momentarily, if ever, in the human world of social relationships. This last point requires further comment and also raises an issue which has been influential in the study of landscape outside anthropology.

Cosgrove (1984: 32) has argued forcefully that landscape implies the denial of process: ‘it is process [that] landscape as an ideological concept formally denies’. Landscape, as discussed by Cosgrove, is based on a reading of the concept’s historical emergence that emphasizes its visual, painterly dimensions. Landscape in this interpretation is a restrictive way of seeing which privileges the ‘outsiders’ point of view, while sustaining a radical split between insiders and outsiders on the land: between those who relate ‘directly’ to the land and those who relate to it as a form of exchange value (Cosgrove 1984: 209–70).

It is certainly the case that the historical emergence of the Western notion of landscape implied ways of viewing and relating to the land and surroundings that were not previously explicit. It also gave expression to notions of inside and outside that were previously less evident. But to suggest that the landscape concept implies a denial of process is to confuse what appears to be driven for in artistic representations, gardens, and estates, and what, by contrast, exists as a part of everyday social practice (cf. Cosgrove 1993: 250–1).

We have seen above (and this is described in some of the essays that follow) that in certain contexts men and women endeavour to attain a timeless permanence reminiscent of that achieved in landscape painting: the ‘picturesque’ Zafimaniry villages and their apogee, the stone megaliths outside their boundaries, come to mind here. But as Bloch reminds us, these Zafimaniry attempts to overcome what they see as the unceasing permanence of the land result only in a pyrrhic victory: the permanent stones themselves become part of that uncaring environment. Or again, in a different setting, outside agencies such as the State attempt to impose on native categories and practice a fixity and permanence associated with an artefactual map as Layton describes for Western Desert Aborigines. By contrast, the Mongolian case detailed by Humphrey shows how the tendency to deny laterality and movement (her ‘chiefly’ mode) coexists with a landscape mode that celebrates movement and toponymic difference.

The point, then, is that landscape is a process in so far as men and women attempt to realize in the foreground what can only be a potentiality and for the