



# 中国历史文化名街

Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets

第五卷

中华人民共和国文化部 国家文物局 批准



中国青年出版社  
CHINA YOUTH PRESS



CYPI PRESS



中华人民共和国文化部 国家文物局 批准

# 中国历史文化名街

罗哲文题 

Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets

第五卷

中国历史文化名街评选推介组委会 编



NLIC2970940831



中国青年出版社  
CHINA YOUTH PRESS



CYPI PRESS

**律师声明**

北京市邦信阳律师事务所谢青律师代表中国青年出版社郑重声明：本书由著作权人授权中国青年出版社独家出版发行。未经版权所有人和中国青年出版社书面许可，任何组织机构、个人不得以任何形式擅自复制、改编或传播本书全部或部分内容。凡有侵权行为，必须承担法律责任。中国青年出版社将配合版权执法机关大力打击盗印、盗版等任何形式的侵权行为。敬请广大读者协助举报，对经查实的侵权案件给予举报人重奖。

**侵权举报电话**

全国“扫黄打非”工作小组办公室 中国青年出版社  
 010-65233456 65212870 010-59521255  
 http://www.shdf.gov.cn E-mail: cyplaw@cypmedia.com  
 MSN: cyp\_law@hotmail.com

**图书在版编目(CIP)数据**

中国历史文化名街. 第5卷：汉英对照 / 中国历史文化名街评选推介组委会 编. — 北京：中国青年出版社，2013. 7  
 ISBN 978-7-5153-1685-7  
 I. ①中 … II. ①中 … III. ①城市道路—介绍—中国—汉、英 IV. ①K928.5  
 中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字（2013）第 112903 号

本书图文均由申报单位提供。  
 All the pictures and texts are supplied by the applicant units.

**中国历史文化名街**

中国历史文化名街评选推介组委会 编  
 英文翻译：邱金媛 潘莉莉 丁洁 王静  
 策划编辑：莽昱 陈婧莎  
 助理策划：陈荟洁  
 责任编辑：刘雅清 张军  
 助理编辑：赵静  
 英文编辑：邱金媛  
 中文编辑：李月 翟群 杜洁芳 李佳霖  
 设计：邱宏

Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets  
 Edited by the Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets Selection Committee  
 Translators: Qiu Jinyuan, Pan Lili, Ding Jie, Wang Jing  
 Commissioning editors: Mang Yu, Chen Jingsha  
 Assistant commissioning editor: Chen Huijie  
 Executive editors: Liu Zhiqing, Zhang Jun  
 Assistant executive editor: Zhao Jing  
 English editor: Qiu Jinyuan  
 Chinese editors: Li Yue, Zhai Qun, Du Jiefang, Li Jialin  
 Designer: Qiu Hong

出版发行：中国青年出版社  
 地址：北京市东四十二条 21 号  
 邮政编码：100708  
 电话：(010) 59521188 / 59521189  
 传真：(010) 59521111

China Youth Press  
 Add: 21 Dongsi Shiertiao Dongcheng District, Beijing China s100708  
 Tel: (010)59521188 / 59521189  
 Fax: (010)59521111

印刷：北京顺诚彩色印刷有限公司  
 开本：635×965 1/8  
 印张：30  
 版次：2013 年 7 月北京第 1 版  
 印次：2013 年 7 月第 1 次印刷  
 书号：ISBN 978-7-5153-1685-7  
 定价：280.00 元

Printer: Beijing Shuncheng Colour Printing Co. Ltd.  
 Size: 635×965 1/8  
 Printed Sheet: 30  
 First published and printed in July 2013  
 ISBN 978-7-5153-1685-7  
 Price: 280.00 RMB

# 目录

## Contents

### 广东广州沙面街

Shamian Street, Guangzhou,  
Guangdong Province 30

### 上海陕西北路

North Shaanxi Road, Shanghai 50

### 河南濮阳古十字街

Ancient Cross Street of Puyang County, Henan  
Province 70

### 江西铅山河口明清古街

Ancient Ming-Qing Street of Hekou Town,  
Qianshan County, Jiangxi Province 90

### 安徽绩溪龙川水街

Water Street, Longchuan Village, Jixi County,  
Anhui Province 106

### 广东珠海斗门旧街

Doumen Old Street, Doumen County,  
Zhuhai City, Guangdong Province 122

### 福建石狮永宁老街

Yongning Ancient Street, Yongning Town,  
Shishi City, Fujian Province 138

### 广东梅州松口古街

Songkou Ancient Street, Meizhou City,  
Guangdong Province 154

### 江苏泰兴黄桥老街

Huangqiao Ancient Street, Taixing City,  
Jiangsu Province 170

### 成都大邑新场上下正街

Shangxiazheng Street, Xinchang Town,  
Dayi County, Sichuan Province 186

### 初评入围街道:

Other Nominees:

### 贵州汤山石阡老街

Shiqian Ancient Street, Tangshan Town, Shiqian  
County, Guizhou Province 202

### 重庆长寿三倒拐

Sandaoguai Street, Changshou County,  
Chongqing 208

### 陕西白河桥儿沟老街

Qiao'ergou Street, Baihe County,  
Shaanxi Province 214

### 湖南湘西花垣茶峒古街道

Chadong Ancient Street, Huayuan County, Xiangxi  
Autonomous Prefecture, Hunan Province 220

