



DATE July 23, 2023
LOCATION Puzhehei Village, Yunnan Province, China
PHOTOGRAPHER Xiang Zhou

Puzhehei Village, sitting in the center of Puzhehei Scenic Area, is surrounded by a beautiful natural system of mountains and waters such as Qinglong Mountain and Puzhehei Lake and famous for her unique landscape of karst lacustrine wetlands.

Landscape-based Heritage Research and Practice

Xiang ZHOU^{1,*}, Ji LI², Yifei LIU³

¹ Department of Landscape Architecture, School of Architecture, Southeast University, Nanjing 210096, China

² Department of Architecture, School of Architecture, Southwest Jiaotong University, Chengdu 611756, China

³ Department of Urban Planning and Design, School of Landscape Architecture, Beijing Forestry University, Beijing 100083, China

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Address: Digital Landscape Laboratory, Yifu
Architecture Building, Southeast University, Sipailou
No. 2, Xuanwu District, Nanjing 210096, Jiangsu
Province, China

Email: plg1123@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

As a modern concept of cultural practice, “heritage” reflects the ways through which different nation-states understand and construct their own values. Accompanied with the emergency and development of “cultural landscape” concept, the relevance between heritage and landscape has greatly changed how people recognize heritage values, and cultural landscape becomes a specific type of heritage in related research and practice. From the holism perspective of Historic Urban Landscape, practices attempt to interpret the values of heritage by regarding landscape as medium, which helps integrate heritage resources into the overall planning of urban development. From the diversity perspective, the emphasis of the relevance between heritage and landscape promotes the academic system construction on landscape-based heritage research and practice. Heritage landscape research in digital era sees promising potential, meanwhile needs more efforts to address basic technique problems.

RECEIVED DATE

2023-08-18

KEYWORDS

Heritage Value; Way of Perception; Cultural Landscape; Historic Urban Landscape; Digital Era

EDITED BY Yuting GAO, Tina TIAN
TRANSLATED BY Yuting GAO, Tina TIAN

1 Understanding Cultural Landscape From the Relevance Perspective

“Heritage” is a modern concept inspired by the Enlightenment. As a cultural practice, the nature of heritage involves a range of understandings and building of values, as well as the process of becoming norms^[1]. The number of designated heritages in different national-states worldwide has risen since the latter half of the 20th century. The UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (“the Convention” hereafter) developed in 1972 is a milestone in the development and institutionalization history of the authoritative heritage discourse—it has not only established an international

certification and protection system for natural and cultural heritages with outstanding universal values, but also promoted the existence of heritage towards an important international issue and institutionalized the conservation ethic dating back to the 19th century. Meanwhile, heritage protection objects witnessed a stronger relevance to landscape. Demonstrated in the Convention, heritage includes the “combined works of nature and man,” which gave rise to cultural landscape, a special heritage type.

In the early 20th century, Carl Sauer, an American geographer, first explicitly defined cultural landscape; subsequently, Otto Schlüter, a German geographer, stressed the role of culture in forming landscapes and suggested a distinction between cultural landscapes and natural landscapes^[2] in the study of regional

settlement patterns and their scientific categorization. His idea prompted the identification of different landscape areas based on the relevance between landscape and environment, and the enrichment of the connotation of cultural landscape by combining “culture” and “landscape”^[3]. At the end of the 20th century, Swedish geographer Don Mitchell pointed out that “the mechanics of landscape production” is the key to understanding landscape^[4]. In his view, landscape, as a cultural practice, is a socio-political process of naturalizing, reproducing, and transforming social or cultural relations, thus landscape should be defined according to the locals’ behaviors, activities, and performances^[4]. Influenced by such ideas, American geographer Kenneth Olwig proposed that landscapes are the history of humans’ cultural practices and changes of values, and the landscape-based heritage research and practice should emphasize landscape’s relevance to locality, community, regulations, and customs^[5]. Therefore, the proposal and development of cultural landscape has enhanced the relevance between heritage and landscape, and greatly expanded people’s perception of heritage values^[6].

