Cultural Landscape, an Informal Term
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In combination of landscape with another definition such as urban landscape, natural landscape, path landscape, public landscape and waterfront landscape, the two combined words each have an absolute meaning which common features. In the mentioned examples city, nature, path, people and waterfront are single objective definitions and landscape is a phenomenon obtained by interaction of man and nature. Urban landscape, path landscape and public landscape are special types of landscapes which refer to specific examples of urban, path or public property. Both components possess an objective aspect and can exist independently. Hence, the word urban landscape puts the dependent words of urban and landscape into a relation to create a compound noun and provide common features. Urban landscape is the type of landscape which can be found in cities; it is genuinely a landscape and typically an urban one. Therefore, the word urban landscape is a compound noun defining a “thing” that is a type of landscape; while having two dependent components.

In the term “cultural landscape” the proportion of the two components in defining a compound noun is different. Here the landscape is an independent word, while culture is not a thing and cannot be considered as an object or substance, therefore cannot have a substantial common feature to support landscape definition and cannot introduce a type of landscape. The word “cultural” emphasizes on landscape character and nature of the phenomenon and it is not independent word that can generate a type of landscape in combination with the word “landscape”. As a result “cultural landscape” can be considered a metaphor, in which culture is an adjective for landscape, rather than a compound noun.

UNESCO World Heritage Convention was the first international law firm to recognize the cultural landscape in 1992, designated in article 1: Cultural landscapes represent the combined works of nature and man. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. UNESCO defined the three types of cultural landscapes as man-made, dynamic and shared landscape in appendix 3 of resolution 2008 which describes the three mentioned types as an interaction context of man and nature in the historic life and their mutual effect and considers their difference on the resulted products and their production process and nature.
In definition of “Donnadio” nature of cultural landscape has maintained the same and his explanation relates to a group of audience. In fact he represents cultural landscape with its conventional nature, provided with its public understanding. Possibly, this is the only difference of cultural landscape and landscape since landscape is the audience understanding of an external matter whose audience can be a single person. This philosophical definition of landscape, when used in environmental intervention, immediately changes the landscape into an object in audience point of view and it can be said that landscape definition in audience point of view is a non-applicable and pure philosophical concept; in other words, being social as an audience is inevitable in landscape culture.

Manzar magazine also queries the expert’s point of view on this matter if there is no non-cultural landscape and every landscape, is necessarily cultural. Therefore, emphasis on the cultural aspect is not scientifically necessary and does not gain a new understanding

Reviewing characters of cultural landscape samples addressed in professional or legal sessions as well as evaluation of common features of nearly 90 registered UNESCO cultural landscapes suggest that they are historical objectivities that have achieved a sustainable interaction with the natural environment.

Persian garden, Bam citadel and Richtersveld, a valley in Andorra, national park of Australia, Wutai Mountain in China, Hangzhou Lake and dozens of other examples are natural areas where people have always lived and created their own made works for durability and survival of life. The gained outcome is a second nature or a cultural nature shaped from balance of primary nature and man-made nature.

In all these examples the cultural landscape is merely landscape while other compound words of landscapes refer to special types of landscape.

Therefore, cultural landscape can be considered a metaphoric term using an adjective such as a beautiful landscape, romantic landscape, romantic, dreadful landscape, epic and theosophical landscape, that emphasizes on a particular quality and excellence rather than a type.

Conclusion

The term of cultural landscape in recent years, due to focus of the scientific communities on cultural aspects of human settlements and the Earth is getting more common and has distorted the scientific process of naming the phenomena and gradually generated a casual term that spread among experts and legal societies, while defections in their philosophical definition.

Regarding the characteristics of the previous samples, it is better to name it as “patrimonial landscape” that can represent a specific type of landscape alongside other types of landscape. In this case, one can understand civilization and historical values of cultural landscape when it is discussed. Currently due to the uncertainty of a variety of landscapes, to which cultural landscape intend to refer, the term cultural landscape is known as a casual term that cannot help in developing the knowledge of landscape or world heritage. As a result, using the term patrimonial landscape instead of cultural landscape is more scientific and reasonable.