### 大事记

Development Highlights 226

### 后记

Postscript 235



中华人民共和国文化部 国家文物局 批准

# 中国历史文化名街

罗哲文题 

Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets

第五卷

中国历史文化名街评选推介组委会 编



NLIC2970940831



中国青年出版社  
CHINA YOUTH PRESS



CYPI PRESS







# 《中国历史文化名街》

第五卷

## 编委会

名誉主任

励小捷 杨志今 单霁翔

主任

刘承萱 李耀申

副主任

宋合意 曹兵武

编委（以姓氏笔划为序）

田 青 朱自煊 阮仪三 吕 舟 汤羽扬  
陈培军 陈同滨 李学良 何戍中 张之平  
张 兵 张 杰 张 松 侯卫东 赵中枢  
郭 旃 郭长虹 谢辰生 彭常新 魏明孔

主编

江继兰



# 序 言

## 留住城市记忆，守护心灵家园

单霁翔

历史文化街区的保护和城市的发展，体现着城市独特的思维方式和文化价值，积淀着城市发展的历史轨迹。这是一个呼唤文化的时代。要延续城市发展文脉，改变“千城一面”的状况，就要努力让这些历史文化街区保持原来的尺度、原来的风貌、原来的肌理、原来的生活方式，让历史文化的沉淀不会骤然消失，更成为社会进步的文化动力。作为城市发展独特见证的历史文化街区，在城市形象展示、历史文化教育、乡土情结维系、文化身份认同、生态环境建设、和谐社区构建等方面具有多重价值。越来越多的人认识到，历史文化街区绝不是城市发展的包袱，而是城市建设的资源和动力。

然而，我们也不得不面对这样的事实：随着城市化进程的加快，各地政府为了谋求政绩，将改造旧城、建设新城当作地方经济新的增长点。这样一来，使承载着千百年文化积淀的历史文化街区受到了极大的挑战。这不仅体现在无视它的存在，而且还表现在对历史文化街区的过度消费上，例如有的省份为了发展旅游，把历史文化街区的居民整体搬迁出来，交给旅游公司经营管理。这样的街区即使建筑设施没有改变，内涵也发生了实质性的改变，是一种不正常的发展方向。所以应该继续对历史文化街区加大宣传，使之朝着正确的保护方向健康发展。

可以说，“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动，是在我国城市化进程持续加快、城市建设大规模展开、历史文化街区保护面临重大挑战的背景下，开展的一项具有开创性意义的文化行动。自2008年启动以来，持续不断的有效实施和宣传，有力地提升了社会各界人士对历史文化街区保护的关注度，将历史文化街区在文化遗产保护中举足轻重的重要意义很好地凸显出来。这一评选活动既将历史文化街区的保护落到了实处，也将传统的文物单体保护整合为集中的连片保护，成为城市文化建设和文化遗产保护的关键内容。

如今，第五届“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动在前四届成功举办的基础上持续开展，保持一贯的严格标准，本着公开、公平、公正的原则，评选出最具有价值、最迫切需要保护的历史文化名街，继续将历史文化街区保护工作推向深入。

回望“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动走过的五个年头，可谓一步一个脚印，没有一分浮躁，评选出的50条历史文化名街文物资源丰富、历史底蕴深厚、文化特色鲜明，街区的传统格局和整体风貌也较为

完整，堪称我国国家和民族难能可贵的文化资源。

尤其令人欣慰的是，这项文化活动产生了良好的效果。在名街评选推介活动的影响下，许多城市都加大了对历史文化街区的投入和保护力度，有序开展了一系列保护工作，包括制定相应的法律法规，将历史文化街区纳入法律保护的范围；完善历史文化街区的保护规划，使历史文化街区与传统建筑免遭破坏。并且在政府的引导和推动下，各地民众保护历史文化街区的积极性和热情不断高涨；相关专家不断呼吁，提出了许多建设性的意见；媒体也加大了对历史文化街区保护工作的持续关注，广泛宣传报道，唤起了社会公众对于历史文化街区的保护意识，使更多的民众和有志之士加入到保护历史文化街区的行列中来。

历史文化街区是特殊类型的文化遗产，也是广大民众日常生活的场所，因此，保护历史文化街区必然是一个动态的过程，也是一个长期的过程。经过五年来的不断努力，“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动已经成为一项具有深刻社会影响的文化行动，但怎样发挥“名街”在文化民生中的突出作用，使“名街”挂牌以后可持续地为城市经济社会发展作出贡献，吸引更多的社会公众参与，还需要我们予以持续关注和重视。

历史文化名街保护的未来发展任重道远，也不断有一些新的情况发生，有喜有忧，一方面很多城市跳出老城、建设新城的现象非常普遍，但是新城建设也有一些问题，例如盖大广场、景观大道，浪费了很多土地资源。另一方面一些旧城在建设压力松绑以后，虽然不再盯着历史城区进行拆迁改造，但是建设仿古一条街、没有依据的历史建筑盲目复建等现象也不断有所耳闻。历史文化街区的保护关键在于以正确的理念来平衡不同的利益主体，走积极健康的可持续发展之路。历史文化街区相关工作不仅仅是抢救、保护，也需要弘扬与发展，让其在展现历史积淀的同时，也镌刻时代的发展内容，并使保护的成果惠及全体民众，通过加强传统民居建筑维修、完善生活基础设施、改善社区生态环境等措施，提高居民生活质量，增强历史文化街区的吸引力。

