Universiteit Leiden

Gaining Ground

Towards a new definition of landscape

Thesis Philosophy of Humanities
Student: A.K. van Veen
Supervisor: Dr. F. Chouraqui
Date: 6 June 2018

Table of contents

Introduction

The painting above represents a landscape. That is beyond any dispute. Anyone would recognise it as such, and not just in its painted form: when confronted with the mill of Wijk bij Duurstede – presently, in fact, another mill – I will recognise the landscape in front of me as similar to the picture. When I walk along the river in the town where I grew up, I recognise the castle, the tower, and I like to think how centuries ago, Ruisdael was struck by a very similar image, which prompted him to paint the scene above. However, I also experience something else: the landscape is not just in front of me. I have walked through it to get to my current standing point. The landscape through which I walked towards the river is still there behind me, and when I turn my head, the landscape turns out to be around me.

Although the landscape painting presented me with a frontal view, the landscape is around me and I find myself in it. One could retort: the landscape is that frontal view, what you are in is the environment. Environments are, indeed, the surrounding that lay at the basis of a landscape. It is the total of the objective characteristics that lay at the basis of it. However, the experience of a landscape goes beyond that. I do not experience the environment: a sum of hills, tries and some farms. Instead, I see a landscape.

In order to include this *experience* of landscape, the notion of what a landscape is has to be thoroughly revised. That is the aim of this thesis. I want to develop a new account of landscape in contrast to the common view of it on a phenomenological basis. To do so, I will first test the presuppositions that inform the common view of landscape against the requirement of satisfying inherence, and then propose an alternative notion of landscape that satisfies this requirement. Most importantly, I will argue that landscapes cannot be like objects. Instead they have to be understood as a relation to the world. Paintings, of course, can also be interpreted in that sense, but the difference is that a painting is a finished product: a landscape is not, my experience of it is constantly subject to change.

To account for these claims, I will first have to make explicit where the faults of the common view lay, and then contrast the common view with my own. To do so, I will draw primarily on the works of Husserl and Heidegger, who both reworked the relation between man and the world around him. Their work provides insight in the nature of our experience of the world, and can be extended to account for the experience of landscape as something in which I am. Yet, Husserl and Heidegger have remained remarkably quiet on landscape, in spite of Husserl's work on horizon and lifeworld, and in spite of Heidegger's attention to world as *Umwelt* and *Gegend.*[1]

My thesis consists of four chapters. The first provides an account of the common view of landscape, works out the conflicting intuitions involved in it and locates the common view within its tradition. The second chapter will develop a critique of the common view: the understanding of its tradition as presented in chapter 1 helps to locate its two most basic presuppositions: specific understandings of world and of subjectivity place the subject opposite his world, and drives a wedge between the two. Landscape is the product of this distance. This account, too, is actually a rather 'common view of landscape', one that has been widely used by landscape theorists arguing for the common view, as well as eco-critics and anthropologists arguing against it. What is new, however, is the way in which I try to tackle this problem with a phenomenological approach.

[1] One might have expected the step to landscape to be a small one: the fact that none of them made it thematic, I think, is caused by the fact that the common view of landscape is irreconcilable with their phenomenology. A phenomenological approach of landscape shows that landscape cannot be an object, and it shows how it nonetheless can remain distinct from environment or world.

The third chapter works out how the presuppositions of landscape can both be understood as abstractions of self and world. Extending Husserl's critique of modern science to include landscape as its counterpart, reveals landscape to be a counterpart of the scientific worldview. It also shows how this abstraction relies on a gap between subject and object. To counter both abstractions, Husserl develops the notion of *Lebenswelt.* This changes the understanding of world as well as of subjectivity. In following his analysis, it becomes clear how this renewed understandings undermine the common view of landscape. Ultimately, it shows that the common view treats landscape as a thing, losing the original experience of in-ness. In Husserl's analysis, though, the subject has two contradictory functions: it constitutes the world while similarly finding itself always already in it. The concept of lifeworld conflicts with Husserl's notion of the subject. This paradox and its implications are worked out in chapter four.

In the last chapter, the move that was prepared by Husserl's concept of lifeworld is completed. To reconstruct 'landscape', we will look at Heidegger's later works, specifically the essay *Bauen, Wohnen, Denken.* The primacy of world in Heidegger's thinking opens new ways of looking at landscape, which from the outset include the experience of being in it. The starting point will be the similarities in Husserl's and Heidegger's critique of the sciences, building further on Husserl's *Krisis,* while including the subject in it. This allows us to work out why landscape is not a thing, and also, to interpret landscape as an objectification. In order to work out a new understanding of landscape, I pay some attention to the accounts of space and *Umwelt* in *Sein und Zeit*. It will be shown that landscape is not the everyday way of dealing with the world, but instead should be understood as a specific kind of awareness. The last section will offer an interpretation of *Bauen, Wohnen, Denken* to construct a concept of landscape as earth-awareness, through a perspective of belonging.

1. Landscape Philosophy: an Introduction

1.1.The Common View

Though there is not one definition of landscape, most authors agree on a certain set of defining characteristics. Firstly, they agree that a landscape is natural.[2] It consists predominantly of elements of nature, be it grassy plains or hills, rivers or trees. That it might also contain a house, a mill or some

[2] L. Trepl, *Die Idee der Landschaft. Eine Kulturgeschichte von der Aufklärung bis zur Ökologiebewegung* (Bielefeld, 2012), 12-13; R. Milani, "Contemporary Meaning of the European Landscape", *Diogenes* 59 (2013). 74-75; M. Smuda (ed.), *Landschaft* (Frankfurt a.M., 1986) 9; M. Schmeling and M. Schmitz-Emanz, *Das Paradigma Der Landschaft in Moderne und Postmoderne* (Würzburg, 2007), 7-8; J. Ritter, *Landschaft. Zur Funktion des Ästhetischen in der modernen Gesellschaft* (Münster, 1963), 10; G. Simmel, *„Philosophie der Landschaft",* in: *Brücke und Tür. Essays des Philosophen zur Geschichte, Religion, Kunst und Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart, 1957), 141-143.

hikers, a carriage, a hayrick or some electricity pylons does not contest the dominance of natural scenery. A landscape does not exist of streets. Yet, landscape cannot be equalled with nature.

A primary distinction lies in the fact that nature cannot be destroyed, whereas it is often lamented that landscapes are.[3] Windmills, pylons, apartment buildings, all of them contribute to a profound change in landscape that is often understood as a destruction. Nature, the hills and forests, the sea and rivers, can be damaged in the sense that the equilibrium of ecosystems is disturbed, but nature itself is not destroyed. It merely changes. Nature also encompasses more: a mountain is not a landscape, but it is nature. The same applies to the sea, to lakes, to forests and caves.

A second characteristic of landscape is that it is selective. Natural surroundings are not landscape: a fragment of them can be called one. If I look out upon the hills, the scope of my vision makes up the landscape. Though the hills have a backside, and continue beyond what I can still see, that is not part of the landscape. Neither is the mountain to my right, nor the forest to my left. The landscape is a certain cut-out of the nature that surrounds the subject.

Thirdly, then, this implies that subjectivity is essential to the landscape: a landscape is a selection of the natural surroundings that is seen by someone. Without someone to look at it, the landscape does not exist, even if the site itself does. If this sounds implausible, think about how to explain a certain landscape without referring to a point of view. All that is possible would be to name a region (which is not a landscape) or a specific feature like a valley (no landscape either). And even when naming a point of view (the landscape you see from the watchtower), the landscape itself will only be there once it is seen. In fact, the common view of landscape sees it as *composed by* a subject – section 1.3 will elaborate on that. This subjectivity can also be demonstrated by the way we talk about landscapes: typically, landscapes can be characterized by adjectives that refer to subjective experiences. We do not say that a landscape is big, or green, or soft, we say rather that it is melancholy, beautiful or impressive - and others might disagree on that. Further support can be found in the relation to space: the aforementioned selection of space depends on the standpoint of the subject. From that point, the composition of the landscape is determined. A landscape, it is held, is typically made up of that portion of land stretching out in front of someone.[4]

Lastly, landscape is a visual perspective: a landscape need only be seen.[5] None of the other senses necessarily play a part. What is more, landscapes have a horizon, and things appear closer or nearer based on their position in it. A close view on trees and shrubberies would be too dense and lack

[3] Trepl, *Idee der Landschaft*, 12.
[4] Idem, 20-22. He uses it to distinguish from landscape as 'environment', but later ends up mentioning as landscape also the natural elements that make it up, which then blurs his distinction: these, I can approach, until they are around me. Trepl tries to solve this by referring to two senses of landscape.
[5] A. Dinnebier, „Der Blick auf die schöne Landschaft – Naturaneignung oder Schöpfungsakt?", https://d-nb.info/105931780X/34.

the depth to be conceived of as a landscape, and so would a green and a blue surface, without anything in it, without any hint of colours fading towards the 'horizon' in between, only be a landscape provided someone willingly interprets it as such.

1.2 Experiencing Landscapes

Intuitive as they may seem, these characteristics exclude an experience of the landscape that is arguably the most characteristic, namely the experience of *being in* a landscape. In fact, the focus mere visuality *excludes* the physical presence in a landscape, the walking in it and moving through it. Though it is true that a landscape is something seen, even a visual landscape does more than just that: Georg Simmel, one of the most influential thinkers on landscape, draws attention to the *Stimmung* of a landscape – that is something that is typically felt.[6] And though it sounds counterintuitive to say a landscape has a smell, the fact that a smell can be at odds with a landscape suggests that smell contributes to it in at least a minor way.

Though it is interesting enough to dive into the question of the different senses with regards to landscape, this is not the place to do so. Besides, the experience of being *in* a landscape makes for a sufficient starting point to look into the relation of subject and landscape.

A landscape exists only for someone in the sense that, as argued above, it needs to be seen. But when I am ice-skating on the polders, I am in a landscape without having to have it constantly in front of me. Also, I am not composing it artistically – as it happens, I am usually too occupied avoiding skating into holes. Yet, I do experience a typically Dutch polder landscape, which I can even recognize in the famous winter landscapes, from Hendrik Avercamp to Louis Apol. There is an aesthetic experience on the one hand, while simultaneously, there is an experience of being there, in the landscape. This cannot be entirely reduced to the environment in which I am: the environment, after all, would also be there without me. I need not experience an environment for it to be there. The landscape, in other words, is not just in front of me as part of an aesthetic contemplation. We live in and walk through landscapes: that is how we experience them. The common understanding of the landscape is far too flat – two dimensional even. It is as though landscape painting influenced the general thinking on landscapes to the extent that painting became prioritized over everyday life.[7] But the way in which a landscape surrounds me goes beyond the way Van Mesdag's panorama does.

Often, landscape philosophers refer to the origins of the word in the Dutch language to denote the representation of a piece of land on canvas.[8] The origins of landscape allegedly lay an aesthetic

[6] Simmel, "Philosophie der Landschaft", 151-152.
[7] A suggestion made by Panofsky. E. Panofsky, "Die Perspektive als „symbolische Form" in: E. Panofsky, *Aufsätze zur Grundfragen der Kunstwissenschaft* (Berlin, 1980), 99-167, 123.
[8] Schmeling and Schmitz-Emanz, *Paradigma Der Landschaft*, 7-8; T. Kirchhoff, "Landschaft" [Version 1.3]. In: Kirchhoff, T. (ed.): *Naturphilosophische Grundbegriffe*, accessed January 28, 2018, www.naturphilosophie.org;

contemplation. The space opened up by perspectivity in painting became dominant over the space that we experience. In order to understand these developments, it is necessary to look at the development of landscape philosophy. A major assumption in doing so will be that the way we relate to the world is influenced by culture, something that is seen as evident these days. In the case of landscape, I think the presumptions of the common view point towards the main characteristics of the worldview that first made it common. To see this, a reconstruction of the development of thinking on landscape is instructive.

The next section will therefore provide an introduction to the tradition that formed the common view of landscape. It deals mostly with the German tradition, which is to this day the most influential. One of the merits is that it draws heavily on the cultural situation that supposedly caused the world to be seen as landscape in the first place. Landscape is presented as the product and expression of a culture, more precisely, the culture of the Renaissance. This contextualization allows for a critique of the common view of landscape through examining its presuppositions. The Renaissance, pictured as a time in which man became an autonomous individual, a free subject, is also characterized as a time of rationality and science. The scientific worldview and a certain kind of subjectivity are held to be conditions for the landscape to be seen.

1.3 Context: the Tradition of the Common View

The way of thinking about landscapes sketched above represents an established tradition with a long history. In fact, it can be traced back to Jakob Burckhardt, who placed the origin of 'landscape' in the Renaissance. In *Die Kultur und Kunst der Renaissance in Italien* he argued that the appreciation of landscapes was a novelty in the Renaissance, and could be connected to the advance of science during that period. Man found himself placed over and against the world, in which he became an increasingly autonomous subject. Burckhardt speaks of a "*geistiges Individuum*" and the rise of the power of the subject, which deals with the world objectively.[9]

Without this separation, landscape could never have come in sight. In fact, landscape and the individual are world and man (re-)discovered. Burckhardt sees in Petrarch the one of the first instances:

> "Vollständig und mit grösster Entschiedenheit bezeugt dann Petrarca, einer der frühsten völlig modernen Menschen, die Bedeutung der Landschaft für die erregbare Seele."[10]

K.R. Olwig, "Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86 (1996), 631.