The research evolution above has been accompanied with the increasing attention on heritages with cultural landscape attributes, and the term “cultural landscape heritage” has emerged in relevant research and practice. To the nature of heritage, cultural landscape becomes an approach to promoting landscape management and heritage conservation; while to the scope of heritage, cultural landscape expands to regional scales and goes beyond the elitist valuation towards focusing on ordinary landscapes or even degraded landscapes. This is in line with the idea of interpreting landscape from the relevance perspective (as emphasized in the European Landscape Convention issued in 2000) and the notion that more and more nominated properties in World Heritage List may not be the monuments in a traditional sense (as highlighted in the Outstanding Universal Value published in 2008). The Law of the People’s Republic of China on the Protection of Cultural Relics (Revised Draft) publicized in November 2020 firstly clarified the legal protection status of the new types of cultural relics (e.g., cultural landscapes), opening a new horizon for the research on cultural landscapes from the relevance perspective.

2 Interpreting Historic Urban Landscape From the Holism Perspective

The year 2021 marks the 10th anniversary of UNESCO’s *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*. Under the impact of globalization, numerous cities’ cultural heritage and

historical patterns have been eroded, losing urban memories and urban identities. As the conflicts between heritage conservation and modern development escalate in global society, the concept of Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) was proposed to shift the emphasis of heritage conservation from the protection of monumental architecture to the construction of city life and values, so as to incorporate cultural heritage into the core of urban spatial development^[7]. As a new trend among recent heritage studies, HUL transcends the traditional history-centered notion to encompass a more inclusive urban context and geographical environment. HUL not only helps understand the full life cycle of historic urban areas, but also provides a holistic approach to guiding the practice about historic landscapes amidst the contradictions between conservation and development. Influenced by the concept of landscape, HUL offers a paradigm for the research and practice of heritage conservation^[8].

Internationally, the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITRAP) take the lead in promoting the application of HUL in cultural heritage conservation practice. Representative pilot projects include the World Heritage-designated cities on the Swahili Coast in East Africa (e.g., the Island of Mozambique, Stone Town in Zanzibar, Lamu in Kenya); European historic cities (e.g., Amsterdam in Netherlands, Naples in Italy), and WHITRAP pilot cities (e.g., Rawalpindi in Pakistan, Cuenca in Ecuador, Ballarat in Australia, Shanghai and Suzhou in China). Recently, the research and practice of HUL have also been integrated in the conservation planning of historical and cultural cities/towns in China such as Beijing, Pingyao, and Lijiang^{[9]~[11]}. Such practices interpret the connotation of landscape regarding landscape as a medium, covering elements, values, stakeholders, and implementation procedures, and also clarify that cultural heritage conservation should focus on the value preservation and inheritance system and improve citizens’ life quality and their heritage management ability, so as to integrate heritage resource into the overall planning of urban development.^[12]

3 Exploring Heritage and Landscape From the Diversity Perspective

The year 2022 enters the 50th anniversary of the Convention. From an initial consensus to today’s complex system of terms, norms, and institutions, World Heritage has symbolized human civilization continuance and the world’s sustainable development. The development of World Heritage has shifted from the integral

restoration of “historic landscape” to the dynamic management of “urban landscapes.” Not only should the contemporary heritage conservation focus on the diachronicity of history, but it also needs to pay attention to the synchronicity and spatial characteristics of landscape elements in each temporal section. The concept of landscape emphasizes holism and relevance since its emergence. The holism perspective drives the advance of cultural heritage conservation methods, leading to practices of greater relevance, holism, and dynamics. In Western cultural contexts, landscapes and aesthetic practices are always associated with certain ideologies that give cultural, aesthetic, and sociological meaning to landscapes. Thus, landscape carries traditional social aesthetic values and exhibits the relevance to economy, culture, and ecology^[13]. In the context of global urbanization, landscape emphasizes a holistic understanding of economic, social, cultural, and natural spaces in heritage conservation and management, and a holistic view that combines and applies multidisciplinary knowledge hierarchies. Thus, landscape-based heritage research and practice contribute to a better exploration of human-environment interactions upon locality and the related dynamics and management, as well as the possibilities and challenges of public participation in such interactions^[14].