在《中国历史文化名街》第五卷即将出版之际，衷心感谢那些为这项事业付出心血和汗水的人们，也由衷希望在社会界的共同关注和推动下，“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动能够越办越好，为留住我们的城市记忆、守护民族的精神家园发挥更大的作用！

（单霁翔：文化部党组成员、故宫博物院院长）



# Foreword

## Preserving the Memory of Our City and Safeguarding Our Spiritual Home

Shan Jixiang

As a testimony to a city's unique thinking and cultural values, the conservation and development of cultural-historic streets epitomize the development trajectory of the city. In order to boost the cultural development of a city in an era when culture is greatly valued, the original size, look, texture and lifestyle of its cultural-historic streets should be maintained. Only in this way can the cultural-historic heritage of the city be inherited, and then give a cultural impetus to its social development. Therefore, cultural-historic streets of a city are of great importance to city image presentation, cultural-historic education, hometown sentiment cultivation, cultural identification, ecological development, development of harmonious communities, etc. It has occurred to more and more people that the cultural-historic streets are by no means a burden but a stimulus to a city's development.

However, we are confronted with such a reality that, in order to leave an illustrious record in the urban development during its tenure, the local government would usually take renovation of historic districts and buildings as a new growth engine for economy in the process of accelerated urbanization. That's the challenge those historic neighborhoods with a profound cultural heritage are facing. Some of them are left in oblivion, while some others, like those that have been relocated and taken over by travel agencies for boosting tourism, are subject to overconsumption. For the latter ones, they have lost the spirit which makes them unique, even though all the entities are kept exactly the way they were. These are exactly the cases that should be avoided in order to promote a healthy development for historic districts.

It is fair to say that the selection program of "Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets" is a groundbreaking cultural activity against the background of accelerated urbanization and severe challenges for historic sites. Since its initiation in 2008, the program has, with its continuous implementation and publicity, effectively attracted attention from people from all walks of life to the conservation of historic streets,

and made prominent the critical role of these historic places in the protection of cultural heritage. Further, it has led to concrete efforts in the conservation of historic neighborhoods and the upgrading of protection of individual cultural relics to an integrated area, which have evolved into a key aspect in urban development and cultural heritage conservation.

In the wake of the four pervious successful programs, preparation for the fifth program is underway. It is hoped that, through the program of this year, the historic streets which are of the greatest value and are in the most urgent need for protection will be unveiled on the basis of transparency and fairness.

Looking back now, the five selection programs are all down-to-earth work. The 50 historic streets selected through the programs are undoubtedly valuable cultural resources with their well-preserved traditional layout, overall style and profound cultural-historic heritage.

It is reassuring that these programs have made impressive achievements. Thanks to them, many cities have intensified their efforts to conserve historic streets by, among others, enacting laws and regulations in this respect and improving the protective planning for such areas to prevent them from being destroyed. Further, under the guidance of the government, local people have become increasingly enthusiastic about the protection of historic neighborhoods, to which relevant experts have contributed many constructive ideas. The media has also given continuous and wide coverage to the preservation of historic streets, which has helped to raise the public awareness and encourage more involvement from the local people.

Historic streets are a special cultural heritage because they are still where the locals live their daily life. Therefore, the conservation of these areas must be a long and dynamic process. Over the past five years, this program has evolved into a highly influential cultural activity. But granting the title and name plate of "Renowned Chinese Cultural-

Historic Streets” is not the end. How these historic sites, after being granted the title “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Street,” will play a role in the daily cultural life of the local people and contribute to the local economic and social development is what we should keep paying attention to in the future.

Although some new developments can be seen in the conservation of cultural and historic streets in recent years, it still has a long way to go. Governments in some areas have bypassed the historic neighborhoods and concentrated on the construction of a new town so as to avoid demolition of these historic sites. However, if things go to extremes, this is inclined to result in either a waste of land resources due to the fact that city image projects such as grand squares and landscape avenues are built, or blind replications of historic sites without reference to historic facts. Therefore, the key to the conservation of cultural-historic sites is to balance the relationship among different stakeholders based on a scientific concept and to bring the development of such areas onto a healthy and sustainable track. Furthermore, cultural-historic streets should not only be about protection and salvation, but also about inheritance and development. Meanwhile, the conservation of historic streets should benefit local people by maintaining civilian residences, improving public facilities and ecological environment, which will in turn improve people’s livelihood and increase the appeal of these historic cities.

For the upcoming fifth volume of *Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets*, we would like to extend our heartfelt gratitude to those who have made contribution to the cause. It is sincerely hoped that, with the increasing attention and involvement from people from all walks of life, the recommendation and selection of “Renowned Chinese Cultural-historic Streets” would play a bigger role in preserving the memory of our city and safeguarding our spiritual home.