[9] J. Burckhardt, *Die Kultur und Kunst der Renaissance in Italien* (Hamburg, 2013), 85-90. The theory first caught my attention in the work of Ton Lemaire: T. Lemaire, *Filosofie van het landschap* (Amsterdam, 2007).

[10] Burckhardt, *Die Kultur und Kunst,* 183.

Burckhardt does not make the point explicit, but he, too, locates the meaning of the landscape in the passions of the soul. The impact the view from the Mount Ventoux has on Petrarch also lies primarily in the memories the landscape evokes.

The focus on subjectivity can also be found in *Philosophie der Landschaft* (1913) by Georg Simmel. He pushes the role of the subject to the extreme, which results in a complete separation of landscape from nature. Landscape becomes something with its own value, which transcends its natural, material basis – to the extent that Simmel states the landscape to be fully 'estranged' from nature.[11] The beauty of the landscape thus finds its origin in this transcendence, rather than in the natural counterpart that is its origin: the chaos, the random collection of things 'out there' is, by itself, not beautiful, Simmel holds.

In a Burckhardtian spirit, it is the subject which is responsible for the transcendence of the landscape to nature. The mental action (*geistige Tat*) by which man transforms the appearances surrounding him (*Erscheinungskreis*) into a landscape, selects a part of those surroundings and frames them as the harmonious unity that a landscape is.[12] Simmel subscribes to selection as a characteristic of landscapes: in relation to this, he explicitly parallels the seeing of landscapes to landscape painting. Landscapes are almost literally 'framed', and seeing them requires genuinely artistic input. Seeing a landscape, for Simmel, is in itself an aesthetic act.[13]

Landscape, when understood as such, is completely dependent on, in fact, exists only for a subject: without subjective input, the elements making it up could not be selected, re-integrated into a new unity, and neither would the end product be appreciated. The only difficulty Simmel encounters is that landscapes do seem to have a certain mood or atmosphere (*Stimmung*) from which their unity can be derived. He even wonders if that should be placed in the elements that make up the landscape. However, precisely because only landscapes have moods in this way, these kinds of mood and landscape appear as two sides of a coin, and originate in the same constitutive moment. Landscape cannot be separated from the mood it has, and neither spring from nature.[14]

The role of the subjective comes to stand in a different light in the work of Erwin Panofsky. Panofsky is famous for his analysis of perspective and its origins in the Renaissance. His ideas are strikingly in line with those of Burckhardt. Both stress the advance of science as a counterpart to other cultural developments: the development of mathematical perspective and the aesthetic appreciation of landscape, respectively. For Panofsky, the invention of perspective and its development in the arts is the first expression of a changing relation to space: even when science had not explicitly formulated

[11] Simmel, "Philosophie der Landschaft", 142.
[12] Idem.
[13] Idem, 147-148.
[14] Idem, 151-152.

it, the arts were already working with an absolute and mathematical space, which could be grasped as a system of coordinates.[15] Space, though experienced subjectively, became something grasped in objective standards. Correspondingly, space is restricted to the visual: proximity that is otherwise experienced, felt, for example, or heard, does not play a part.

Landscape painting as popularized in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, operates with this exact-perspectivistic paradigm, painted by drawing according to lines of flight converging in a vanishing point. This idea of landscape is still strongly present in our own thinking on landscape, and presumably, even in our perception of it: think, for example, of Simmel, who believed that the perception of landscape could only be understood in analogy with the composition of a painting. For him, the perception of a landscape is akin to the way in which an artist organizes the different elements in his painting to form a harmonious unity: he called the perception of a landscape an artwork in *statu nascendi*.[16]

Both Simmel and Burckhardt contrast the autonomy of the modern subject with the belonging in a world order that supposedly characterized the people of the medieval and antique world. This thought is taken up by Joachim Ritter, who seeks the origins of the aesthetic appreciation of landscape in the increasing distance to it, and independence from it. In *Landschaft. Zur Funktion des Ästhetischen in der modernen Gesellschaft*, Ritter famously argued that the aesthetic appreciation of nature testifies to human freedom. In pre-modern times, people depended on the whims of the weather, the quality of the soil and were living with the constant presence and pressure of their natural surroundings. Ritter repeats the account Petrach's ascent of the Mount Ventoux that had been analysed by Burckhardt.[17] For Ritter, Petrarch's ascent demonstrates an increasing distance to the world, a desire to have a certain overview and distant gaze on it. Petrarch is hit by the realization that his undertakings are precisely those that Augustine condemns as distraction from the inner, spiritual life, an event that demonstrates for Ritter Petrarch's status as a threshold figure, thinking ahead into modernity but with one foot still in the Middle Ages.

Ritter reconciles Simmel and Burckhardt with Panofsky in the sense that he interprets landscape as a compensation. He acknowledges the change in worldview in science, which increasingly drove a wedge between man and his world. According to Ritter, the world became a domain of causality and laws, a clockwork rather than a world endowed with meaning. In order to compensate for this loss, however, nature was rediscovered in its natural beauty, as landscape. In this respect, Ritter rejects the Romantic view in which individuals become alienated and estranged from nature. Instead, he stresses the freedom and individuality of the subject in freely contemplating the beauty of

[15] Panofsky, "Die Perspektive".
[16] Simmel, "Philosophie der Landschaft," 147.
[17] Ritter, *Landschaft*, 7-17.

the landscape. Ritter agrees with Panofsky's thesis that nature had to become objectified, but he sees that as a necessity for mankind to achieve freedom. The conception of nature as an object is the necessary correlate to the self-realization of man as autonomous subject.[18]

In all of these definitions, landscape has been placed in the realm of the aesthetic. Like Simmel, many authors think that the landscape is composed by the subject in the way that painters compose their landscape paintings. For example, the introductory handbook on landscape philosophy by Ludwig Trepl calls the moment (*Augenblick*) of framing the landscape constitutive.[19] He also draws attention to the fact that a landscape is always in front of the viewer, and has a horizon – which separates landscapes from environments. The common view, in short, can be summarized as follows:

> "To see a landscape means to transform a segment of the visual world in a virtual piece of art - a painting, a drawing, a photo - by sight itself."[20]

2. Towards a Critique of the Common View

To constitute a landscape out of the natural surroundings in the way that Simmel and Ritter intended, presumes a level of agency on the side of the subject, and on the other side, a pre-existent world. Out of this world, the 'artist' draws the elements that together make for the unity we recognize as a 'landscape'. Landscape is both the product of this process, as an 'artwork', as well as it is the act of constituting it. Peculiarly, 'landscape' seems to be a verb, as well as its object: upon having constituted it, the subject has won a new unity, which is seen as landscape:

> "Aber es wirken in alledem Gestaltungsarten, die wir gleichsam nachträglich künstlerische nennen müssen; denn wenn sie in Eigengesetzlichkeit und gelöst von der dienenden Verwebung in das Leben ein Objekt für sich formen, das nur ihr Produkt ist, so ist dies eben ein »Kunstwerk«."[21]

This is problematic because it implies that the landscape is constantly recreated, every time I move my gaze. And every 'landscaping' in turn, supposedly creates a new landscape out of the environment. Yet, at the basis of it lies the same natural material. For Simmel, this is not a problem:

[18] Ritter, *Landschaft*, 26-32. He contrasts Rousseau, as representative of the Romantics, with Schiller's *Briefe über die Ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen*
[19] Trepl, *Landschaft* 21-22.
[20] Schmeling and Schmitz, *Paradigma der Landschaft,* 7.
[21] Simmel, "Philosophie der Landschaft," 146-147.

> "Das Material der Landschaft, wie die bloße Natur es liefert, ist so unendlich mannigfaltig und von Fall zu Fall wechselnd, dass auch die Gesichtspunkte und Formen, die diese Elemente zu je einer Eindruckseinheit zusammenschließen, sehr variable sein werden."[22]

The second point is that Simmel speaks of 'free nature', opposing it to culture – nature in turn *can* be conceived of as a symbol, and so become part of culture, as landscape. Landscapes are cultural. Nature, when taken as the totality of everything that is natural, is not. The 'freedom' of nature is a negative freedom, a freedom that is characterised by the absence of human influence. The opposition of man and nature is conceived of in terms of freedom, in which man gains the artistic gaze, which is able to appropriate 'free nature' – supposedly rendering it unfree. Ritter, on the other hand, contrasts nature, as the sphere of necessity, with the sphere of *human freedom*. Freedom here denotes a potential of man: only in achieving freedom from nature can man re-appraise it aesthetically, as landscape.[23] Ritter follows Schiller in hailing the independence of man from nature, and the loss of an 'original unity', as a condition for human freedom: the free contemplation of nature as landscape requires that, in Schiller's words, man has become legislator of nature, rather than her slave.

> "Zur Freiheit gehört, daß er [der Mensch, *AK*] aus diesem Einssein heraustritt; sie schließt ein, daß er nicht mehr "Sklave der Natur" ist, sondern sie als ihr Gesetzgeber und Subjekt für sich zum Objekt gemacht hat…"[24]

The constant factor for both authors is the presence of the 'landscaping' subject: an agent who constitutes the landscape out of the independent elements of a pre-existing natural world. This is what accounts for the 'artistic' input in Simmel's terminology and the human independence in Ritter's. The common view of landscape seems to carry the separation between nature and landscape further: ultimately, it depends on a gap between man and world. Simmel does not make a point of it, but he does clearly put landscape on the side of human agency, conceiving 'mere nature' (*bloße Natur*) as 'matter'. Ritter, as mentioned, does thematise the gap. For him, it is a condition for the aesthetic appreciation of nature and thus, for the very perception of landscapes. Landscapes do require a viewer: they are typically characterized by a perspective and a standpoint. Yet, to see landscapes as human actions, as compositions out of the elements of nature, put together by and being fully dependent on a human subject, is taking the position of the viewer well beyond what it can be accredited with.

A closer inspection of the implications of perspective and standpoint point in the direction of why this is so. Both abstract from the way in which I am in the landscape, and do, indeed, create a

[22] Idem, 144.
[23] Ritter, *Landschaft,* 28-29. Also already hinted at in Simmel's essay. Simmel, "Philosophie der Landschaft", 143-144.
[24] Ritter, *Landschaft,* 29.

composition in a way that I myself could never do. They are supposed to 'work' because they render a true representation of the perceived landscape. The two-dimensional counterpart of it seemingly opens up a space that convincingly mimics actual three-dimensional space, and I am able to recognise landscapes from paintings or photos. My standpoint, to begin with, is in a landscape – literally. My feet are on the ground, my eyes right above them. In paintings, the perspectival lines place the viewer beyond the canvas, creating a distance between the viewer and the landscape that is not there.

> "Die abstrakte Beziehungseinheit Augenpunkt-Fluchtgebilde ist weltlos, aber raumschaffend (…) Der Gesichtpunkt befindet sich an der Peripherie des Raumes und hat ihn – monadologisch – als Raum."[25]

Secondly, the rules of perspective require that the viewer is reduced to a single eye. This is a point made by Panofsky, and it entails a phenomenon that is probably evident for everyone who ever noticed that a branch of a tree blocked the view for one eye, but not for the other.[26] In fact, of course, we are not creating the landscape with a wink of the eye – though Ludwig Trepl did mention the *Augenblick* as constitutive. They are *Augen:* we look at landschapes with both eyes. Panofsky also argued for an abstraction of subjective reality with regards to space. He analyses this with regards to perspectivity, and holds that perspectivity requires an abstraction from reality: ,*if reality, in this case, may refer to the actual, subjective visual impression',* he adds between brackets.[27] The kind of space which requires this abstraction is rational or mathematical space. In other words, it is the space that science captures in mathematical laws. Panofsky characterizes this space by pointing to its universality, infinity and homogeneity, and quotes Ernst Cassirer to characterize the 'other kind of space', i.e. the space of the *"psychophysiologische Raumanschauung"*.[28]

The alteration of space in science can be characterized as an objectification: it objectifies in the sense of applying universal standards and unities of measurement. "Heavy" or "lightweight" are different to everyone, but applying unities like 'kilograms' makes weight something universally communicable. 'Kilograms' are a higher order conceptualization. This is the kind of abstraction of the subjective that Panofsky refers to.

