

# 从威尼斯到奈良：透过雷蒙·勒迈尔档案看真实性

From Venice to Nara: Authenticity through the Lens of Raymond M. Lemaire's archives

克洛迪娜·乌巴尔<sup>①</sup>（列日大学 比利时列日 4020）

*Claudine Houbart (School of Architecture, University of Liege, 4020 Liège, Belgium)*

崔金泽（译）（鲁汶大学工程科学学院/雷蒙·勒迈尔国际保护中心 比利时鲁汶 3000）

*Translated by Cui Zejin (Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation, Faculty of Engineering Sciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium)*

吴美萍（校订）（天津大学建筑学院 天津 300072）

*Revised by Wu Meiping (School of Architecture, Tianjin University, 30072 Tianjin, China)*

**摘要：**本文旨在透过比利时艺术史学家雷蒙·勒迈尔的经历来检视从《威尼斯宪章》到《奈良真实性文件》中的真实性问题讨论。作为国际古迹遗址理事会的首任秘书长和第二任主席，勒迈尔档案中保存有许多从未发表过的1960年代到1990年代以来的国际辩论记录。这批档案被保存在比利时鲁汶大学。勒迈尔曾是《威尼斯宪章》和《奈良真实性文件》起草会议的报告员，两份文件的草稿即被保存在其档案中；此外，还能见到1970年代勒迈尔试图修改《威尼斯宪章》的相关记录。档案材料揭示了这些事件鲜为人知的一面，增进了我们对遗产史上两个重要参考坐标的认识。它们凸显了国际原则性文书制定中的人为因素，提示我们不要将它们视为普世性的、不可改变的声明。

**关键词：**威尼斯宪章；奈良真实性文件；普世主义；真实性；雷蒙·勒迈尔；赫布·斯托韦尔

① 克洛迪娜·乌巴尔（Claudine Houbart），比利时列日大学建筑学院教授，从事建筑史和遗产保护历史和理论方面的研究和教学工作，专攻国际古迹遗址理事会创始人雷蒙·勒迈尔教授（Raymond M. Lemaire）的档案研究；Prof. Claudine Houbart is a full professor at the School of Architecture at the University of Liege, Belgium. Her research and teaching focus on architectural history, monument restoration. She has been doing research on the archives of Prof. Raymond M. Lemaire, a co-author of the Venice Charter and co-founder of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS);

崔金泽，比利时鲁汶大学工程科学学院研究员，研究方向为批判性遗产研究及遗产保护的历史与理论；Dr Cui Jinze, a researcher at the School of Engineering Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium, and his research focuses on critical heritage studies, the history and theory of heritage protection;

吴美萍，天津大学建筑学院英才副教授，国际文物修护学会委员会成员，中国文物保护技术协会建筑遗产预防性保护专业委员会外事秘书，长期从事中西方建筑遗产保护历史和理论、建筑文化遗产的预防性保护方面的研究工作。Prof. Wu Meiping is an associate professor of excellence at the School of Architecture, Tianjin University. Her research and teaching focus on preventive conservation of built heritage, monument restoration, historic gardens and landscape conservation, Sino-EU built cultural heritage exchange, etc.

**Abstract:** This article examines the question of authenticity from the Venice Charter to the Nara Document, through the experience of Belgian art historian Raymond Lemaire (1921-1997). First Secretary General and second President of ICOMOS, his archives, kept at the University of Louvain, conserve many unpublished sources concerning international debates from the 1960s to the 1990s. The drafting of the Venice Charter and the Nara Document, two documents for which he acted as rapporteur, are documented, as are the attempts to revise the Venice Charter in the 1970s. These records shed light on little-known aspects of these processes and add to our knowledge of these two key references in the history of heritage. They highlight the human factor in the construction of international documents of principle, warning us not to regard them as universal, immutable statements.