(Shan Jixiang: Party member of the Ministry of Culture; President of the Palace Museum)



## 深化保护内涵，展现街区特色

## Deepening the Conservation Spirit and Displaying Street Features

朱自煊  
Zhu Zixuan

“中国历史文化名街”评选推介活动自2008年启动以来，已举办了四届，共评出40条街，均已挂牌公布，影响很大。日前刚举行过第五届专家评审会，评出15条候选名街，等待公众投票。澳门特别行政区望德堂坊是港澳特区第一条名街入选。这次送审材料有65条名街，不少来自内地小县城，知名度低，但历史文化价值不低，真实性完整性都不错。专家们看了都很欣慰。见到又一批历史文化遗产得到保护，也说明过去几届评选推介活动取得了效果。不少好的街区得到了公认，评选标准也取得了共识。历史街区保护与发展是历史文化名城保护重点，牵涉面广，各种利益相互纠结，有待实践深化。寻根溯源，重温一下影响历史街区保护发展的两个国际宪章和建议，对深化其保护内涵，展现两类不同历史街区风貌特色会有一定启发。

一、《保护文物建筑及历史地段的国际宪章》是1964年5月31日从事历史文物建筑工作的建筑师和技术人员国际议会（ICOM）第二次会议在威尼斯通过的决议，简称《威尼斯宪章》。内容主要有两方面，一是文物建筑及其历史环境保护，二是文物建筑修复。《宪章》开宗明义指出：“世代代的人民历史建筑，饱含着过去的年月传下来的信息，是人民千百年来传统的活的见证。人民越来越认识到人类各种价值的统一性，从而把古代的纪念物看作是共同的遗产。大家承认为子孙后代妥善地保护它们是我们共同的责任，我们必须一点不走样地把它们的全部信息传下去。”《宪章》共16条。第1条讲文物建筑的概念，即文物建筑不仅指建筑本身，还指产生它的城市或农村环境也即其时代背景，第六条讲保护一座文物建筑意味着要适当保护它的四周环境，不允许拆、改和新建。第十四条，关于“历史地段”，提出“必须把文物建筑所在的地段当成专门注意的对象，要保护它们的整体性、要保证用恰当的方式清理和展示它们”。从以上所引不难看出，《宪章》把保护文物建筑及其环境的意义、重要性和内容讲得很清楚。

二、《内罗毕建议》全称为《关于保护历史的或传统的建筑群及它们在现代生活中的地位的建议》，1976年11月26日由UNESCO（联合国教科文组织）第19次全体大会在内罗毕通过，比《威尼斯宪章》晚了12年，却在人类历史文化遗产保护方面前进了一大步，把保护这类历史地段的重要性和紧迫性提到了前所未有高度。《建议》一开始就指出：

“考虑到历史的或传统的建筑群形成了人们日常生活环境的一部分，它向人们展示了产生它们的那个过去的时代，他们使生活环境具有与社会多样性相适应的多样性，因此，他们获得了价值和人道的重要性。”

考虑到历史的或传统的建筑群经历了长久的岁月之后，构成了人类文化、宗教、社会的创造性、丰富性和多样性的最确切的见证，因此，保护它们并把它们纳入现代社会环境之中，是城市规划和国土整治的一个基本因素。

考虑到我们时代经常出现的千篇一律化和非个性的危险，这些过去时代的生动见证对每个人、每个民族都具有极大的重要性，他们从这些见证上既能找到他们文化的表现，又能找到他们自己特色的基础之一。

考虑到全世界和各地在发展和现代化的借口下无知的破坏和不合理的不恰当的重建正严重地损害着这种珍贵的历史遗产。

考虑到历史的或传统的建筑群构成了一份不动产，它的破坏即使不造成经济损失时也会引起社会动荡。

考虑到这种情况使每个人都负有责任，使公共权力机构有义务，只有他们才能担当的起这些责任和义务。

考虑到面对这种破坏甚至完全消灭的危险，每个国家都应该行动起来，紧急采取全面的和积极的政策，作为国家的区域的或地方的规划的一部分，来保护这些历史的或传统的建筑群及它们的环境，并使它们充满生气，从而拯救不可替代的无价之宝。

考虑到许多国家还没有一个关于建筑遗产和它与城市规划关系的充分有效并具有灵活性的立法。”

为此，于1976年11月26日通过了现在这个建议。

以上所引是多么形象，多么具体而又深刻地把当前破坏历史文化遗产的现象和谬论揭露得如此彻底，说明加强保护和抢救是如此迫切。它切中时弊，有力促进了国际社会对保护的热情和积极性。

在保护对象的定义上，《内罗毕建议》指出：历史地段“内容很广泛，包括史前遗址，历史城市，老城区，村庄，小村落和纯文物建筑群。而构成这些历史的或传统的建筑群的整体环境，就成了这类应该得到保护的历史地段”。其保护措施既有静态，又有动态，使其能获得活力，



并永续利用。此外,《建议》还对立法、行政措施以及国际合作等方面提出许多建议。

这两个《宪章》和《建议》,出现于上世纪六十到七十年代,很快影响到全球,在七十年代末至八十年代初日本就开展了历史的町並み(历史街区)保护活动,政府主导,地方和民间积极配合,在全国形成了一批各具特色的“历史の町なみ”(历史街区)。在上世纪七十年代末八十年代初,我国各地在建设商业一条街活动时以北京琉璃厂改建为契机,也开始了这类历史地段的保护更新方面的探索,有大拆大建,拆真造假。也有以保护整治为主,改善基础设施,保持原汁原味,如安徽黄山屯溪老街。