On the other hand, an opposing movement exists. Gottfried Boehm has pointed out that the representation of landscapes is subjective: as a perspective, it is entirely relative to a single person's point of view. The truth of the representation, correspondingly, is relative to that subjective standpoint, he argues. He opposes it to truth in the medieval paintings, which allegedly laid in the truth

[25] G. Boehm, *Studien zur Perspektivität* (Heidelberg, 1969), 80.
[26] Panofsky, "Die Perspektive*",* 101.
[27] "wenn wir in diesem Falle als "Wirklichkeit" den tatsächlichen, subjektiven Seheindruck bezeichnen dürfen", Panofsky, 101.
[28] Panofsky, 101 and fn 7, 128.

of what it represented, not in the truth of the representation itself.[29] By contrast, in the landscapes painted according to the rules of central perspective, size and proportion of the elements they are composed of become relative to the position of the beholder. In that sense, the entire representation is 'subjected' to an individual viewpoint – and also in the sense that the subjective standpoint determines where the landscape begins and ends. The entire horizon depends on the subject facing it. His gaze is sovereign over the world as landscape, as the whole composition depends on him. In short, the landscape is of the viewer's making. It is best described as a verb whose subject is the viewer. To "view" a landscape is to make a piece of the environment appear.

The introduction of the subjective agency that is present in 'landscaping', or in landscape as verb, tries to do justice to the experience of being *in* a landscape, of feeling its atmosphere and of overcoming the distance between man and nature that is achieved via the creation of a new cultural object. At the same time, in the process of turning the environment into an object, an abstraction of this subjective experience takes place, and it forfeits exactly the experience of inherence and replaces it with a fictional, sovereign gaze. Ultimately, the common view of landscape comes down to seeing landscape as a verb, and it be explained as an abstraction of the world. Meanwhile, this abstract notion is taken up by the natural sciences, whose object is what Simmel calls *bloße Natur*. The world, as a result becomes increasingly separated from the subjective experience of it – an assumption inherent to the natural sciences as Husserl criticizes them in *Krisis der Europäische Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Philosophie* (henceforth: *Krisis*). The next chapter argues that Husserl's critique can be extended into a systematic critique of the common view of landscape, one that would accommodate for the element of inherence I have been stressing so far.

3. Husserl: Regaining World

In *Krisis* Husserl makes very similar observations concerning the development of modern philosophy from the Renaissance onwards, linking them to those in science. He sees the same sort of developments that the proponents of the common view have pointed to as relevant for the development of landscape, namely that split between man and world, mental and physical, which ultimately was articulated in objectivist philosophy and one for which the mind, i.e., subjectivity, became the starting point:

> "Die ganze neutzeitliche Philosophie, im ursprünglichen Sinne als universal, leztbegründete Wissenschaft, ist nach unserer Schilderung (…) eine einziges Ringen zwischen zwei Wissenschaftsideen: der Idee einer objektivistischen Philosophie auf dem Boden der

[29] Boehm, *Perspektivität,* 25.

> vorgegebenen Welt unter derjenigen einer Philosophie auf dem Boden der absoluten, transzendentale Subjektivität.“[30]

The sciences are a correlate of this separation: they thrive on the presumption that there is an objective world which can be analysed objectively, that is, by excluding any subjective ‘corruptions’ of experience. In the Renaissance, the world was increasingly mathematized, the conception of space was altered, and man increased his control on nature.[31]

> "Die Konzeption dieser Idee eines rationalen unendlichen Seinsalls mit einer systematisch es beherrschenden rationalen Wissenschaft ist das unerhört Neue.“[32]

I believe that this ‘*Idee eines rationalen unendlichen Seinsalls*’ is the sort of world that is presumed in the common view of landscape. Like the sciences, the common view of landscape reflects a mechanistic worldview. Both the scientific method and the common view of landscape objectify the world in a strikingly similar sense. Husserl provides the occasion for extending his scientific critique by mentioning how Galilei’s convictions have shaped not just modern science, but philosophy and the general spirit of modernity:

> "An erster Stelle betrifft diese Aufgabe aber die Besinnung auf den Ursprungssinn der neuen Wissenschaften und allen voran der exakten Naturwissenschaft, da sie (…) von entscheidender Bedeutung für Werden und Sein der neuzeitlichen positiven Wissenschaften, desgleichen der neuzeitlichen Philosophie — ja des Geistes des neuzeitlichen europäischen Menschentums überhaupt, gewesen ist und noch ist.“[33]

3.1 A Scientific Worldview

Husserl’s thought contributed to and was influenced by a broader crisis of the subject around the 1900s.[34] The idea of an absolute subject was under attack, as from different disciplines attention shifted to the way in which man was influenced and determined by his environment, his culture and his time. Subjectivity changed from an escapable realm of opinion and taste to an inevitable context that informed every perception. Correspondingly, the objectivity that the sciences had claimed, came under attack, perhaps most spectacularly by science itself: Einstein’s restricted theory of relativity

[30] E. Husserl, *Die Krisis der Europäischen Wissenschaften und die Transzendentale Philosophie* (Den Haag, 1976), 212.
[31] Husserl makes no historical claims, though. In fact, he stresses that he makes no factual or causal claims, but tries to unravel the historical coherence teleologically, understanding what lies at heart of the *Sinnverwandlung* of modernity. Husserl, *Krisis,* 145-146.
[32] Idem, 19.
[33] Idem, 59.
[34] T. Slevin, Visions of the Human: Art, World War One and the Modernist Subject (London, 2015), 1-17.

dates from 1905. In literature, the change could be found in the work of modernist authors, who focussed on the ways environments changed their protagonists; in the arts, it was the challenging of traditional rules, most obviously, that of perspective.

This crisis is the general problem that shapes the investigations in *Die Krisis der Europäische Wissenschaften und die Transzendentale Phänomenologie*. In the face of these challenges, political developments, and World War I, science remained silent in spite of its universalist claims. Husserl tries to account for the failure of modern science to answer existential questions – the truths of science, he maintains, are objective truths, but they are no more than just that. They cannot answer existential questions, or questions of meaning and purpose. The natural sciences rests primarily on method, and this method is not designed for anything more than practical purposes – in claiming anything more, they not only go beyond their authority, they also confirm that they have lost insight in their origins. Husserl works out the case of geometry, providing an account of how it moved from concrete measurement to an increasingly autonomous mathematical discipline, eventually abstracting space into mathematical ideality:

> "Ihr, der Welt der wirklich erfahrenden Anschauung (…) hier finden wir nichts von geometrischen Idealitäten, nicht den geometrischen Raum, nicht die mathematische Zeit mit allen ihren Gestalten."[35]

In itself, this is not necessarily a problem. After all, the edifice of science looks like a solid, logical, construction, and functioning perfectly at that. It can hardly be disputed that the natural sciences are a paragon of certainty. Husserl ascribes their success to their reliance on method. The method of the sciences consists in idealization or abstraction of actual things into mathematical unities. This is how science is able to generate ever more universally communicable truths, which Husserl calls '*irrelativ*': they are true for everyone, regardless of standpoint.[36] However, it is a problem that eventually, Galilean sciences became so influential that its idealization and mathematization started to replace the experience that stood at its basis:

> "Gleich mit Galilei beginnt also die Unterschiebung der idealisierten Natur für die vorwissenschaftlich anschauliche Natur."[37]

[35] *Krisis*, 50.
[36] Idem, 22-25 ("empirisch-praktisch objektivierende Funktion").
[37] Idem, 50. Husserl uses the term 'mathematization of nature' as well. Note that '*gleich mit* Galilei', does not mean that Galilei himself, on his own, is held responsible. This is the same point Panofsky made, to which I referred earlier.

He speaks of a mathematization of nature – a thesis very similar to that of the 'mechanisation of the world picture'. In a meticulous study of this process, Eduard Jan Dijksterhuis has investigated this development. His influential study in general confirms that there was such a mathematization: the world was increasingly understood as a mechanical system, obeying universal rules and devoid of a sense of purpose. He nuances the picture by demonstrating how the origins of this 'mechanization' can be found in the focus on mathematics due to the popularity of Platonism at 12th century universities, while *de facto* experimental science took off only during the 17th century. [38] Still, the book supports the claim that changes in the sciences over time changed the understanding of nature and gave rise to a more objectivist understanding of the world.

The understanding of the world as a 'machine' or 'clockwork', which gained popularity in the 18th century, proves the point in case: contrary to our everyday experience, the world is seen as a pre-determined sequence of events, as everything in it obeys the same laws of physics and can be predicted in every aspect.[39] This is where Husserl's famous quote that we see the world 'through a garb of ideas' comes from.[40] Rather than referring back to the actual world, the sciences concern themselves with an idealized version of it, which is held to be the 'objective' one – think of modern physics, its experiments often literally taking place in a vacuum. This generates very useful insights, and enables a multitude of applications, but in its popularity, the fact that this is actually a *method* has been forgotten:

> "Das Ideenkleid macht es, dass wir für wahres Sein nehmen, was eine Methode ist…"[41]

This worldview generates the image of a closed-off natural causality, that is: fully separated from the mental activities that reflect it.[42] In the second part of *Krisis,* under the title *Die Ursprungskläring des neuzeitlichen Gegensatzes zwischen physikalistischem Objektivismus und transcendentalem Subjektivismus,* Husserl argues that this objective understanding of the world increased the gap between subject and object, preparing the way for the dualism articulated by Descartes in the seventeenth century. [43] The subjective sphere was increasingly understood as that of 'merely subjective', i.e. *relative* experiences, which could not generate a world in itself, and to which the objective world was ever more inaccessible.

---

[38] E. J. Dijksterhuis, *The Mechanization of the World Picture*, trans. C. Dikshoorn (London, 1969), 237.
[39] R. Groh and D. Groh, *Weltbild und Naturaneignung* (Frankfurt a.M., 1991), 30. G. Visser makes the same observation, but includes the emergence of anatomy as subjecting man to the same rationalization. G. Visser, *De druk van de beleving. Filosofie en kunst in een domein van overgang en ondergang* (Amsterdam, 2012), 198.
[40] J. Humphreys, "Husserl's Archeology of Exact Science", *Husserl Studies* 30 (2014), 101-127, 124. Cf. *Krisis,* 51.
[41] *Krisis*, 52.
[42] Idem*,* 61.
[43] Idem*,* 18-101.

> "Natur und seelische Welt, von der die letztere es freilich durch die Art ihrer Bezogenheit auf die Natur zu keiner selbständigen Weltlichkeit bringt."[44]

This opposition finds its clearest expression in psychology. The human being, as the combination of a soul and a physical body, becomes the battlefield of subjectivist and objectivist approaches. In trying to mimic the natural sciences, psychology applies the scientific method to the soul, as if it were a physical body. On the other hand, experience is treated as something 'inner', distinct from the corporeal world. Due to this contradiction, the symptoms of the European crisis of the sciences first showed themselves in psychology.[45] On these grounds, Husserl protests against the idealism of the presumed 'inner experience' and argues for a new, transcendental psychology, that has its own notion of scientific validity.[46]

The common view of landscape saw the aestheticizing of nature as the counterpart of the development of science: the world conceived of as an object had to precede subjective appreciation of it. If that is so, then the critique that *Krisis* offers, especially on the world as an object, can be extended to include the common view of landscape. Perspective and perceiving landscape as restricted to the world as something in front of us are abstractions in the same way that the methods of the sciences use abstractions to capture things restricted to their objective qualities. That there is a world to be recovered beneath the 'garb of ideas' is supported by Husserl's argumentation that there is in fact such a garb over the world. To uncover it, we have to start with the Husserlian *epoché.*

3.2 The Phenomenological Epoché

The phenomenological epoché focusses on the phenomena as we experience them, that is, subjectively: our judgements of it and the way we grasp them (for example, as objects, and as beautiful or disgusting), though without uncritically following those judgements. It distinguishes between the intention of consciousness, the contents of the experience and whatever emotions or thoughts they bring about, while remaining aware of all of them, as components of the same experience. Ultimately, transcendental phenomenology aims at unravelling the structure of consciousness.

In this attempt, the phenomenological epoché should be contrasted with that of Descartes. Husserl explains the latter's *ego cogito* as an articulation of the existing gap between scientific objectivism and transcendental subjectivism, rather than as the absolutely unbiased foundation that it was supposed to be. According to him, Descartes did not manage to see the presuppositions behind his own project. Descartes' radical doubt already aims at maintaining the self as mind, abstracting away

[44] Idem, 61.
[45] Idem, 215-227
[46] Idem, 70.

from even the body – and therefore presupposes an abstraction that is part of the Galilean or scientific worldview:

> "Die Seele aber ist das Residuum einer vorgängigen Abstraktion des puren Körpers und nach dieser Abstraktion, mindestens scheinbar, ein Ergänzungsstück dieses Körpers. Aber (wie nicht ausser Acht zu lassen ist) diese Abstraktion geschieht nicht in der Epoché, sondern in der Betrachtungsweise des Naturforschers oder Psychologen auf dem natürlichen Boden der vorgegebenen, der selbstverständlich seienden Welt."[47]

Descartes' project of finding secure foundations for knowledge thus backfired. Though he found a ground in the certainty of his inner experiences, this certainty led to a contradiction with the outer world. The Cartesian Ego is one without world (*entweltlichtes Ich*); experiences are mere phenomena, and the world itself becomes an idea in the mind of the Ego. Husserl takes up again the Cartesian project of an epoché, and seeks for certain foundations of knowledge, but from an I that is in the world. For him, in contrast to Descartes, precisely the phenomena become the starting point. 'Epoché' for Husserl denotes the bracketing of the natural interpretation of things, so that only the phenomena as they present themselves remain. In doing so, he is able to provide a counterweight to the scientific abstraction of the world that caused the crisis of science in the first place. The recovery of the world is, in light of the current project, the first and most important of Husserl's achievements, as it undermines the notion of a pre-given world in the common view of landscape.