From “cultural heritage” to “cultural landscape,” from historic city to historic urban landscape, landscape-based heritage research and practice, as a concept and a method, are constructing a productive academic system. The speculation of the relationship between nature and culture led to the birth of cultural landscape concept; the understanding of spaces and communications enriched the typologies of cultural routes and heritage corridors; the mediation of the conflicts between the traditional and the modern stimulated the views on HUL; and the concerns on the urban-rural dichotomy resulted in an extensive discussion about rural landscape heritage and sustainable development. In recent decades, landscape has been studied by different disciplines including landscape architecture, urban and rural planning, architecture, cultural geography, archaeology, ecology, psychology, and sociology. This trend enhances the synthesis and diversity of landscape research, and also promotes multi-disciplinary studies, multi-stakeholder participation, and multi-entity governance in associated fields.

4 Heritage Landscape Research Towards Future

Recently, digital technology plays an increasingly important role in heritage research and practice. New infrastructure, data, and approaches (e.g., the Internet of Things, big data, and artificial

intelligence) are profoundly changing the city and the ways we see the city. All of these are bringing existing opportunities to landscape-based heritage research and practice. The International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) General Assembly took “protecting and interpreting cultural heritage in the age of digital empowerment” as one of the core topics, suggesting that digital conservation has become an emerging interest in contemporary heritage landscape research and practice. Carl Doersch et al.^[15] found that people are sensitive to the geo-informative characteristics of visual environment. Through computational geo-cultural modeling that is featured with geo-cultural visual reference, their research shows that digital technology can help us better respond to basic questions in heritage conservation—how to understand and utilize historical space, and how historical space affects people’s behaviors. In digital era, heritage landscape research supported by information technology is of great potential, and quantitative research of the spatial elements and characteristics of heritage landscapes will help improve traditional heritage research in width and depth.

At present, conflicts between urban conservation and development still intensify along with global urbanization. HUL needs to keep its focus on the preservation of historic spatial structures, maintenance of traditional community networks, and promotion of socio-economic development. Despite its promising potential, digital technology is still inadequate to respond to fundamental technical problems, for example, how to determine the value, authenticity, and integrity of heritage landscapes. In other words, digital technology at present can only be an assistive tool to our research. How to utilize new technologies to deepen our understanding of heritage landscapes, to enhance the efficiency of heritage management, and to keep and spread the heritage information and knowledge to future generations are common issues that need to be continuously explored.