1986年国务院公布第二批全国历史文化名城时指出:“对一些文物建筑比较集中,或比较完整地体现出某一历史时期的传统风貌,和民族地方特色的街道,建筑群,小镇,村寨等也应予以保护。公布为各级‘历史文化保护区’。对‘历史文化保护区’的保护措施可参照文物保护单位的做法,着重保护整体风貌。”这一指示概括了两个《宪章》和《建议》所提出的保护内容和要求。以后结合国情又把“历史文化保护区”细分为“历史街区”“历史文化名镇”和“历史文化名村”。形成了我国名城保护体系。

在历史街区保护中,特别是体现《内罗毕建议》的历史的或传统的建筑群地区,在名城保护中属抢救性项目,规定名城至少要有两个以上,并有一定规模的“历史街区”,其保护要求是坚持“历史真实性,风貌完整性,和生活延续性”三项原则。在实践中,这类“历史街区”保护占了很大比例,在名城保护三十年之际,全国通报批评了八座名城,并责其限期改正,问题大多也出在历史街区被严重破坏上。

可以这样说,历史街区是名城保护的重点和难点,拿首都来说,2000年北京旧城25片“历史文化保护区”保护规划,都体现出这两类历史地段的特点,有的还相互包容,以文物建筑整体环境为主的就有景山周边,包括北海大桥、国子监街、什刹海、钟鼓楼、东交民巷等。就全国而言,连续开展五届的“全国历史文化名街”评选推介活动,也评出了北京国子监、苏州山塘街、青岛八大关、小鱼山人故居街区、无锡清名桥和惠山老街、上海多伦路、福州三坊七巷等。两类历史街区保护重点各有侧重,只有深化保护内涵才能展现出街区特色。

文物建筑历史街区和以历史和传统建筑群为主的街区在保护对象及其文化内涵上有很大不同,保护重点,难点也各异,表现在以下几个

方面。

一、重要文物建筑位尊权重,是名城中的主体,如宫殿、衙署、寺庙、塔、楼、桥梁等。在格局上又常与山川形胜相互融合,成为城市形象标志,因此常被列为名胜古迹、重大文物保护单位。应将其列入历史街区范畴,并将其当成这类街区的保护重点。成功例子如北海金鳌玉蜆桥的保护与改造,解决了交通难题,又最大限度保护了三海文物环境的完整性,成为这类街区保护的典范。遗憾的是原来的汉白玉桥栏板尚未恢复。另外一个例子是国子监街,两大文物建筑国子监和孔庙连同其历史环境成贤街,四座牌楼、石碑以及沿街建筑浑然一体,从内容到形式完整地表达出深厚的文化底蕴和特色。但在保护工作中文化内涵发掘得还不足,特别是中段街南又出现一片新建筑,破坏了街区的传统界面,不知现在情况如何。由此可见这类街区保护之好坏,对古城风貌影响比一般街区重要得多。

二、文物建筑历史街区保护成功与否来自上面,来自决策的科学,民主和依法决策。天安门广场是古都北京皇城的前院,是最重要的古都历史地段,受到世界的关注。1959年国庆十周年,天安门广场改建是一项成功的案例,既解决了重大功能转换的需求又在形象上体现了保护继承与发展原则,保持了传统格局、历史风貌和时代精神。这一成功来自中央领导、地方主管、众多建筑师和广大市民的通力合作,以及公正公开的设计竞赛。相反是后来的国家大剧院选址方案,由于违背了这一科学决策,造成严重的损失。首先是错误的理念,即脱离了皇城这一重要的历史背景,追求形象工程。其次是没有严格按《文物法》办事,三是没有发动市民、专家进行公开、充分的论证,长官意志成为主导,致使今天无论走在长安街,还是从景山万春亭俯瞰故宫和皇城,都会感到国家大剧院超大体量、独特形象与古都风貌以及雄伟和谐的中轴线格格不入,是一大败笔。目前,北京正积极申报中轴线为世界遗产,我很担心国家大剧院选址是一处硬伤。建筑艺术是一项环境艺术。中外古今一切知名建筑都脱离不了时空给它的机遇和对它的限制。这要看建筑师的修养和功力。巴黎埃菲尔铁塔是巴黎的象征,它的选址巧妙地选择在塞纳河拐弯处,在与塞纳河平行的巴黎轴线之间留出了足够的缓冲空间,使两者相得益彰,才有今天美丽动人的效果。悉尼歌剧院独特优美的形象,是其选择在海角,与大海、铁桥一起,相映成趣,构成一幅“扬帆出海”的景象。这是建筑师伍重的灵感,也是评委埃罗·沙里宁的伯乐慧眼。



三、文物建筑历史街区要传递文化内涵，成为文化传承的载体。前面提到的历史名街中的国子监、山塘街、青岛小鱼山名人故居等都体现出它们有丰富的文化底蕴，是重要文化载体。但如何使这些潜力转变为动力，展示出各自的魅力特色才是关键。如苏州山塘街，评上名街后，一手抓文物环境整治，一手抓文化内涵的发掘和发扬，同时开展最后的战役，即虎丘的全面整治，这种精神值得学习。福州三坊七巷，除名人故居及文化内涵整理发掘外，正在酝酿保护管理体制方面的创新。