3.3 A Pre-given World

While the Cartesian epoché started with shutting out the world as a domain of possible deception, 'world' is the first thing that is recovered in the Husserlian epoché. The Cartesian '*entweltlichtes Ich*' regains its world when the phenomena of that world become the point of departure. This world, however, is a different one from the causal domain that is the world of the sciences. That world is a presumption of the objectivism that takes the world for granted.[48] In the above, it has been explained that Husserl sees this as an abstraction already. He focusses on what is presented to us in sensual perception:

> "Konkret aber sind uns, zunächst in der empirischen sinnlichen Anschauung, die wirklichen und möglichen empirischen Gestalten bloß als „Formen" einer „Materie", einer sinnlichen Fülle

[47] *Krisis*, 81.
[48] Idem, 70.

gegeben; also mit dem, was sich in den sogenannten „spezifischen“ Sinnesqualitäten, Farbe, Ton, Geruch und dergleichen, und in eigenen Gradualitäten darstellt.“[49]

By focussing on the phenomena, the ‘*Fülle’* (fullness, richness) of the senses is recovered, and with it, the way that the things are presented to us, as what they mean to us. A tomato can be seen as ‘form’ (round, so-and-so many inches) of ‘matter’ (water, fibre, so-and-so many grams), but it is a tomato, which may be hard or soft, has a certain degree of redness, and if it is ripe, it smells of tomato and might make me hungry. The focus on the objective world as the true world has led to a devaluation of this life ‘before and beyond science’ (*vor- und außerwissenschaftlichen Lebens*), as supposedly ‘merely subjective’.[50] But this also means that the truths of science have nothing to do with what we experience: their truths provide no answers to the questions of life, no guidance in everyday experiences. The focus on ‘objectivity’ in science has led to discrepancy between what we believe to be real and what is relevant and true, and matters to our lives.

This abstraction from experience entails a tacit separation of two worlds: the subjective experiences are located in a mental world, and the corporeal entities of nature in a separate, physical one. Here originate the concepts of a ‘free’ subject (Ritter) and ‘free’ nature (Simmel), respectively.[51] Initially, the ‘two worlds’ coincided in their shared rationality: the rationality of nature was held to be universal, and it was warranted by and grounded in the divine. Philosophy and science were still seen as branches of the same project, the rational understanding of the world being perfected by the tool of applied mathematics.[52] Eventually, of course, the gap between the two widened, and scepticism start sawing at the foundations of both undertakings – roughly the chronology as Husserl presents it.

For Husserl, part of the modern (*neuzeitlich*) world representation is that the earth is seen as a body (*Körper*). In a late essay from 1934, Husserl argues that this idea is not in line with our experience. Our perception of the world starts with things that move and change, or stand still and remain unchanged. The world, as the basis of all these things, stands still: all movement is relative to this ground (*Boden*):

“Dieser "Boden" wird zunächst nicht als Körper erfahren, in höherer Stufe der Konstitution der Welt aus Erfahrung wird er zum Boden-Körper, und das hebt seine ursprüngliche Boden-form auf.“[53]

[49] *Krisis,* 27.
[50] Idem, 54
[51] Idem, 61.
[52] Idem, 5.
[53] E. Husserl, "Grundlegende Untersuchungen zum phänomenologischen Ursprung der Räumlichkeit in der Natur,“ in *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, ed. M. Farber (Cambridge MA, 1940), 307-325, 308.

Hence Husserl's famous claim that *the earth does not move*. Galilei's *eppur si muove* was, even if not wrong, an abstraction from the original experience of world. That means there are two notions of 'world' at work: one that is phenomenological, and sees the earth as ground or *Boden,* the other as product of a higher level of constitution, namely, the scientific or Copernican view: the earth as body (*Körper*). These two notions of world cannot go together, or at least, the understanding of them has to come about at a different level. Husserl defends the phenomenological experience of the earth as ground as more original then the Copernican view of the earth as body. The former is true to our experience of the world and accounts for our dealing with it, while the Copernican view is a historical product. Presuming that to be the 'true' one would be to make the same mistake as Descartes according to *Krisis*: it would be to take for granted something that is not intuitive.

The Copernican worldview derives its origin and sense from the world of which it is a 'worldview'. Its truth therefore cannot surpass the truth of that world.[54] This observation demonstrates why the earth cannot be a seen as a thing at all, even if we can think of it as one. To see the earth as body would require its relativity, as though life on earth could have taken place on any other star or planet, in no way relating back to the earth as its original ground. Husserl tries to imagine a situation in which that would be the case, but inevitably, any person in such a position would still have historical ties to *our* earth.[55] However far away, history would always lead back to the earth on which we live, as its final ground.

The earth as a thing, floating in an infinite space that is no different from its own spatiality, is exactly the pre-existing world that lies at the basis of the landscape in the common view. When that world is revealed as an abstraction, this problematizes the common view of landscape. The question is to what extent the process of constitution can be maintained, if nature is no longer there as a 'raw material', to be assembled by a free subject that is located outside of it. To denote the actual 'world' that is given to us, Husserl introduces the term *Lebenswelt*: this is the world as prior to scientific abstraction.

3.4 Lifeworld as Horizon

Husserl's concept of lifeworld provides a more accurate way to understand our relation to landscape, as it recovers a self-evident unity between self and world. For this normal way of being, Husserl uses the term 'natural attitude' (*natürliche Einstellung)*, which refers to the way the things around us are present. In following how he develops the concept of horizonality, and by contrasting it with the things in a horizon, it becomes possible to see a fault in the common view of landscape: it conceives of landscape as a thing, which is where the 'aroundness' of landscape is lost.

[54] J. Himanka, "Husserl's Argumentation for the Pre-Copernican View of the Earth", *The Review of Metaphysics* 58 (2005) 621-644, 630-633.
[55] Husserl, "Grundlegende Untersuchungen", 319.

Husserl starts from Franz Brentano's famous thesis that our consciousness is structured intentionally. This comes down to the seemingly simple fact that consciousness is always consciousness of something: thought and perception, desire and disgust, they are always aimed. According to Husserl, Descartes had overlooked this fact – this accounts for his misinterpretation of the ego.[56] And how, Husserl asks rhetorically, could one even start an investigation of the soul without the awareness of intentionality? This realization, that consciousness is never purely residing in itself, renders the question of the existence of the world impossible. Appearance or being, there remains a consciousness of *something* out there.[57] The fact that consciousness is about *something* implies also that the things in the world are turned into objects as soon as they are grasped by a consciousness. In that sense, every thought, perception and feeling is an objectification.[58] This objectification is characteristic of what Husserl terms the 'natural attitude' towards things, which is how we deal with things in everyday life:

> "Dinge, Objekte (…) sind „gegeben" als für uns jeweils (in irgendwelchen Modis der Seinsgewißheit) geltende, aber prinzipiell nur so, daß sie bewußt sind als Dinge, als Objekte im Welthorizont."[59]

It is this natural attitude that also grounds the sciences, though they objectify also on a higher level, as has been discussed above. This experience of 'being with the things themselves' accounts for the unity of self and world, tackling what was one of Descartes' most pressing problems. '*Leben ist ständig In-Weltgewißheit-Leben,* Husserl notes.[60] For this unity of self and world he employs the term 'lifeworld' or *Lebenswelt.* The lifeworld is mentioned for the first time as the forgotten foundation of the sciences, but turns out to provide the sense and validity of the world for every experiencing individual. It provides a horizon; a background that allows us to understand things in the first place.[61]

This understanding of horizonality is important to the understanding of the lifeworld. The lifeworld functions as a horizon, in the sense that it provides context, sense and meaning to everything in it.[62] This is why Husserl can speak of '*einem verwandelten Sinneshorizont',* and '*der Vorgegebenen Welt als Horizont aller sinnvollen Induktionen'.*[63] The horizon is the way we understand and interpret

[56] *Krisis*, 83-85.
[57] "Sein oder Schein" sounds better in German. *Krisis*, 239.
[58] Objects are always comprehended by a '*gegenstandliches Meinen'.* G. Hoffmann, *Heideggers Phänomenologie: Bewusstsein - Reflexion - Selbst (Ich) und Zeit im Frühwerk* (Würzburg, 2005), 63-64. E. Schrödinger, ,*Nature and the Greeks' and 'Science and Humanism'* (Cambridge, 2014), 93.
[59] *Krisis,* 146..
[60] Idem*,* 145.
[61] L. Učník, The Crisis of Meaning and the Life-World : Husserl, Heidegger, Arendt, Patočka (Ohio, 2016)*,* 4.
[62] *Krisis*, 147.
[63] Idem, 48 and 50.

the things around us, and that can change over time or per culture: we use knives, for example, in a culturally determined way, when we see a paring knife, we would understand and use it differently from a table knife. A medieval knight would simply drive the former into his meat and start eating, conceiving of the table knife as a virtually useless, blunt tool. Horizons make for an inextricable connection between the objects in the world and the world around them: the horizon could not be present without the individual objects, just like the individual objects could not be grasped as such without the presence of a horizon:

> "Jedes ist etwas, „etwas aus" der Welt, der uns ständig als Horizont bewußten. Dieser Horizont ist andererseits nur als Horizont für seiende Objekte bewußt und kann ohne sonderbewußte Objekte nicht aktuell sein." [64]

The lifeworld as horizon is thus as inseparable from the objects we perceive as it is inseparable from the subject that relies on it. In this way, an absolute correlation between objects which are grasped, and the subjectivity that grasps them, is asserted, and the estrangement that is inherent to the scientific objectification can be overcome. This same estrangement characterises landscape in the common view, and turns the landscape into an object. Though horizons are characteristic of landscapes, landscape in the common view is nothing like a lifeworld. In relation to this 'landscape-thing', a sovereign subject is able to take a stance and compose a new unity out of the raw material that he is provided with. Though Husserl was not referring to landscape, the following quote on things reads as though the first 'Ding' refers to landscape:

> "Das Ding ist eines in der Gesamtgruppe von simultan wirklich wahrgenommenen Dingen, aber diese Gruppe ist für uns bewusstseinsmäßig nicht die Welt, sondern in ihr stellt sich die Welt dar, sie hat als momentanes Wahrnehmungsfeld für uns immer schon den Charakter eines Ausschnittes von der Welt."[65]

The common view of landscape, contrasting landscape with nature, would also contrast landscape with world. Yet, the implication that it is constituted like an object might feel counterintuitive. The issue becomes more pressing if it is rephrased as in the above: a landscape as a 'thing', even if a 'mental thing', shows that the common view severely overstretches the impact of the subject on landscape. I believe that this is what is wrong with the common view: it objectifies a part of the world in a sense that ignores any role the landscape itself might play in being seen as such, and completely passes over the fact that we find ourselves *in* a landscape, rather than in opposition to it. In order to work this out,

[64] Idem, 146.
[65] Idem, 165.

the role of the subject needs to be more closely inspected. How does the modern worldview change the understanding of subjectivity?

Husserl allows us to see that the inherence to landscape is lost because the common view treats it as a thing. In addition to that, the lifeworld provides us with an alternative to the kind of pre-given world that is assumed in the sciences and in the common view of landscape alike. An actual rebuilding of landscape, though, requires us to first deal with the other side of the landscape: that of the subject inside of it.

3.5 Sense and Subjectivity

The developments in the understanding of world can also be traced with regard to the subject, which provides insight in the account of subjectivity presumed in the common view of landscape. The subject that constitutes landscapes is the sort of *entweltlichtes Ich* that is criticized by Husserl, and it is part of the same rationalistic worldview which Husserl characterises as overly courageous. This paragraph contrasts both notions of subjectivity: the Husserlian transcendental subject and the subject that is presumed in the common view, which, for sake of disambiguation, I will call the Renaissance subject.

Husserl treats the Renaissance subject as belonging to a naive phase in history. 'Naivity' is one word he uses to describe the Renaissance spirit, alongside bold (*kühn*) and overly courageous (*überschwenglich*).[66] This overconfidence of the individual can be illustrated by the following quote from Giovanno Pico de Mirandola, an Italian humanist, who wrote, on behalf of God himself:

> "Ich habe dich nicht himmlisch noch irdisch, nicht sterblich noch unsterblich geschaffen, damit du dich frei, aus eigener Macht, selbst modellierend und bearbeitet zu der von dir gewollten Form ausbilden kann. Du kannst ins Untere, zum Tierischen, entarten; du kannst, wenn du es willst, in die Höhe, ins Göttliche wiedergeboren werden."[67]

Pico testifies of a positive belief in the possibilities of the human race, and illustrates the Renaissance spirit of optimism. The quote above places man on a scale of reason between animals and the divine. God provides the one end, as the "infinitely distant man" (Husserl).[68] Along with the natural world, man and eventually God were rationalized and mathematized, and thus brought within a sphere of human control. Influenced by such expressions by Pico, Petrarch and the like, Burckhardt and later Ritter and Simmel, understood the Renaissance as the period in which man was born as an autonomous subject, a proper individual, aware of his rational potential.