REFERENCES

- [1] Smith, L. (2006). *Use of Heritage*. Routledge.
- [2] Whitehead, J. (1981). *Urban Landscape: Historical Development and Management*. Academic Press Inc.
- [3] Conzen, M. P. (1990). *The Making of the American Landscape*. Routledge.
- [4] Mitchell, D. (1994). Landscape and surplus value: The making of the ordinary in Brentwood, CA. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, (12), 7–30.
- [5] Olwig K. R. (1996). Recovering the substantive nature of landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 86(4), 630–653.
- [6] Liu, Y. (2015). Three dimensionalities of value inspired by cultural landscape: Take World Heritage Cultural Landscape as example. *Landscape Architecture*, (8), 50–55.
- [7] Li, J., Jing, F., & Shao, Y. (2022). Global practices of the UNESCO Historic Urban Landscape: Ten-year review and insights for Chinese urban heritage protection. *City Planning Review*, 46(11), 90–98.
- [8] Liu, Y. (2017). Historic Urban Landscape. *Landscape Architecture*, (6), 4–5.
- [9] Li, J., Krishnamurthy, S., Pereira Roders, A. R., & van Wesmael, P. (2021). Imagine the Old Town of Lijiang: Contextualising community participation for urban heritage management in China. *Habitat International*, (108), 102321.
- [10] Lv, Z. (2022). Cognition and protection of Beijing central axis from the perspective of Historic Urban Landscape. *Landscape Architecture*. 29(4), 20–25.
- [11] Shao, Y., Hu, L., & Zhao, J. (2016). A research on the conservation plan of the human-habitat World Heritage: Case study of Pingyao Ancient City. *Urban Planning Forum*, (5), 94–102.
- [12] Veldpaus, L., & Pereira Roders, A. R. (2017). Historic Urban Landscape Approach as a Tool for Sustainable Urban Heritage Management. In: S. Asikainen, C. Brites, K. Plebańczyk, L. Rogač Mijatović, & K. Soini (Eds.), *Culture in Sustainability: Towards a Transdisciplinary Approach* (pp. 62–74). University of Jyväskylä.
- [13] Zhou, X., Liu, Z., & Shi, J. (2022). Evaluation on visual landscape perception under the support of digital footprint: A case study of Historic Urban Landscape of the Qinhuai River Area. *Landscape Architecture*, 29(9), 18–25.
- [14] Stenseke M. (2018). Connecting ‘relational values’ and relational landscape approaches. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, (35), 82–88.
- [15] Doersch, C., Singh, S., Gupta, A., Sivic, J. & Efros, A. A. (2012). What makes Paris look like Paris?. *ACM Transactions on Graphics*, 31(4), 1–9.

基于景观的遗产研究与实践

周详^{1*}，李骥²，刘祎绯³

- 1 东南大学建筑学院景观学系，南京 210096
2 西南交通大学建筑学院建筑系，成都 611756
3 北京林业大学园林学院城乡规划系，北京 100083

*通讯作者
地址：江苏省南京市玄武区四牌楼2号东南大学逸夫建筑馆数字景观实验室
邮编：210096
邮箱：plg1123@yahoo.com

摘要

作为一种关于文化实践的现代概念，“遗产”体现着不同民族国家对于特定价值的理解与建构方式。随着“文化景观”概念的提出与发展，遗产与景观的关联极大扩展了人们对于遗产价值的认知方式，文化景观也成为相关研究与实践中的一种特定遗产类型。历史性城市景观的整体性视角使相关实践尝试从景观载体的角度解读遗产的价值内涵，并将遗产资源纳入城市发展的整体规划框架。在多元化视角下，对遗产与景观的关联性的强调推动了对基于景观的遗产研究与实践的学术体系构建。在未来，数字化时代遗产景观研究拥有巨大的价值和潜力，同时也需解决相应的基本技术问题。

关键词

遗产价值；
认知方式；
文化景观；
历史性城市景观；
数字化时代

收稿时间

2023-08-18

编辑 高雨婷，田乐
翻译 高雨婷，田乐

1 关联性视角下的文化景观

“遗产”是受到启蒙思想影响而诞生的现代概念。作为一种文化实践，遗产的本质涉及一系列关于价值的理解与建构，及其不断被纳入规范化的过程^[1]。20世纪后半叶，全球各民族国家被认证的遗产数量激增。联合国教科文组织（UNESCO）于1972年颁布的《保护世界文化和自然遗产公约》（以下简称《公约》）便是在权威遗产话语体系发展和制度化过程中的一座里程碑：它不仅确立了对具有突出普遍价值的文化与自然遗产进行认证和保护的国际制度，还将遗产的存在确定为一个重要国际议题，并以制度化的形式进一步发展始于19世纪的保护理论。与此同时，遗产保护的对象与景观的关联性也逐步加强。《公约》所阐释的遗产保护范畴包括了“人与自然共同的作品”，随后在此基础上产生了“文化景观”这一特定遗产类型。