另一类是旧瓶装新酒，利用传统环境，增添新的时尚内容，上海新天地开了个头，各地均有仿效（严格来讲，新天地不能说是“历史街区”）。无锡惠山老街，就是将惠山脚下一处众多文人会聚的祠堂群，开辟成文艺沙龙、会所等休闲场所。苏州平江区也有类似的举措，此外，还有一类非物质文化遗产发源地、场所，如苏州桃花坞、天津杨柳青等如何保护整治，发展都值得研究。这类“历史街区”经营上很容易考虑到旅游。有的街区保护规划和旅游规划一起编制，似乎保护目的就是为了旅游，这样很容易形成本末倒置，应该看到保护是目的，要使其得到可持续发展或永续发展。旅游只是一种手段。另外谈到旅游，还要强调两点。一是把握好“度”。千万不可过度，“喧宾夺主”，破坏文物环境，损害街区生活和文化氛围，干扰居民正常生活。二是不要“离谱”。这个谱就是历史街区的环境质量即传统格局、历史风貌和空间尺度。

（朱自煊：国家历史文化名城保护专家委员会委员、清华大学建筑学院教授）

Since 2008, the selection program of “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets” has been held for four successive years, through which 40 renowned cultural-historic streets have been selected. The names of the streets were released in various ways, which have produced an enormous impact. Currently “The Fifth Expert Seminar of Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets” has just been held. The seminar has selected 15 streets for the shortlist, among which ten streets will be finally decided through public voting as “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets.”

St. Lazarus Quarter of Macau SAR is the first street selected from Hong Kong and Macau SAR. This time there are 65 famous streets that have filed an application to the program. Many of the streets are from

small counties. The streets keep a low profile, but have a high degree of historic and cultural value, authenticity and integrity, which makes the experts feel relieved. The good conservation of a new group of historic and cultural heritages means that the last four “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets” programs have made certain achievements.

Many well-preserved streets have been universally acknowledged, and the selection criteria have reached consensus. The conservation and development of cultural and historic streets is the cultural and historic cities' key conservation area with different parties involved in and various benefits intertwined. The conservation of historic and cultural streets should be deepened in theory and in practice. Tracing back to the origin of the historic and cultural streets and reviewing an international bill and several recommendations will certainly give some enlightenment on deepening the conservation spirit to display two different historic streets.

The creation of *The Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*, hereinafter referred to as *The Venice Charter*, is the second conference resolution reached by the Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments (ICOM) on May 31st, 1964. *The Venice Charter* mainly includes the following two aspects: first, the concept of a historic monument and the conservation of the historic setting, and secondly, the conservation and restoration of the historic monuments. *The Venice Charter* makes clear the purpose from the very beginning that “Imbued with a message from the past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witnesses of their age-old traditions. People are becoming more and more conscious of the unity of human values and regard ancient monuments as a common heritage. The common responsibility to safeguard them for future generations is recognized. It is our duty to hand them on in the full richness of their authenticity.” There are 16 provisions in *The Venice Charter*. The first gives the definition for a historic monument, which “embraces not only the single architectural work but also the urban or rural setting in which is found the evidence of a particular civilization,

a significant development or a historic event.” The sixth provision brings up that the conservation of a monument implies preserving a setting which allows no construction, demolition and modification. The 14th provision is about “historic sites,” which brings forward that “The sites of monuments must be the object of special care in order to safeguard their integrity and ensure they are cleared and presented in a seemly manner.” Through the above information and references, it is not difficult to see *The Venice Charter* has made a clear explanation about the meaning, the importance as well as the content of preserving historic monuments and its historic settings.

The full name of *The Nairobi Recommendations* is *Recommendations Concerning the Safeguarding and Contemporary Role of Historic Areas* which was passed at the 19th session of UNESCO’s General Conference in Nairobi on November 26th 1976. Although *The Nairobi Recommendations* is 12 years later than *The Venice Charter*, it has made a huge step forward in protecting human being’s historic and cultural heritage. *The Nairobi Recommendations* has brought up the importance and urgency of protecting the historic sites to a historically high level. *The Nairobi Recommendations* made it clear at the very beginning:

“Considering that historic areas are part of the daily environment of human beings everywhere, that they represent the living presence of the past which formed them, that they provide the variety in life’s background needed to match the diversity of society, and that by so doing they gain in value and acquire an additional human dimension,

Considering that historic areas afford down the ages the most tangible evidence of the wealth and diversity of cultural, religious and social activities and that their safeguarding and their integration into the life of contemporary society is a basic factor in town-planning and land development,

Considering that in face of the dangers of stereotyping and depersonalization, this living evidence of days gone by is of vital importance for humanity and for nations who find in it both the expression of their way of life and one of the corner-stones of their identity,

Noting that throughout the world, under the pretext of expansion or modernization, demolition ignorant of what it is demolishing and irrational and inappropriate reconstruction work is causing serious damage to this historic heritage,

Considering that historic areas are an immovable heritage whose destruction may often lead to social disturbance, even where it does not lead to economic loss,

Considering that this situation entails responsibilities for every citizen and lays on public authorities obligations which they alone are capable of fulfilling,

Considering that in order to save these irreplaceable assets from the dangers of deterioration or even total destruction to which they are thus exposed, it is for each State to adopt, as a matter of urgency, comprehensive and energetic policies for the conservation and revitalization of historic areas and their surroundings as part of national, regional or local planning,

Noting the absence in many cases of a legislation effective and flexible enough concerning the architectural heritage and its interconnection with town-planning, territorial, regional or local planning,” therefore, *The Nairobi Recommendations* was passed on November 26th, 1976.