[66] *Krisis*, 6, 37.
[67] Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, *Über die Würde des Menschen*, ed. A. Buck (Hamburg, 1990), 7.
[68] Krisis, 67.

Subjectivity in *Krisis* denotes different things, but none of them the autonomous individual that is celebrated in Renaissance literature. Firstly, 'subjectivity' refers to the problem for which scientific method provided a solution: a plenitude of different opinions and observations.[69] Secondly, it denotes the sphere of the mind in general, the psychic as opposed to the physical world.[70] Lastly, and most importantly, it denotes Husserl's own understanding of subjectivity as the sphere of the human experience that is the basis of any relation to the world – that last definition informs his entire project.

When tracing the development of subjectivity alongside that of science, we can see with Husserl, that the role of subjectivity in the common view of landscape is overstated. Though presented as a sphere of autonomy and human freedom, the notion of subjectivity in the common view actually shuts the subject out of the world. The Renaissance subject reigns sovereignly over a world to which he is no longer really connected. To overturn the sovereign position of the subject in the common view of landscape, Husserl's account of the development of subjectivity can provide the necessary insights.

When contrasting the pre-scientific philosophy with modernity, subjectivity is compared to *doxa*.[71] Doxa is either mere opinion, but Husserl also equates it with everyday knowledge and self-evidence. Here, it hints towards the later rehabilitation of our everyday experience of the world as the point of departure for philosophical investigation – the phenomenological project. Subjectivity in this context means relativity, and has to do with mere appearances in the senses, in the way scepticism questioned all knowledge.[72] The Renaissance belief in the world as a rational system, warranted by God as principle of rationality, silenced these worries.[73] Though subjective, experiences could approach the ideal entities in the world. The opposition between rationality and subjectivity paved the way for an understanding of subjectivity as not just what is individual and personal, but any experience of the outside world through the senses.[74] Eventually, even empirical data were separated from the objective world:

> "Gleichwohl müssen auch diese Qualitäten, muß alles, was Konkretion der sinnlich anschaulichen Welt ausmacht, als Bekundung einer „objektiven" Welt gelten."[75]

As we saw, this problem finds its clearest expression in Descartes' search for certain foundations: there is no need to abstract thoughts and experiences away from the body *unless* there is already a

[69] "relativität der Subjektiven Auffassungen", Cf. *Krisis,* 27, 30, 32.
[70] „… das Seelische… das nach Ausschaltung des in die regional geschlossene Natur hineingehörigen animalischen und zunächst menschlichen Körpers übrig bleibt", *Krisis*, 64.
[71] *Krisis*, 11 and 66
[72] *Krisis,* 78.
[73] *Krisis,* 27.
[74] *Fülle* as opposed to extension.
[75] *Krisis,* 31.

distinction between the experienced, material objects, and the mathematical idealities and rational laws they obey. Descartes started out by bracketing the most evident certainty to a scientific presupposition. Understood in this way, subjectivity gains a wholly different overtone: its unlimited freedom and potential now reach into a meaningless infinity without any real touchstones. Rather than being in accordance with the world through reason, it has lost all ties to the world, being locked up in the soul, a 'residuum of an earlier abstraction' (*Residuum einer vorgängigen Abstraktion*).[76] With regards to the objective world, any representation it has thereof could as well be mistaken – experience can only provide *doxa,* opinions, and is rendered useless with regards to certain knowledge.

This subject, though, was precisely the Renaissance subject that is central to the traditional view of landscape, which presumes free, mental activity over and against an objective nature. The aesthetic appreciation of landscape, according to the common view, *requires* a 'step back' from the immediate experience, re-organising 'objective' features into an artistic whole. This is a subjective activity in every sense of the word: depending on personal preference, expressing individual perception, and a purely mental activity. In the common view of landscape, the separation of subjectivity from the world is valued positively: it is the domain where man is free, independent, and sovereign over his world – as Burckhardt correctly diagnosed when he spoke of a *'geistiges Individuum'.* This understanding of subjectivity sees the Renaissance subject as the result of a process of liberation: over time, man became increasingly autonomous, until he was able to take a fully distant position against the objective world. The same process that Husserl describes as an increasing devaluation of direct experience is presented as the development of human autonomy by the proponents of traditional landscape philosophy.

To escape the cage in which the subject is held captive, Husserl wants to turn around: rather than the 'objective world', the subject becomes the point of departure. Subjective experiences no longer appear as untrustworthy distortions of objective truth, they are to be the basis of a new science. Here, we come to the third notion of subjectivity: the transcendental subject that informs Husserl's phenomenological investigations.

4. The Paradox of Subjectivity

Husserl's notion of subjectivity, however, ends up facing another problem: the subject is at once in the world as a physical object, as a body, whilst the unity of self and world is given in consciousness, and is therefore something subjective. The distance to the world that characterised the Renaissance subject is overcome, and replaced by an immediate presence of world in the presentation of phenomena, but at the cost of 'subjectivizing' the world. It remains unclear how phenomenology, with

[76] Idem, 81.

its focus on mental phenomena, can counter solipsism: it is hard to see how the world presented in consciousness has any bearing on an objective reality. Or, as Husserl states it: everything objective changed into something subjective.[77]

This problem presents itself already, and acutely, with regards to spatiality. There is no reason why consciousness in itself should be spatial, so Husserl turns to body to show how awareness of space can come about.[78] Husserl discusses the visual field as something that is two-dimensional. In perception, the subject can only view one side of something at the time, as it is limited to a certain standpoint and perspective.[79] At the same time, Husserl demonstrates that we normally perceive things in their entirety, in spite of only seeing one side. For example, of a piece of paper, we also experience the backside, though we are not able to see it. But as is revealed in the phenomenological reduction, its immediate *presence* for us in experience cannot change the fact that we only have the appearance (*Erscheinung*) of one side.[80] The continuity of perception is needed to constitute actual things out of these appearances.[81]

The subjective perspective on a thing depends on the orientation towards the object.[82] This leaves us with a leap of faith when it comes to the synthesis of different viewpoints into one. At this point, Husserl turns to body. It is through movement that perception gains spatial orientation, and it is through a 'here', that I gain my distance or proximity to the things around me.[83] The spatial orientation is to account for directing towards things as well as the multiplicity of visual fields.

Thus, Husserl painstakingly regains spatiality through an analysis first of the thing, of which we can only perceive one side at the time; then vision, which is limited to a two-dimensional field; an lastly, the body, through the movements of which a continuous perceptions of fields constitutes the appearance of space:

> "Aber durch die Kontinuität der Phasen geht im Wechsel der Bilderfülle des visuellen Feldes Einheit der Wahrnehmung hindurch; die im kontinuierlichen Nacheinander zur Darstellung kommenden Objektkomplexe schließen sich im Einheitsbewußtsein zu einem umfassenderen

[77] *Krisis,* 183.
[78] Husserl, *Ding und Raum. Vorlesungen 1907* (Den Haag, 1973), §19-21. Compare Casey's argumentation that Husserl recovers place 'by way of body', E. Casey, *Fate of Place. A Philosophical Topography* (Berkely, 1998), chapter 10.
[79] Husserl, *DRV,* 44; E. Scheerer, "The Constitution of Space Perception: a Phenomenological Perspective" *Acta Psychologica* 63 (1986) p. 157-173, 164; P.S. Macdonald, "Husserl and the Cubists on a Thing in Space", *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 36 (2005) 258-276, 261.
[80] I translate *Erfahrung* with 'experience' here and *Wahrnehmung* with 'perception', a translation which does not hold for all Husserl's texts, but which does simplify the present argumentation. Cf. Husserl, *DRV,* 14. For the same point, cf. Boehm, *Perspektivität,* 109.
[81] Scheerer, "Constitution of Space", 164.
[82] Husserl, *DRV,* 131.
[83] On being 'here': Husserl, *DrV,* 165; Casey, *Fate of Place,* 225; Scheerer, Constitution of Space, 166.

> Objectkomplex zusammen, (…) so konstituiert sich in der Fortführung der Wahrnehmungskontinuität, die immerfort den Charakter einheitlicher Wahrnehmung hat, die Erscheinung des endlosen Raumes und der endlosen Welt.“[84]

However, this argument leaves space itself dependent on the things in it and on the consciousness of it for its constitution.[85] Empty space cannot be seen, but it appears instead as the ‘in between’ of things.[86]

Section 53 of *Krisis,* under the pregnant heading “Die Paradoxie der menschlichen Subjektivität: das Subjektsein für die Welt und zugleich Objektsein in der Welt“, formulates this problem in terms of the intersubjectivity of world. The world is the correlative part to the subjective perception, constituted as the counterpart of the intention. But how should a subject, which has the world intended in his consciousness, at the same time be conceived of as part of the world?[87] In the end, Husserl’s transcendental subject ends up in a solipsism similar to that he criticized in Descartes. The transcendental subject is united with the world only because the world has become a mental product of that subject.

The solution Husserl offers is worked out on two levels. First, he contrasts between subjectivity and people: we as people are real entities in the world, which means we are phenomena, and therefore subject to the same transcendental reduction. But subjectivity cannot be equated with ‘people’ in this sense. The epoché generates the insight that the ‘I’ as concrete person belongs in the constituted world: a world constituted by a subject that is more than the concrete ‘I’ in the world which deals with phenomena, and this is, again, a different level from the phenomena themselves.[88]

Secondly, the I is conceived of as a ‘primordial I’, an *Ur-Ich.* This solution starts from intersubjectivity: even in the epoché, the I still knows himself to be part of a community. The distinction between I and others becomes a phenomenon to be analysed. The world is recovered through acknowledging that the ego is part of a transcendental intersubjectivity that constitutes the world. On a deeper level, even this road fails to do justice to the extent to which the I is part of the intersubjective. In fact, the personal identity is maintained, and the contrast between ‘we’ and ‘I’ turns out to be appearance. The ‘other’ that the I encounters is in fact as much ‘I’ as the I himself. The actual, present I constitutes the others as others, and is therefore able to present himself to himself – the

[84] Husserl, *DRV,* 216. Cf: Macdonald, “Cubists”, and Scheerer, “Constitution of Space”.
[85] Casey’s argument that place, in Husserl, is recovered ‘by way of body’, is an apt illustration.
[86] Husserl, *DRV,* 261-2.
[87] *Krisis,* 183. I gloss over the fact that ‘subjectivity’ here refers to humanity, that is: not to a single subject. Husserl makes a point of intersubjective objectivity, but that goes beyond the scope of this thesis. On top of that, I believe the problem persists for a single subject.
[88] Husserl contrasts a encompassing ‘Ich’ (Subjective, cogitatio), with a concrete ‘Ichpol’ (that has the phenomena, an Ego). The relation between the two, which should be worked out in relation to intersubjectivity, unfortunately goes beyond the present aims. (See esp. §50, *Krisis*)

original other sustains, and is evidently in another way, on a different level, then the *phenomenal* others: this 'other' is part of the transcendental intersubjectivity that co-constitutes the world.[89]

At this point, Husserl proves himself a good heir to the German idealist tradition: the move he makes reminds of Fichte, who solves the problem of constitution by contrasting self-positing from opposing. The move that constitutes the self cannot be the same as that which constitutes the things the self encounters – that would render an infinite I. The thing cannot be fully derived from the act. Similarly, the other in Husserl's transcendental subjectivity exists as my counterpart which co-create the world.

The thing is that the move Husserl makes – apart from being very opaque – has little to do with the evidences and direct phenomena. The epoché is supposed to reveal what lies beyond the natural attitude, to investigate how phenomena are present to our consciousness, and to understand why this is so. The epoché that reveals the primordial I, on the other hand, reminds one of the way Descartes allegedly started with his goal assumed. Husserl proves too attached to the subject, and wants to maintain it, at the cost of bringing in different layers of subjectivity, and tacitly, different levels of world, as well. The lifeworld as the direct horizon of everyday life does not need an absolute subjectivity which constitutes it, nor does it need the sort of proof through intersubjective constitution. The first encounter with an 'Other' seems to precede the constitution of world, generating at least one horizon before the intersubjective world is created. The world that is created seems to have only the ontological structure of world, while not yet being concretely filled in. In fact, intersubjectivity is already part of the lifeworld, as these concepts are mutually interdependent.