20世纪初，美国地理学家卡尔·索尔首次明确定义了文化景观。随后，德国地理学家奥托·施吕特在研究区域聚落形态及其科学分类时，呼吁人们充分认识文化在景观形成过程中的作用，并建议明确区分文化景观与自然景观^[2]。这促发人们基于景观与环境的关联性来确定不同的景观区域，并将“文化”与“景观”相结合，进一步拓展了文化景观的概念^[3]。20世纪末，瑞典地理学家唐·米切尔指出“景观的产生机制”才是理解景观的关键。在他看来，景观是一种关于社会或文化关系自然化、再生产和转化的社会-政治过程，因此应当根据在地性的行为、活动和表现来定义景观^[4]。受其影响，美国地理学家肯尼斯·奥维提出景观是人

们的文化实践方式及价值变迁的历史，基于景观的遗产研究与实践应当重视景观与地方性、社区和法规习俗的关联性^[5]。因此，“文化景观”概念的提出与发展不仅增强了遗产与景观的关联性，也极大扩展了人们对于遗产价值的认知^[6]。

受上述研究转向的影响，许多拥有文化景观属性的遗产日益受到关注，“文化景观遗产”一词也逐渐出现在相关研究与实践中。在遗产的性质层面，文化景观逐渐扩展为一种促进景观管理和遗产保护的途径；在遗产的范畴上，文化景观则扩大到区域空间尺度，并突破精英化的价值认定，开始将日常景观甚至是退化的景观纳入研究。这与2000年颁布的《欧洲景观公约》中强调的通过关联性视角看待景观的理念，以及2008年发布的《什么是突出普遍价值》报告中指出的可能越来越多提名列入《世界遗产名录》的遗产不再是传统意义上的文物古迹的理念等相符。2020年，《中华人民共和国文物保护法（修订草案）》首次明确了文化景观等新型文物类型的法定保护地位，这标志着关联性视角下的文化景观研究已经进入到一个全新的时代。

2 整体性视角下的历史性城市景观

2021年，UNESCO的《关于历史性城市景观的建议书》颁布10周年。在全球一体化浪潮的冲击下，众多城市的文化遗产和历史格局被侵蚀，城市记忆与城市特质正在变得模糊。随着遗产保护与现代发展的矛盾冲突在国际社会不断升级，历史性城市景观（Historic Urban Landscape，HUL）

概念的提出旨在将遗产保护的重心进行转移——从保护纪念性建筑转移到构筑城市生活的城市价值，从而将文化遗产纳入城市空间发展的核心内容^[7]。作为遗产研究领域近年来的新思潮，HUL超越了传统“历史中心”的概念，涵盖了更为丰富的城市背景及其地理环境；其不仅有助于理解城市历史地段的全生命周期，还提供了一种在保护与发展的矛盾中指导历史景观相关工作的整体性方法，是遗产保护领域受到景观理念影响的典型研究与实践代表^[8]。

国际上，世界遗产中心与亚太地区世界遗产培训与研究中心（WHITRAP）率先推动了HUL在文化遗产保护中的实践应用。代表性试点项目包括东非斯瓦希里海岸世界遗产城市保护（如莫桑比克岛、桑吉巴尔石头城和拉穆古城），欧洲城市保护发展（如荷兰阿姆斯特丹、意大利那不勒斯），以及WHITRAP全球性试点项目（如巴基斯坦拉瓦尔品第、厄瓜多尔昆卡、澳大利亚巴拉瑞特、中国上海和苏州）。近年来，HUL的研究和实践也更多地被纳入中国北京、平遥和丽江等历史文化名城的保护规划工作中^{[9]-[11]}。这类实践尝试从景观载体的角度解读景观的概念及其方法内涵，囊括了要素、价值、相关群体和执行程序等方面；也进一步明确了文化遗产保护不仅要关注遗产的价值保护与传承体系，还要提升居民的生活品质和遗产管理能力，并将遗产资源纳入城市发展的整体规划框架^[12]。

