

Porteous, J. Douglas, *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990. Pp. xv, 227. Illustrations. \$40.00, (hard)

Brian S. Osborne

Volume 19, Number 3, February 1991

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017597ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017597ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Osborne, B. S. (1991). Review of [Porteous, J. Douglas, *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990. Pp. xv, 227. Illustrations. \$40.00, (hard)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 19(3), 233–234. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017597ar>

Porteous, J. Douglas, *Landscapes of the Mind: Worlds of Sense of Metaphor*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990. Pp. xv, 227. Illustrations. \$40.00, (hard).

Porteous' study is a reaction to a desensitized world dominated by consumerism, a "cretinous popular culture," "amiable mediocrity," and scientism. It is an investigation of the human condition in the Western world and an exploration of "the convoluted, intricate, and always rewarding landscape of our minds." The concern is not merely academic. Rather, Porteous is advocating a "more inter-subjectively loving relationship with the earth" to be achieved through the honing and transformation of the conscious at the personal and, hopefully, global levels.

Porteous is a geographer, and for him geography is "above all, the study of landscape, and a striving to be at home in our physical and social landscapes." But he wants more. Recognizing the dominance of visual constructs in people's identification with place, Porteous urges the exploration of non-visual and metaphorical constructs as foundation for his study. As is recognized by the author, much of this is redolent of Gerard Manley Hopkins' search for the complex of characteristics that went to make up the essence of things. Porteous-like, Hopkins lamented in his *Journal* how the "beauty of inscape was unknown and buried away from simple people and yet how near at hand it was if they had eyes to see it." And Porteous-like, Hopkins sought through his "inscapes" and "instress" the patterns and order that explain external forms and help explain the quality of living.

Clearly, all of the senses are necessary for this exercise and we have to go

beyond the dominance of sight. Thus, Porteous introduces us to "smellscapes" and "soundscapes" as additional components of the sensory world, while the psychological structures of the mind are approached through the worlds of metaphor found in literature. Indeed, while several authors are referred to, over half of the book is devoted to two writers, Malcolm Lowry and Graham Greene. For this reader, the book is worth the read simply for the imaginative and fertile interpretation and application of the minds of these two major literary figures. But there is more. Porteous uses these "exiled Englishmen" as particularly powerful guides to the "shadow realm" of six metaphorical landscapes of the mind. These are grouped in three paired antimonies: bodyscape and inscape; homescape and escape; childscape and deathscape.

These chapters constitute the springboard to launch into the world of "otherscapes" in order to "add to the reader's burden of awareness, to provide a counterweight to the unbearable lightness of being." Porteous' list of other consciousnesses is as daunting as it is imaginative: allscapes, blandscapes, dreamscapes, Godscapes, noisescapes, tastescapes, touchscapes and sexscapes. This exercise in neology stops short of "genitalandscapes," but the imagery is there.

Many readers may not be ready to identify factory chimneys, dockside bollards or water towers with phallic symbols, but for Porteous, "the body is a complex of components that metaphorically correspond with the component complex that is the natural landscape." He guides us through a forest of symbolic relationships between the human body and

the natural landscape. Having climbed so many mammary peaks and explored so many orificial caves, I can corroborate his assertion that the male monopoly of power has so often expressed itself in the imposition of a masculine lexicon of sexual toponymy.

For readers of this journal, Porteous' chapter on "deathscapes" may prove most challenging. It opens with the provocative assertion that "[s]ensitive persons are generally not enamoured of twentieth-century urban-industrial landscapes." Seen through the eyes of Porteous' Lowry, cities are defined in terms of filth, corruption, and evil, their ethic symbolized by an icon of "Jesus Christ driving a locomotive across a virgin forest." Graham Greene's view of the "underside of life" in "Greenland" and "Metroland" is no less daunting and results in a proposition and question: "Deathscape in the shape of the city, as we shall see, looms large. And if this is 'home,' should we not try to escape?"