Ultimately, the lifeworld does unite self and world in a way that surpasses the notion of subjectivity, and moreover, the entire distinction between subject and object. Husserl is at pains in trying to save both, but has to acknowledge the paradoxes that it leads to. His solution raises more questions than it answers. On the one hand, the lifeworld puts the primacy with the world, but Husserl wants to hold on to the subjective sovereignty inside of it. Had he completed his move, he would have ended up with a different notion of subjectivity, more akin to the Heideggerian *Dasein.*

5. Heidegger. Regaining *Erde*

Heidegger could be seen to complete the move that Husserl started when he turned the interest of philosophy from the *cogito* to the phenomena: Heidegger goes from the phenomena to the side of world, rather than that of 'subject'. His phenomenology deals with the phenomenon world. The notion of *Da-Sein,* intimately connecting world to the people in it, may serve as an illustration of this move. The focus on *Da-Sein* could be seen to draw the implications from Husserl's concept of lifeworld:

[89] My rendition of *Krisis*, §54.

subject and object are left behind, and the unity that Husserl sought in the intentionality of subjective consciousness is now worked out on an ontological level. I will argue that this insight into the relation between world and *Dasein* also informs the later critique of modernity that is found in Heidegger's collected *Vorträge and Aufsätze.* The texts there, partially lectures, criticize the modern approach to the world through science and technology, an attitude which can be designated as, at heart, objectifying. Heidegger's critique is in many ways very similar to that of Husserl in *Krisis:* both stress the primacy of method in the sciences, and though Heidegger works out this point in a different way, both conceive of modern science as *technè,* a craft rather than a genuine search for truth.

In placing the focus with world, rather than with the subject, Heidegger also offers new perspectives on landscape. The entire relation between man and world is turned around, to the extent that even speaking of 'relation' is problematized, as we will see. If Husserl allowed us to move beyond the idea of a world as an object, Heidegger allows us to see that who is in this world, is also not there as a subject.

Husserl and Heidegger seem to agree on their diagnosis of what is wrong in the natural sciences: both argue that the sciences have become a *τέχνη,* a method that carries on itself, rather than being motivated by genuine questions.[90] They also agree that the scientific stance towards the world is only one way of dealing with it, and not necessarily the one that yields the most insight. None of them dispute the truths of science, but they would agree that it is one-sided knowledge – think back on the *Fülle* that the sciences abstract away from. Heidegger argues that science is part of a technical way of dealing with the world, a way in which nature is challenged to deliver utility (*Nützlichkeit*). Objectification here gains a third sense: it designates a reduction to use-value, to economic utility. This is more akin to the kind of objectification that is criticized in feminist theory: the reduction to objective qualities by degree of their assumed value.

The primacy of world in Heidegger's thinking also undermines that notion of a sovereign subject constituting the world. This subject was at odds with Husserl's concept of lifeworld, which was mostly due to making every relation to the outside world a constitution of an object by a subject – never getting beyond a *gegenständliches Meinen* (objectifying meaning).[91] This chapter will first discuss in more detail the critique of science and technology and the implications of the scientific aim at objectivity: to a large extent, this is similar to Husserl's critique, but carried further, extending the critique to include any talk of objects or subjects at all. Secondly, the primacy of world in the notion of *Dasein* is discussed*,* as it accounts in part for the critique of science, and is central to the Heideggerian

[90] *Krisis*, esp. 57, and M. Heidegger, "Die Frage nach der Technik" in: M. Heidegger, *Vorträge und Aufsätze, GA 7* (Frankfurt a.M., 2000), 5-38, 23-24. (Henceforth: FndT)

[91] W. Del-Negro, "Von Brentano über Husserl zu Heidegger. Eine vergleichende Betrachtung", *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 7 (1953), 571-585, 574.

understanding of world. A beginning is made with the problematization of the common view of landscape. Thirdly, the *Dasein's* way of being in the world necessitates a new vocabulary, in which the feature of the world that it is *around* is playing a central role. Lastly, I will try to work out the implications that this has for landscape, arguing that the best re-interpretation of landscape in the common view is to conceive of it as awareness of *Erde* as the place where we belong. At that point, I will return to Husserl's concept of the *Erde* as *Urheimstätte,* as well.

5.1 The Scientific Worldview as Vor-Stellen

While Husserl had tried to criticize objectivity on account of forgetting its indebtedness to the subject in which original evidences had its place, Heidegger's account of scientific objectivity expands its argument to include the subject. Heidegger aims at elucidating the attitude that characterises the subject: the investigation of the world by modern science is treated as illustrative of an objectifying attitude in the reductive sense of the word. Put simply, science and technology are characterised parallelly: while technology reduces things to their utility, and people to users, science reduces things to objects (of research) and people to subjects. Illustrative of this idea is the following quote from *Die Frage nach der Technik:*

> "Wenn also der Mensch forschend, betrachtend der Natur als einem Bezirk seines Vorstellens nachstellt, dann ist er bereits von einer Weise der Entbergung beansprucht, die ihn herausfordert, die Natur als einen Gegenstand der Forschung anzugehen…"[92]

Man is demanded to take a certain stance towards nature, one that turns nature into an object (*Gegenstand*) of research. His attitude, which is probing (*forschend*) and considering (*betrachtend*) makes nature into a domain of proposition (*Vorstellen*).[93] What exactly that entails, can best be understood in connection to the analyses of Husserl above. Husserl demonstrated how nature was altered into a domain of idealities, which were universal and communicable – in spite of our everyday experience of difference: the garb of ideas that prioritizes the 'objective' representations over actual experience. Heidegger calls this the domain of 'proposition': *Vor-Stellen* is written with a hyphen, stressing that something is 'put in front', readily presented, as one would when pinning a butterfly on a board. In *Wissenschaft und Besinnung*, Heidegger characterises science as:

[92] Heidegger, FndT, 19.

[93] 'Proposing' is an awkward translation, but better then 'imagining', which sounds too much like phantasy. Also, 'proposing' has the advantage of including a sense of 'if', which is present in scientific hypothesis: if we propose that this rock has an ideal acceleration of 9,81 m/s², then it will fall to the ground in 3,1 seconds. This is the kind of mathematical abstraction of the world Husserl was getting at.

> "Die Wissenschaft ist eine und zwar entscheidende Weise, in der sich uns alles, was ist, darstellt.c"[94]

Science then, is not a practice, or a craft or profession, it is a way in which things 'present' themselves. Things present themselves for a subject, which looks upon them as objects. That *Vorstellen* should be understood as an objectification in the reductive sense, can be illustrated by the way Heidegger analyses '*betrachten*' – the other characterization of the researcher's attitude: he traces it back to the Latin *tractare,* which he translates as 'to work on', or 'to process' (*bearbeiten*). This processing of reality changes it into units processible for science, fitting into formulas and graphs, and secures it as proof for scientific hypotheses. For Heidegger, this is what scientific 'objectivity' is all about: turning reality into objects to fit procrustean natural laws. It helps to think of Francis Bacon here, who wanted to put nature on the rack to torture her into revealing her secrets. [95] Hypotheses will be posed until nature in some way refutes or confirms them: meaning that things in the world are being reduced to their measurable qualities relevant for this particular thesis. Physics, as Heidegger says in *Die Frage nach der Technik,* summons nature as a 'system of information'. [96]

In this system, 'objectivity', or *Gegenständigkeit* is the mode of appearance of things that corresponds to science.[97] The object is scrutinized in the light of a very specific question, through which research, in turn, reduces it to correspondingly specific properties. The answers are in that sense already limited to a very narrow range of options – and so too, the possibility of asking questions. Open questions are not very welcome in the natural sciences: their method requires that the questions they pose are narrowed down, answerable, which entails that the answer is sought in a relatively small field.[98] Heidegger, like Husserl, observes a priority of method in the modern sciences, and sees in it a tendency to control outcomes, or at least, to anticipate outcomes.[99] He equates 'method' with the way *Vorstellen* secures (*sicherstellen*) reality by capturing it in measurable quantities. The whole domain of reality thus becomes reduced to quantity is understood as calculability, quality as property, and causality is only relevant in so far as it entails predictability: "*Das Wirkliche zeigt sich jetzt als Gegen-Stand."*[100]

---

[94] M. Heidegger, "Wissenschaft und Besinnung", in *Vorträge und Aufsätze GA 7* (Frankfurt a.M., 2000), 39. (Henceforth: WuB)

[95] E. Jorink, *Wetenschap en Wereldbeeld in de Gouden Eeuw* (Hilversum, 1999), 92.

[96] Heidegger, FndT, 24.

[97] "Diesem gegenständigen Walten des Anwesens entspricht die Wissenschaft, insofern sie ihrerseits als Theorie das Wirkliche eigens auf seine Gegenständigkeit hin herausfordert." Heidegger, WuB, 50.

[98] WuB, 53.

[99] WuB, 52. In the priority of method, Heidegger also sees the pervasion of technology. Cf. R. Schaeffer, „Martin Heidegger und die Frage nach der Technik", *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung* 9 (1955), 116-127.

[100] WuB, 47.

Gegen-Stand, like *Vor-Stellen* above, is written with a hyphen, as an indication of another important characteristic: objects, as *Gegenstände*, stand opposite someone. As said, subject and object imply one another. This distinction remains in the background in *Wissenschaft und Besinnung,* but it is relevant to elucidate it in the present context.[101] Subject comes from the Latin *sub-jectum,* a translation of the Greek υπο-κειμενον, which means 'what lies under', or 'what is the basis of'. The word used to designate substance, and had nothing to do with human subjectivity.[102] That it does now, shows that man is supposed to be the foundation of the world – this can be seen in Husserl's account of how experience became understood as subjective, thus changing everything objective to something subjective; but the idea persists in Husserl's transcendental subject.[103] In the end, and in spite of Husserl's attempts to unite self and world, even the lifeworld is referred back to a primordial I in experience. The move to an acknowledgement of the primordial earth, and the lifeworld, halt in the insistence on subjectivity.

Vorstellen can also be understood as 'imagination', traditionally the realm of aesthetic creation: landscape can be located in Heidegger's critique of modern science as a *Gegen-Stand*. Firstly, it is located opposite someone, composed or proposed by a subject, in virtue of its aesthetic values. Landscape in the common view, in the light of Heidegger's analysis, appears as an objectification.

5.2 The Primacy of World in the Notion of *Dasein*

For Husserl, the primacy of phenomena and the intentional structure of consciousness safeguard the unity of self and world. In spite of that, the status of the world in relation to the subject remains in many cases difficult to determine. First, there is the problem of constitution: the subject constitutes the world, of which it is at once already an inhabitant. This tension can also be demonstrated with regards to the intentional object: while on the one hand, the objects are already out there, they simultaneously are only there for a subject, and exist only as they are grasped by an intentional consciousness as objects.[104] For example, Husserl argues that the backside of a sheet of paper is perceived along with its front side, in so far as it is intended along in the phenomenon of it for a subject's consciousness.[105] Though he focusses on the primacy of earth as the horizon of all experience, it is the subject that is understood in terms of this experience. Husserl's reduction renders the question of existence of the world redundant, focussing instead on meaning in phenomena – that distinguishes

[101] Heidegger mentions how the subject-object relation changes from *Gegenstand* into *Bestand,* in which the 'relation' between them reaches their actual character. WuB, 57.
[102] W.H. Pfleger, „Heideggers Kritik der Neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft und Technik, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 43 (1989) 641-655, 648.
[103] "… das Anwesende zum Gegenstand für ein Vor-stellen wird…", in WuB, 48.
[104] W. Del-Negro, "Von Brentano über Husserl zu Heidegger. Eine vergleichende Betrachtung", *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 7 (1953), 571-585, 574.
[105] Husserl, *DV,* 74.

him from Descartes. Yet one could argue that in this way, he loses the world out of sight, and turns his gaze inwards nonetheless.[106]

This idealism is exactly what Martin Heidegger wanted to overcome. He moves away from the very distinction between object and subject that had enabled it in the first place, and formulates the relation of self and world in terms that draw the two inextricably together. His point of departure is the *Dasein* in its dealing with the world, all three already present in the act. Through this dealing, the primacy comes to lay with the life the *Dasein* lives. The way in which the *Dasein* is in the world is contrasted with the way a body exists in space: the world is not a meaningless void. The *Dasein*, by contrast, lives in the world and understands it, showing this in the way he deals with it.[107] In this 'system', neither 'objects' nor 'subjects' have a place: these terms assume that they are interchangeable, and they allow for switches in perspective between the one and the other, while the ways of dealing of *Dasein* grant no priority to either thing or *Dasein* in a moment of action.

The way in which *Dasein* exists in the world is laid out in the second chapter of *Sein und Zeit* (henceforth: SuZ). Heidegger there determines the existential constitution of *Dasein* as Being-in-the-World (*In-der-Welt-sein*). He contrasts the way in which things 'are in' the world with the way a *Dasein* is 'in' it. The first is categorial, while in the second it is constitutive of the way *Dasein* is, and therefore, existential. It has nothing to do with spatial categories or locations of the physical body, but with the way they are together (being *with* is the next existential Heidegger defines). Heidegger also does away with any attempt of physical foundations for the world, because any ontic reference to 'spatiality' or 'corporeality' appals to *Dasein* as a thing in the world amongst other things. Rather, spatiality as an existential characteristic can only be understood from the structure of *Being-in-the-World.* In two sweeping sentences, human existence is tied to world in a way that blocks any ways out of it:

> "Der Mensch 'ist' nicht und hat überdies noch ein Seinsverhältnis zur 'Welt', die er sich gelegentlich zulegt. Dasein ist nie 'zunächst' ein gleichsam in-seins-freies Seiendes, das zuweilen die Laune hat, eine ‚Beziehung' zur Welt aufzunehmen."[108]

This allows for different 'ways' of being in the world – in ordinary language one would speak of 'relations to it'.[109] To think of *Dasein* as something that 'is' before anything else – in both senses of primacy – allows for the attitude Heidegger ridicules in the quote above: the idea that *Dasein* could

[106] It should be in so far as Husserl's reduction concerns *meaning,* while the Cartesian doubt concerns *existence.* Husserl's turn to the transcendental subject makes this question redundant. W. Soffer, „Husserl's Neo-Cartesianism", *Research in Phenomenology* 11 (1981), 141-158.
[107] M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen, 1967), §12.
[108] Heidegger, SuZ, 57.
[109] Much like the *Gegebenheitsweisen* that a lifeworld might provide of the same things, depending, for example, on cultural background.

relate to the world if and as it pleases.[110] Here, again, we can recognise the sovereign subject of the common view, that chooses to step out of his environment, and compose a landscape out of it. With regards to landscape, the landscape is far more than just that one *Augenblick* of composition. Landscape can, in terms of the argument above, be explained as objectification, not just of the world, but indirectly also of the self. To start from and stay with the phenomenon of world means to gain insight into a different way of being in the world, which prioritizes the way we deal with it (*Umgehen*) in everyday life. This could be the start for a new understanding of landscape.