The references have made a vivid, detailed and profound description about the existing damage done to the historic and cultural heritage and has thoroughly exposed the current false theories. It has stated how important and urgent it is to strengthen the preservation and the salvation of the historic and cultural heritage. It has cut into the present-day malpractices and vigorously promoted the international community’s enthusiasm in preserving the historic and cultural heritage.

In terms of object of conservation, *The Nairobi Recommendations* points out that historic areas are “varied in nature,” including “prehistoric sites, historic towns, old urban quarters, villages and hamlets as well as homogeneous monumental groups.” The general settings of these historic or traditional architectural groups have become the “historic site” that



requires safeguarding. Both static and dynamic safeguarding measures are adopted in order to keep the historic and cultural areas full of vitality and in sustainable use. Moreover, *The Nairobi Recommendations* has also brought up a great deal of advice for administrative measures, international cooperation, etc.

*The Venice Charter* and *The Nairobi Recommendations* were brought up in the 1960s and 1970s, which soon extended its influence to the whole world. Japan had carried out a series of preservation activities for historic and cultural streets from the late 1970s to the early 1980s. A group of characteristic “historic quarters” were formed around Japan under the guidance of the government and with cooperative effort from local and civil communities. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, taking the renovation of Liulichang (a famous district in downtown Beijing) as an opportunity, various regions across China began to explore the renovation of such kinds of historic areas while building business streets. Some governments did large-scale reconstruction, and changed authentic ones to mimic ones, while some governments focused on preservation and renovation, just improving the infrastructure to keep the original look of the streets, such as Tunxi Ancient Street in Huangshan, Anhui.

In 1986, the State Council has pointed out after the list of the second group of famous “National Historic and Cultural Cities” was released that “Streets, building groups, towns, villages, etc. which have a concentration of historic monuments, or which can fully display traditional features of a historic period or ethnic and regional features should be preserved and should be announced as ‘conservation districts of historic sites’ at different levels. Based on the practices of cultural relics conservation units, the ‘conservation districts of historic sites’ could focus on preserving the overall scenes.” This instruction has summarized the objects of conservation and the conservation requirements brought up by the *The Venice Charter* and *The Nairobi Recommendations*. Later, given the national conditions, the “conservation districts of historic sites” are subdivided into “historic streets,” “historic and cultural towns,” and “historic and cultural villages,” which have

constituted our country’s conservation system of historic cities.

Historic districts, especially the area of historic or traditional building groups as mentioned in *The Nairobi Recommendations*, belong to salvage projects in the conservation of historic and cultural cities. It is required that historic and cultural cities should have at least two or more “historic quarters” of some scale. The conservation should adhere to the three principles of being “historically authentic, intact in styles and continuous in living.” In practice, the conservation of “historic streets” has taken a large proportion of the work in preserving historic and cultural cities. On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the conservation of historic and cultural cities, eight historic and cultural cities were publically criticized and required to make corrections within a time limit during the inspection of the conservation of historic and cultural cities. The problem for these eight cities mainly lies in the severe damage of the historic and cultural streets.

It can be said that the historic and cultural streets is the key and difficult points of the conservation of historic and cultural cities. Take Beijing for example, the preservation planning of Beijing’s 25 “conservation districts of historic sites” in 2000 has displayed the features of these two types’ historic sites, which have been inclusive of each other. The surroundings of Jingshan Park have prioritized the overall environment of the historic monuments, including Beihai Bridge (“North Sea Bridge”), Guozijian Street (“Street of the Imperial College”), Shicha Lake, the Bell Tower and Drum Tower, the Legation Street etc. The five “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets” programs have selected Guozijian Street in Beijing, Shantang Street in Suzhou, Badaguan Street (“Eight Great Passes Street”) in Qingdao, former residences of celebrities in Xiaoyushan historic district, Qingming Bridge and Huishan Old Street in Wuxi, Jiangsu, Duolun Road in Shanghai, Three Lanes and Seven Alleys in Fuzhou, Fujian, etc. The conservation of the two types of historic streets has focused on different aspects. Only through deepening the spirit of conservation could the features of the historic streets be displayed.

The object of conservation and the cultural connotation of historic

and cultural streets differ a lot from those of streets the main body of which is historic and traditional building groups. The difficulty and key points of conservation for these two types of streets also differ. The differences lie in the following three aspects:

1. Historic monument occupies an important position and constitutes the main body of historic cities, such as palaces, ancient government offices, temples, towers, buildings, bridges, etc. These monuments form beautiful sceneries with mountains and rivers in terms of layout, which usually becomes the landmark of cities. Therefore, these sites will often be selected as places of historic interest and key cultural relics under conservation. The conservation and renovation of Beihai Bridge is one of the successful cases. This case has both solved the traffic problem and protected the integrity of the cultural relics of the three seas (North Sea, South Sea and Central Sea), which has become the role model for district conservation of this type. Unfortunately, the original white marble bridge railings haven't been restored yet. Another successful example is the conservation of Guozijian Street. The Beijing Guozijian (Imperial College) and the Temple of Confucius are located in this street. These two historic relics as well as its historic context have formed Chengxian Street ("Becoming Saint Street"), including four memorial archways and stone tablets. These historic monuments have integrated with the surrounding buildings along the streets, which has displayed rich cultural deposits and features both in form and in content. However, the conservation work hasn't fully explored the cultural connotation of this district. A new block was built to the south of the central street, which has disrupted the traditional scene. Therefore, it's not difficult to see that the features of old cities could be more influenced by the conservation situation of this street type than by that of common streets.