But perhaps the most exciting contribution of this volume is its advocacy of a new way of looking—(I mean touching, feeling, smelling, hearing!)—at reality. Recent literature in the social sciences has been preoccupied with litanizing the deficiencies of "scientism" and eulogizing the insights of humanistic and qualitative enquiry. Both the central premise and organizational structure of this volume underscore the need for a liberalization of the social sciences. Porteous argues thus: "Despite the recent humanistic revolutions in psychology, sociology, and geography, society continues, as yet, to reverse technical science and remains skeptical of the insights to be derived from poetry, introspection, free association, and other 'unscientific' forms of knowing. This is ill

advised. It is not that the humanist calls for the overthrow of science, rather that more subjective modes of understanding and expression . . . should be given greater consideration." In this vein, he advances the lessons to be drawn from Lowry's near-schizophrenic blurring of self and lived-in environment. To be sure, Porteous recognizes that this might be dangerous for the individual, but he concurs with Heidegger's approach to "environmental humility," via a fusion of psychiatry, biography, ecology, and geography, that may serve modern Western society by breaking down our alienation from nature and ourselves.

Brian S. Osborne
Department of Geography
Queen's University

Noon, Alan, *East of Adelaide: Photographs of Commercial, Industrial and Working-Class Urban Ontario 1905-1930*. London, Ontario: The London Regional Art and Historical Museums, 1989. Pp. 179. Black-and-white photographs. \$29.95.

East of Adelaide represents a labour of love: the retrieval from obscurity of 1200 surviving negatives produced by Henry Hines, a commercial photographer active in London, Ontario, between 1906 and 1929, and the subsequent restoration of approximately 400 of these negatives by Alan Noon of the University of Western Ontario. This process began in 1971 and culminated with an exhibition of Hines' work at the London Regional Art Gallery in 1987 and with the publication of this book two years later. Researchers who wish to examine the negatives may want to know that they are part of the Regional Collection at Western's D.B. Weldon Library, though, unfor-

tunately, the book assumes that its readers will know this essential information.

Librarian-archivist Edward Phelps of the University of Western Ontario has characterized the Hines collection as a " tantalizing peep-hole into the rich texture of the world we have lost . . . a challenge to the academic and social historian to take proper notice of the photograph as a document." Unlike many other collections of commercial photography, which consist largely of formal portraiture, the Hines negatives document a rich variety of non-portrait subjects: people at work, such as auctioneers, barbers, bartenders, blacksmiths, butchers, McCormick's chocolate makers, cobblers, deliverymen and their vehicles, firemen, and garage mechanics; working-class families and interior views of their homes; advertising displays in store windows and at London's annual Western Fair; the electrification of the city's factories, businesses and homes; and recreational activity at such places as Springbank Park and Port Stanley. Obviously, the passage of time has altered perceptions; during the 1920s, Hines himself probably regarded the photographs essentially as his means of making a living, but in the 1990s they have become potentially significant historical documents for researchers.

One of the strengths of *East of Adelaide* is the manner in which it overcomes the problem that the negatives, when recovered, lacked accompanying documentation. The book supplies a brief and informative biography of Hines, as well as a series of thematic notes about the photographs, and captions which, while avoiding the problem of over-elaborating what is already evident in each photograph, carefully read each

image for evidence which is then linked with information from other sources like newspapers and city directories. By drawing our attention to such details as the number of men wearing prostheses as the result of industrial accidents, the text emphasizes the power of photographs to document aspects of urban life that may not be readily evident in any other source.

Like many labours of love, however, *East of Adelaide* suffers from the fact that it assumes that Hines is significant merely because he has been rescued from obscurity, and fails to establish critical perspective on his work. For example, the book refers to "the uptown society photographers, whose ranks he [Hines] apparently never achieved." Just which of London's photographers are we talking about here: Frank Cooper, the Edy brothers, J. K. O'Connor, Westlake and Company, E. J. Sanders? And do sufficient quantities of their work still exist, both to justify the gratuitous label of "society photographers" and to allow meaningful comparisons to be made with Hines' work? Unless these questions can be answered, this phrase remains nothing but an unsupported generalization that fails to place Hines in context. Other sweeping statements, such as "[t]he history of Ontario and its urban centres is, for the most part, a record of the upper class and the wealthy," sacrifice accuracy as they strain to establish Hines, almost by default, as someone whose work was different and therefore important. Finally, the statement concerning the acquisition of "the entire collection" in 1978 should be clarified. The same donor, John K. Johanneson, in fact donated 168 negatives to the National Archives of Canada in 1971, seven years before donating the