5.3 The World as *Umwelt*

The way we deal with the things in the world is not in the first place a way of knowing: rather than an subjecting my chair to an inquiring look, I sit on it. My fingers blindly find the keys on my laptop. The primary mode of dealing is using or handling, according to Heidegger. This takes place in what he calls *Umwelt,* or the environment of everyday life.[111] This notion is close to that of Husserl's horizon, but the method of Husserl – that of reduction, is carried out in the opposite way. Husserl wanted to abstract away from the natural attitude towards things, moving towards the phenomena as they presented themselves – taking on a phenomenal attitude instead of the 'natural attitude'. Heidegger wants to proceed the opposite way:

> "Streng genommen ist diese Rede von einem Sichversetzen irreführend; denn in diese Seinsart des besorgenden Umgangs brauchen wir uns nicht erst zu versetzen. Das alltägliche Dasein ist schon immer in dieser Weise (…)"[112]

Heidegger goes on to determine the things we deal with in everyday life as tools, which we understand in their functioning, without having to determine them prior to picking them up and using them. The famous analyses of the hammering proves the case in point: the act of hammering is the most appropriate dealing with it, more so than knowing it or understanding the structure in which it functions. The image that forces itself to the fore is the slightly laughable professor who knows every detail of, say, an elephant, while never having actually encountered one.

Though in Heidegger's analysis it is not a focal point, this analysis of tools also sheds light on landscape by providing an account of the structure of spatiality. In Husserl, we encountered the problem of spatiality as pre-phenomenal, yet necessarily constituted on the basis of physical experience. For Heidegger, space becomes subordinate, again, to the world in which *Dasein* deals with things. Tools, to start there again, do not fill up a room as things that can be summed up. Their meaning

[110] It is not *Daseinsmäßig.* Boehm, *Perspektivität*, 79.
[111] *SuZ*, 67
[112] *SuZ*, 67

and appropriate place are prior to their coordinates in space. They are not like objects with a specific location in absolute space. Secondly, the room in which they are is not understood in a geometrically spatial way: the room is also conceived of as a tool, part of a bigger cohesion in which things have meaning. Heidegger provides an account of how things are in rooms: it is the room that is entered first, though the room itself is not thematic, and the chairs and tables are understood and dealt with, based on their being in place, in a certain room. The room, in turn, is already understood in the same way as part of the house in which I live.[113]

The same applies at a larger scale, to roads, and streets, street lamps and bridges. Things have their appropriate places, are in the right or wrong place, near, at hand, or far away. These distances, unlike those of perspective, are not mathematical: they can be called 'subjective', in a sense:

> "Das ist jedoch eine »Subjektivität«, die vielleicht das Realste der »Realität« der Welt entdeckt, die mit »subjektiver« Willkür und subjektivistischen »Auffassungen« eines »an sich« anders Seienden nichts zu tun hat."[114]

The distances are subjective in the sense that they are the product of everyday experiences rather than universally communicable, mathematical quantities. Thus, I will say that I live next to the station, indicating that it is very close by, but I will complain if a roadblock forces me to cycle twenty metres more. Or, more convincingly, perhaps, the often heard difference in perception of distances between Americans and Europeans: the latter find a two hour drive quite an investment, while for the former it is everyday reality, making the distances 'smaller'.[115] These experiences of proximity and distance are objective as any – they are the distances that we experience as most real in everyday life. This implies that the central perspective of landscape, which processes the things in the landscape and depicts them according to mathematical formulas, abstracts from the landscape as we experience it.

Moreover, while a room might be seen as a living-tool, the world at large itself is not conceived of in the tool-mode. This difference lies in the fact that the world is not seen as a thing in any way at all.[116] Again, Heidegger and Husserl share a good deal of their observations: while for Husserl, the world was tied to our history on it, as a sense-giving horizon, Heidegger uses the term *Verweisungszusammenhang* to characterize worldliness. This can be (though awkwardly) translated to 'nexus of indication'.[117] To continue with the example of tools, this 'web' includes their reasons and context, but stretching out to provide meaning beyond function: the hammer is there for the sake of

---

[113] *SuZ*, § 15.
[114] *SuZ*, 106.
[115] "abgeschätzte Entferntheit einem Seienden zugehört, zu dem man besorgend umsichtig hingeht", *SuZ*, 106.
[116] Neither *Vorhanden* nor *Zuhanden.* The world is of a different order.
[117] I could not find a better translation. Nexus of indication comes from L. Embree (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (Dordrecht, 1997), 742.

hammering in a nail, which is to construct a roof, which is for the sake of taking shelter from the rain. Eventually, the primary reason to do something is the *Dasein* itself, but the indications work in two ways.[118] The material of the tools (iron, wood, glass, stone) indicates the resources they are made of, and so ultimately points back to nature. This whole context remains unthematic and invisible in our everyday dealing with the world – yet we tacitly understand it and act upon it. Indeed, the world necessarily remains in the background, or we could no longer use tools in their appropriate, matter-of-factly way.

When *Dasein* deals with the tools, the most appropriate way is an almost instinctive dealing with them: the tailor grabs the cloth next to him, a needle in his mouth and his foot steadily tapping on the pedal. He need not direct his limbs consciously, rather he lets the things direct them in the direction of their purpose, and adapts himself to it. This way of dealing is called *Umsicht,* or circumspection: [119]

> "Der Umgang mit Zeug unterstellt sich der Verweisungsmannigfaltifkeit des "Um-zu". Die Sicht eines solchen Sichfügens ist die Umsicht."[120]

The *Umsicht* functions on the basis of understanding the *Umwelt* as described above. Environment as *Umwelt* has little to do with the natural environment of 'objective natural features', but everything with human life: *Umwelt,* like horizon, is that which grants meaning to the things in it.[121] In so far as the tools refer to nature, through their material or purpose (to provide shelter from rain), it is a very specific conception nature that is meant. Nature as it appears in these indications (rain, ore), derives its meaning from the same context in which these indications also appear. Thus, nature at this moment appears neither as objective matter, nor as sublime power nor as aesthetic, but instead as a product or resource. Landscape is explicitly excluded from this kind of disclosure (*entdecken*):

> "Diesem Naturentdecken bleibt aber auch die Natur als das, was "webt und strebt", uns überfällt, als Landschaft gefangen nimmt, verborgen."[122]

When nature is part of the nexus of indication, and part of world, there is apparently also another way that nature can exist in. Landscapes as compositions, as objects for an aesthetic eye, can be characterised as *Gegen-Stand* of a *Vor-Stellen,* as argued in the previous section. But nature can, apparently, also *take us aback,* or overwhelm us: Heidegger speaks of *überfallen*. Here, another way

[118] *SuZ*, 85.
[119] Translation derived from K.R. Martel, "The Narrative Subject and Place" (PhD diss. Duquesne University, 2011), 12.
[120] *SuZ*, 69.
[121] In fact, *Umwelt* can only be experienced (*Erlebt*).
[122] *SuZ*, 70.

that nature can present itself comes in sight. I will argue that, if anywhere, landscape belongs there. As we will see, for Heidegger, nature is tied closely to *Erde,* the earth. I will try to interpret landscape as being aware of the earth as the place where we humans belong, combining the insights of both Husserl and Heidegger with regards to earth.[123]

5.4 Landscape as Earth-Awareness

When we see the landscape, we experience first of all surroundings, the environment: but the experience of being in it makes it a distinct category. It seems that we have won the experience of being in the world and with the things, but along the way, the experience of landscape has been lost: the geometrical space of linear perspective yielded to *Umsicht* in which objects appeared primarily as tools.[124] Landscape was analysed as a verb, a process of objectification or abstraction. How, if at all, is it possible for the *Dasein* to experience landscape?

In the investigations up to this point, earth has remained largely out of sight. So too, in landscape, contradictory as that may sound. In starting from the everyday way of being in the world, world as 'nexus of indication', as a tacitly presumed horizon, showed that landscape in the common view was an abstraction. I believe that starting from world or horizon, the landscape can still be experienced, but the experience becomes different. The experience of a landscape is the experience of being together with my environment on the basis of the earth. The earth is thus defined as the ground of my co-belonging with the environment. To work this out, I have to briefly introduce the notions of *Erde* in Heidegger, and then in Husserl, as *Urheimstätte,* or *Ur-Arche.* I hope to demonstrate that ultimately, both notions refer in fact to belonging on earth, even though Heidegger characterises this as belonging to nature and Husserl as belonging to human history.

Heidegger does not make landscape thematic – he mentions it in passing a few times, as in the essay *Bauen, Wohnen, Denken.* In this essay, he investigates what *dwelling* means, and how it is related to building. Dwelling is the way in which mortals are on earth, even if we are usually unaware of this. We understand it habitually (*Gewohntes*):

> "Das Bauen als Wohnen, d.h. auf der Erde sein, bleibt nun aber für die alltägliche Erfahrung des Menschen das im vorhinein, wie die Sprache so schön sagt, »Gewohnte«."[125]

Being on earth as dwelling, and as building at the same time, can best be illustrated by Heidegger's example of a *Schwarzwald*-farm, which acknowledges the earth in the way that it is built. Because of that, living on that farm also heeds the earth:

---

[123] To what extent Heidegger refers to 'aesthetic' is not clear from this passage, but nature which overwhelms (*überfällt*) or takes one aback does sound like the experience of landscape as sublime (*Erhaben*) nature.
[124] Boehm, *Perspektivität,* 77.
[125] *BDW,* 149.

> "Hier hat die Inständigkeit des Vermögens, Erde und Himmel, die Göttlichen und die Sterblichen einfältig in die Dinge einzulassen, das Haus gerichtet. Es hat den Hof an die windgeschützte Berglehne gegen Mittag zwischen die Matten in die Nähe der Quelle gestellt. Es hat ihm das weit ausladende Schindeldach gegeben, das in geeigneter Schräge die Schneelasten trägt und tief herabreichend die Stuben gegen die Stürme der langen Winternächte schützt."[126]

The earth is heeded in the farm's location, between the meadows, near the well, the sky in the protecting rooftop. The mortal and the divine are also given their rightful place – they are allowed, let in things and places. To be a mortal, and dwell as one, is to reside in places in which the mortal, the divine, the sky and the earth have been let in. We reside at once with all these dimensions. Heidegger calls this the *Geviert,* but unravelling that concept would go beyond the purpose of this thesis. Instead, another building will take us into the landscape again: the bridge, as a built thing *(Baute*), also unites the *Geviert* by it, and more specifically, the earth *as landscape*:

> "Die Brücke versammelt die Erde als Landschaft um den Strom."[127]

That we see landscape, thus, means that we see the earth in a specific sense: as gathered (*Versammelt*) by a place. place is not in the sense of a standpoint, as in the common view: the place in the Heideggerian sense is prior to space, not a point in it. That sense of 'place' he calls *Stelle,* instead of *Ort. Stelle* are merely the result of coordinates. Places have meaning, *Stelle* do not. We understand the world around us in terms of places. Landscape is the appearance of earth as gathered by the bridge, which means that it is the appearance of the surrounding earth through places, which in turn *are places* by virtue of the fact that they gather earth. Landscape and earth are mutually dependent. We could not see the landscape without becoming aware of the earth, nor could we be aware of the earth without seeing landscape.

The notion of bringing the river, banks and land together is determined as *versammeln* (gathering, bringing together). What this means becomes clear only gradually. In *BWD 'versammeln'* is explained by referring to the Germanic "thing", a meeting. Heidegger asks to what extent the bridge is a 'mere' thing. Of course, it is in part a tool, and most people cross it in the everyday mode of *Umsicht.* But as a gathering thing, it also collects the *Geviert*. *Versammeln* can be understood as providing place, *eine Stätte verstatten.*[128] The bridge is more than a thing: it is also a place, because through it, the

[126] *BWD,* 162.
[127] *BWD*, 154.
[128] *BWD*, 156.