2. Whether the conservation of historic and cultural streets works or not depends on the government's scientific, democratic and legal decisions. The Tiananmen Square ("Square of Gate of Heavenly Peace") is the front courtyard of Beijing's Imperial Palace, which is the most important historic site for the ancient capital. In 1959, on the occasion

of the 10th anniversary of the PRC's founding, the renovation project of the Tiananmen Square was a huge success and brought a successful functional transformation. Following the conservation, heritage and development principle, today's Tiananmen Square has retained its traditional style, historic features and also represented the spirit of the time. The success of this renovation project comes from the joint efforts made by the central leadership group, local authorities, numerous architects and the general public, as well as open and fair design competitions. On the contrary, the later site selection planning for the National Grand Theater has gone against this scientific decision and caused serious damage. First, the construction concept for the National Grand Theater is wrong, for it just aimed for image without giving consideration to the important historic context of the imperial city. Secondly, the construction of the National Grand Theater did not strictly follow the *Law of the PRC Governing Cultural Relics*. Thirdly, the general public and the experts were not motivated to justify the planning in an open and sufficient way. The construction process had been dominated by government instructions. Therefore, today whether walking along the Changan Avenue or overlooking the Imperial Palace or the imperial city from Wanchun Pavilion ("Everlasting Spring Pavilion"), you will find the National Grand Theater's super-large scale and unique image doesn't fit into the historic features of the ancient city as well as the magnificence and harmony of the Central Axis of Beijing at all. Currently, the Central Axis of Beijing is applying for recognition as World Heritage, and I am concerned that the site selection of the National Grand Theater might be an impediment to a successful application. Architecture is environmental art. Ancient and modern famous architecture is endowed with both restrictions and opportunities by time and space, so successful architecture solely depends on the architect's accomplishment and capability. The Eiffel Tower, a proud symbol of Paris, is successful because it is located at the turning of the Seine, which has left enough cushion space with Paris' axis parallel to the Seine. The enhancement of each other has contributed to today's appealing view. The unique feature of the Sydney Opera House relies on its site selection. Located at a port,



the Sydney Opera House has contrasted finely with the sea and the iron bridge, thus forming an amazing “setting sail” scene. The Sydney Opera House came from architect Jorn Utzon’s inspiration, which could not do without judge Eero Saarinen’s scouting talent.

3. Historic and cultural streets should pass on cultural connotations and become the carrier of cultural heritage.

Being carriers of cultural heritage, the above-mentioned Guozijian Street, Shantang Street, and former residences of celebrities in Xiaoyushan historic district, etc. have displayed their rich cultural background. How to turn the potentials of these historic streets into development motivation is one of the key questions. Take Shantang Street for example, after being selected as “Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Streets,” Shantang Street has taken comprehensive measures to renovate Hu Hillock while improving the environment for the cultural relic and deepening its cultural connotation. This case should be learnt as an example. Former residences of celebrities in the Three Lanes and Seven Alleys in Fuzhou are being renovated and its cultural connotations are being further explored, and in the meantime a proposal for management system renovations for cultural relic conservation is under consideration.

Putting new wine into old bottles is another way to conserve the historic streets. New fashion elements have been channeled into the traditional environment. Shanghai Xintiandi (“New Heaven and Earth”) has taken the lead, and various regions followed suit. However, Shanghai Xintiandi is not a “historic street” in a strict sense. Huishan Old Street in Wuxi has renovated a group of ancestral halls which is frequented by literati to literary salons, clubs and other places for relaxation. The same measures have been taken by Pingjiang District of Suzhou. Moreover, the conservation, renovation and development of some birth places for intangible cultural heritages, for example, Taohuawu area (“Peach Blossom Cove”) in Suzhou and Yangliuqing area (“Green Poplar and Willow”) in Tianjin are worthy of study. The development of tourism is usually resorted to while managing such kinds of “historic streets.” The conservation plan and the tourism plan are formulated at the

same time, which leaves people the impression that the conservation aim is to develop tourism. This is putting the incidental before the fundamental. It should be made clear that the aim of conservation is to achieve sustainable development for the historic streets. Tourism is just one of the means for development. As for tourism, two points need to be highlighted. First, the “degree of tourism development” should be probably handled. Tourism should not be done too much to overshadow the aim of conservation. The cultural relics, street life, cultural environment and residents’ life should not be disrupted while developing tourism. Secondly, the development of tourism should “follow the principles,” which requires that the environmental quality of historic streets, including the traditional layouts, historic scenes and spatial scales, should be preserved.

(Zhu Zixuan: Member of Committee of Experts on Protection of Renowned Chinese Cultural-Historic Cities; Professor of School of Architecture, Tsinghua University)