3 多元化视角下的遗产与景观

2022年是《公约》诞生50周年。从最初的一纸共识到今天由一系列术语、规范与制度构成的复杂体系，世界遗产已经成为人类文明赓续和世界可持续发展的风向标之一。纵观世界遗产的发展进程，从对“历史风貌”的完美复原，转向对“城市景观”的动态管控；当代遗产保护在注重历史纵向“历时性”过程的同时，还应关注每一个时间断面上景观要素的“共时性”和空间特性。景观的概念自诞生之日起便具有综合性与关联性的特征。景观的综合性视野推动着文化遗产保护方法不断发展，催生出更具关联性、整体性和动态性的文化遗产保护实践。在西方文化语境中，景观和审美实践总是与特定的意识形态相关联，从而使景观产生文化、美学与社会学上的意义。在这种语境下，景观不仅承载着传统的社会审美价值，经济、文化、生态等要素在景观维度上展现出关联性^[13]。而在全球城市化的语境中，景观强调在遗产保护与管理过程中对于经济、社会、文化和自然空间层积性的整体把握，是多学科知识体系交叉运用的整体观的集中体现。因此，基于景观的遗产研究与实践有助于人们更好地理解以地方性为基础的人与环境的互动及其动态过程与管理，以及公众参与的这类互动的可能性和挑战^[14]。

从“文化遗产”到“文化景观”，从“历史城市”到“历史性城

市景观”，基于景观的遗产研究与实践作为一种理念与方法，正在建构起一个丰富的学术体系。对于自然与文化关系的思辨，产生了文化景观的概念；对于空间和交流的理解，催生出文化线路与遗产廊道的类型；对于传统与现代之间矛盾的调和，衍生出HUL的观点；对于城乡二元发展困境与出路的关怀，则促成乡村景观遗产与可持续发展议题的广泛讨论。近几十年来，景观已经成为风景园林学、城乡规划学、建筑学、文化地理学、考古学、生态学、心理学、社会学等学科的研究对象。这一发展趋势进一步增强了景观研究的综合性与多元性，相关领域的研究和实践也明显呈现出学科交叉、多方参与和多元共治的特点。

4 面向未来的遗产景观研究

近年来，数字技术在遗产研究与实践中扮演着愈发重要的角色。以物联网、大数据和人工智能为代表的新基建、新数据、新方法的迅猛发展正深刻地影响、改变着城市及人们看待城市的方式，并为基于景观的遗产研究与实践带来了变革可能。2017年，第19届国际古迹遗址理事会全体会议将“数字赋权时代的文化遗产保护和阐释”作为会议核心议题之一，这表明数字化保护已成为当代遗产景观研究和实践的新兴领域与重要趋势。卡尔·杜尔施等人^[15]的研究发现，人们对于视觉环境中的地理信息特征非常敏感；通过建构一种以地理文化视觉参照为基础的“计算性地理文化建模”方法，发现数字技术可以帮助我们更好地回应遗产保护的基本问题——人们如何理解和使用历史空间，历史空间又以何种方式影响人群的行为。信息技术支持下的遗产景观研究是数字化时代遗产保护中最具成长潜力的学术领域之一，而依托数字技术对遗产景观的空间要素与景观特征进行量化解析将有助于拓展传统遗产研究的广度与深度。

当前，全球城市化进程中的城市保护与发展之间的矛盾胶着不下。保护历史性空间结构、维持传统社区网络与促进社会经济发展等依旧是HUL需要重点关注和持续疏解的核心城市问题。尽管数字技术的研究潜力巨大，但仍存在一些在技术层面的基本问题，包括如何确定遗产景观的价值、真实性与完整性。而在这些问题面前，数字技术只能作为辅助研究的工具。如何利用新技术加深对遗产景观的理解、提升遗产管理效率、实现遗产信息向后代的传播等是需要我们持续探索的共同议题。

文前图片说明

日期 2023年7月23日

拍摄 周洋

普者黑村坐落在普者黑风景区的核心区域，由青龙山、普者黑湖等自然山水体系环绕而成，拥有独特的喀斯特湖泊湿地景观。