Geviert is let in a place. From this place, space at large is sorted (*eingeräumt*) by places, which means space is organised along with it:

> "Aus dieser Stätte bestimmen sich Plätze und Wege, durch die ein Raum eingeräumt wird."[129]

The environment of everyday life is characterised by places, which we understand in our dealing with them, our going towards them: the crossing of bridges to go to roads which lead to towns. This can be understood as the 'dwelling perspective' that Tim Ingold refers to. He interprets landscape not as aesthetic, but focusses on dealing with it in everyday life.[130] Similarly, Jeffrey Malpas speaks of a 'perspective of active engagement', as opposed to a 'passive 'point of view''.[131] The passive 'point of view' would be that which yields landscape, the contemplating gaze that takes itself to be not in the landscape, not dwelling, but apart – though Simmel and Ritter would disagree with the alleged 'passivity' of this point of view. What is important here, however, is that the 'point of view' is located in a place that does not belong to the space represented.[132] Instead, the point is placed opposite the space, whereas a 'dwelling perspective' would look around from within.[133]

In our everyday 'dwelling perspective', we are not aware of the landscape as such, of that in which the places are. From the bridge, I see roads going into the distance, to houses, churches and towns that I recognise – either as such, or as *my house,* a particular church or the town I was born. As soon as I become aware of this as landscape, the earth becomes visible as that on which I and my environment exist, together. The earth comes in sight as organising principle, present in built things that heed to it, which in turn, are places by which we, as human beings, reside. It is highly comparable to the way a house can reveal itself when our attention is directed away from our everyday mode of dealing, for example, due to something being out of place – the difference being that nothing is out of place on earth. The earth is home to everything on it.

> "Die Erde ist die dienend Tragende, die blühend Fruchtende, hingebreitet in Gestein und Gewässer, aufgehend zu Gewächs und Getier."[134]

Heidegger determines earth as nature, serving and supporting, blossoming and bearing fruit. It reminds of a 'mother earth', home to *Gewächs und Getier,* plants and animals. We understand them in virtue of their presence *on earth* – usually inexplicitly so. The fact that 'being on earth' is also what

[129] *BWD*, 156.
[130] T. Ingold, "The temporality of the landscape", *World Archaeology* 25 (1993), 152-174, 152.
[131] J. Malpas, *Place and Experience. A Philosophical Topography* (Cambridge, 1999), 51.
[132] G. Boehm, *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen. Die Macht des Zeigens.* (Berlin, 2007), 74.
[133] A point made by J. Gibson, quoted in T. Ingold, "The temporality of the landscape", *World Archaeology* 25 (1993), 152-174, 166.
[134] *BWD*, 151.

defines dwelling, suggests that *Erde* can be interpreted in a broader sense, namely, as where humans belong.

At this point, it helps to return to Husserl. In a late essay, he worked out a concept of earth as *Urheimstätte,* providing the ground for all sense, all understanding of self and world in relation to one another. Even if we were to leave earth, take a standpoint outside of it, all movement would still be understood relative to the earth. Husserl takes us on a flight with a bird, on spaceships and to distant stars, even builts an imaginary settlement on the moon, but the earth as source of meaning cannot be left behind. Humanity is not only tied to earth in the sense that nature provides for us – the Heideggerian focus on nature – but also in a historical sense. The whole history of humanity is tied to this earth and this earth alone. Even the conception of the earth as a body in space is a historical product, dependent on the history of humanity on earth. As a horizon, earth provides us with all possible forms of orientation, all forms of sense and meaning: it is on this earth that we belong.

The same move that makes me aware of being on earth renders the landscape visible, and the awareness of landscape at the same time is the awareness of the earth as grounding me and my environment. My orientation derives from earth, and that is how I can see landscape. Landscape is not oriented by a vanishing point, but broader, to the earth as supporting ground. I am at the same time *on the earth* and *in the landscape.* I am in a place, in an environment, with and in virtue of an orientation. When a landscape takes me aback, this means I become aware of the earth as at once the ground of my orientation in my environment, as well as the ground *of* that environment and the places in it.

Landscape, in this sense, is not a verb – at least, not one whose subject is human. Landscape happens when attention is drawn to the earth as that on which a person and his world are together: something that can happen almost anywhere, but is more accessible where the earth is more visible, i.e., literally open places. The relation I have to the places, my habitually passing by or my only first discovering them, derives its meaning from the earth. As the *Umsicht* gains priority in familiar environments, we are more aware of landscapes away from home: hence the attention to landscapes on holiday, where landscapes become a purpose in themselves. The landscape, is a 'belonging perspective' not necessarily restricted to being in a familiar environment, but rather in the sense that it brings into view the earth both as the environment a person is in, *and* as the ground of all orientation, as *Urheimstätte*. A 'belonging perspective', thus, in a double sense, which allows both for the experience of the world around us, and for the experience of *being in* this environment. There is no real distinction between the two, since the awareness of the earth requires landscape and the landscape requires awareness of the earth.

Conclusion

Ruisdael's mill cannot be seen like a painting: this has nothing to do with the fact that the original mill is no longer there, nor with the trees that block the view on it. Yes, when standing on the bank of the river, I am in another landscape, in another time and space than the painting tries to bring to me. But more importantly, the very idea of landscape as a painting, a mental composition or a cut-out requires an abstraction that requires me to leave the banks of the river behind, and step out of the world.

We started off with a common dissatisfaction: our common notion of landscape amputates it from the experience of inherence which demands justice. This experience has shown to be far from self-evident: that is, it has been overlooked in traditional landscape philosophy, that gazed into the distance, towards a vanishing point, and focussed primarily on the space that was opened by flight lines. Following the developments in landscape painting, the representation of landscape was equalled with the actual experience, granting the composition of paintings priority over the actual being in landscapes. I have demonstrated that this was an abstraction.

The understanding of landscape as an abstraction from experience was enabled by extending Husserl's critique of the sciences. The distance between self and world could be understood as a by-product of Cartesian dualism, that was undone by starting from the intentional structure of consciousness. With this recovery of world, the presuppositions of the common view and the development towards it became understood as a correlate of the development of science. Confronted with Husserl's notion of lifeworld, both the pre-given objective world and a sovereign subject proved untenable. Landscape cannot be understood as an object, or rather, to do so was shown to be an abstraction of the lifeworld.

However, since Husserl's idea of subject as transcendental turned out to be paradoxical, the next step required an even more thorough revision of self and world. The similarities between Husserl's and Heidegger's critique of the sciences provided a starting point, which lay in Heidegger's *Vorträge und Aufsätze.* Heidegger's critique of science suggested that landscape could be understood as an objectification similar to that taking place in the sciences, taking Husserl's critique of the abstraction of the world (in the 'garb of ideas') even further. It restructured the relation between self and world in a way that moved beyond the subject-object distinction altogether. The scientific mode of dealing with the world turned out to be highly similar to landscape. This allowed us to reconstruct a notion of landscape outside of the scientific mode of *Vorstellen,* starting from *Umsicht*. The familiarity with our environment could be brought back to the presence of earth, as the source of orientation. Landscape was then interpreted as the awareness of this earth as source of all orientation, and, borrowing Husserl's notion, as *Urheimstätte.*

The landscape as understood in the common view has been proven to rest upon untenable foundations. To replace it, I have built up a new notion of landscape, that starts from the experience of being in it, and having landscape around oneself. In turning my gaze away from the landscape in front of me, I have gained ground under my feet, and an understanding of landscape as an awareness of the earth. However, a host of questions remain: I have already pointed towards the status of the aesthetic dimension as worth of investigation, but related to this theme is the question to what extent this account of landscape can be brought into accordance with Heidegger's understanding of art and artistic objects. With regards to Husserl, I have left out of consideration where landscape as representation, as perceived of in the common view, should be located in his phenomenological system. His theory of cultural objects could provide insight in the weight of landscape in the common view. Lastly, of course, I hope the idea of landscape as awareness of the earth, which to my knowledge is entirely new, sparks further debate.

Bibliography

G. **Boehm**, *Studien zur Perspektivität* (Heidelberg, 1969).

G. **Boehm**, *Wie Bilder Sinn erzeugen. Die Macht des Zeigens.* (Berlin, 2007).

J. **Burckhardt**, *Die Kultur und Kunst der Renaissance in Italien* (Hamburg, 2013).

E. **Casey**, Fate of Place. A Philosophical Topography (Berkely, 1998).

W. **Del-Negro**, "Von Brentano über Husserl zu Heidegger. Eine vergleichende Betrachtung", *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 7 (1953), 571-585.

E. J. **Dijksterhuis**, *The Mechanization of the World Picture*, trans. C. Dikshoorn (London, 1969)

A. **Dinnebier**, „Der Blick auf die schöne Landschaft – Naturaneignung oder Schöpfungsakt?", https://d-nb.info/105931780X/34.

L. **Embree** (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (Dordrecht, 1997).

R. **Groh** and D. **Groh**, *Weltbild und Naturaneignung* (Frankfurt a.M., 1991).

M. **Heidegger**, *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen, 1967).

M. **Heidegger**, *Vorträge und Aufsätze, GA 7* (Frankfurt a.M., 2000).

J. **Himanka**, "Husserl's Argumentation for the Pre-Copernican View of the Earth", *The Review of Metaphysics* 58 (2005) 621-644.

G. **Hoffmann**, *Heideggers Phänomenologie: Bewusstsein - Reflexion - Selbst (Ich) und Zeit im Frühwerk* (Würzburg, 2005), 63-64.

J. **Humphreys**, "Husserl's Archeology of Exact Science", *Husserl Studies* 30 (2014).

E. **Husserl**, *Die Krisis der Europäischen Wissenschaften und die Transzendentale Philosophie* (Den Haag, 1976).

E. **Husserl**, *Ding und Raum. Vorlesungen 1907* (Den Haag, 1973).

E. **Husserl**, "Grundlegende Untersuchungen zum phänomenologischen Ursprung der Räumlichkeit in der Natur." In *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, ed. M. Farber (Cambridge MA, 1940), 307-325.

T. **Ingold**, "The temporality of the landscape", *World Archaeology* 25 (1993), 152-174.

E. **Jorink**, *Wetenschap en Wereldbeeld in de Gouden Eeuw* (Hilversum, 1999), 92.

T. **Kirchhoff**, "Landschaft" [Version 1.3]. In: Kirchhoff, T. (ed.): *Naturphilosophische Grundbegriffe*, accessed January 28, 2018, www.naturphilosophie.org.

T. **Lemaire**, *Filosofie van het landschap* (Amsterdam, 2007).

P.S. **Macdonald**, "Husserl and the Cubists on a Thing in Space", Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology 36 (2005) 258-276.

J. **Malpas**, *Place and Experience. A Philosophical Topography* (Cambridge, 1999).

K.R. **Martel**, “The Narrative Subject and Place” (PhD diss. Duquesne University, 2011).

R. **Milani**, “Contemporary Meaning of the European Landscape”, *Diogenes* 59 (2013).

Giovanni Pico della **Mirandola**, *Über die Würde des Menschen*, ed. A. Buck (Hamburg, 1990).

K.R. **Olwig**, “Recovering the Substantive Nature of Landscape”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 86 (1996), 630-653.

E. **Panofsky**, “Die Perspektive als „symbolische Form“ in: E. Panofsky, *Aufsätze zur Grundfragen der Kunstwissenschaft* (Berlin, 1980), 99-167.

W.H. **Pfleger**, „Heideggers Kritik der Neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft und Technik, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 43 (1989) 641-655.

J. **Ritter**, *Landschaft. Zur Funktion des Ästhetischen in der modernen Gesellschaft* (Münster, 1963).

R. **Schaeffer**, „Martin Heidegger und die Frage nach der Technik“, *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung* 9 (1955), 116-127.

E. **Scheerer**, “The Constitution of Space Perception: a Phenomenological Perspective” *Acta Psychologica* 63 (1986) p. 157-173.

M. **Schmeling** and M. **Schmitz**-**Emanz**, *Das Paradigma Der Landschaft in Moderne und Postmoderne* (Würzburg, 2007).

E. **Schrödinger**, *‚Nature and the Greeks' and 'Science and Humanism'* (Cambridge, 2014).

G. **Simmel**, „*Philosophie der Landschaft“,* in: *Brücke und Tür. Essays des Philosophen zur Geschichte, Religion, Kunst und Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart, 1957).

T. **Slevin**, Visions of the Human: Art, World War One and the Modernist Subject (London, 2015).

M. **Smuda** (ed.), *Landschaft* (Frankfurt a.M., 1986).

W. **Soffer**, „Husserl’s Neo-Cartesianism“, *Research in Phenomenology* 11 (1981) 141-158.

L. **Trepl**, *Die Idee der Landschaft. Eine Kulturgeschichte von der Aufklärung bis zur Ökologiebewegung* (Bielefeld, 2012).

L. **Učník**, The Crisis of Meaning and the Life-World : Husserl, Heidegger, Arendt, Patočka (Ohio, 2016).

G. **Visser**, *De druk van de beleving. Filosofie en kunst in een domein van overgang en ondergang* (Amsterdam, 2012).

G. **Visser**, *Water dat zich laat oversteken* (Amsterdam, 2011).