**Keywords:** Venice Charter; Nara Document; Universalism; Authenticity; R.M. Lemaire; H. Stovel

几十年来,《关于古迹遗址保护与修复的国际宪章》(International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, 1964)(以下简称《威尼斯宪章》)和《奈良真实性文件》(Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994)(以下简称《奈良文件》)已引发众多学术讨论。《威尼斯宪章》的根源和背景<sup>[1][2]</sup>、其起草过程<sup>[3][4]</sup>、接受情况<sup>[5-7]</sup>和被中断的修订<sup>[8]</sup>已成为大量研究的主题<sup>[9]</sup>。每逢其十周年纪念,都会组织会议和座谈会,为讨论和质疑宪章的现实意义提供机会。这些讨论和质疑涉及遗产概念的变化、辩论的全球化或当今可持续发展目标所面临的新挑战<sup>②</sup>。《奈良文件》虽然发布时间较晚,但也引起了学者的注意,相关研究涵盖其起草过程<sup>[10]</sup>,以及解读和影响<sup>[11]</sup>。本文通过两份文件主要起草人之一——比利时艺术史学家雷蒙·勒迈尔(Raymond M. Lemaire, 1921—1997)的经历,探讨真实性问题的演变。勒迈尔是1964年《威尼斯宪章》起草会议的报告员,以及30年后《奈良文件》法文版的编写者,曾担任国际古迹遗址理事会

## Introduction

Over the decades, both the Venice Charter (1964) and the Nara Document on Authenticity (1994) have given rise to numerous publications. The roots and context of the Venice Charter<sup>[e.g. 1,2]</sup>, its drafting<sup>[e.g. 3,4]</sup>, reception<sup>[e.g. 5,6,7]</sup> and aborted revisions<sup>[8]</sup> have been the subject of much research<sup>[9]</sup>. Each of its ten-year anniversaries has seen the organization of meetings and colloquia, providing opportunities for discussions and questioning the relevance of the document in the face of changes in the notion of heritage, the globalization of debates, or the new challenges summed up today in the objectives of sustainable development<sup>1</sup>. Although more recent, the Nara Document on Authenticity has also attracted the attention of researchers, who have examined its drafting<sup>[10]</sup>, interpretation and influences<sup>[11]</sup>. This article looks at the evolution of the question of authenticity through the experience of one of the protagonists in the drafting of both documents: Belgian art historian Raymond M. Lemaire

1. e.g., in 1995 in Naples, Italy (La Carta di Venezia, trenta anni dopo); in 2004 in Budapest-Pécs, Hungary (The Venice Charter 1964 - 2004 - 2044? The Fortieth Anniversary); in 2014 in Philadelphia, USA (The Venice Charter at Fifty) and in 2024 in Lisbon, Portugal (The Venice Charter Reloaded); Florence, Italy (1964-2024 The Venice Charter. Theoretical reflections and operating practices in the restoration project); and Ouro Preto, Brazil (Revisiting the Venice Charter: Critical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges).

② 例如1995年在意大利那不勒斯(“《威尼斯宪章》,三十年后”);2004年在匈牙利布达佩斯—佩奇(“《威尼斯宪章》1964—2004—2044四十周年纪念”);2014年在美国费城(“《威尼斯宪章》五十周年”);2024年在葡萄牙里斯本(“《威尼斯宪章》重装上阵”);意大利佛罗伦萨(“1964—2024《威尼斯宪章》:修复项目中的理论反思与操作实践”);以及巴西欧鲁普雷图(“重温《威尼斯宪章》:批判性视角与当代挑战”)。

(ICOMOS) 第一任秘书长 (1965-1975) 和第二任主席 (1975—1981)。以此身份，他在遗产概念不断扩展和辩论全球化的几十年中，密切参与到遗产原则和实践的演变之中。他的档案提供了这些发展的幕后视角，并表明，我们思考所依据的这些原则组合远非对普遍真理的记录，而更像是在寻求不可能达成的共识中所进行的修修补补。

## 一、真实性与《威尼斯宪章》

基于第二届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议期间撰写的几份草稿以及随后几个月的信件往来，勒迈尔的档案使我们能够追溯《威尼斯宪章》的起草过程，在此期间，勒迈尔负责宪章的最终定稿。从这些资料出发，再结合皮耶罗·加佐拉 (Piero Gazzola, 1908-1979) 和罗伯特·帕内 (Roberto Pane, 1897-1987) 的档案以及国际文物保护与修复研究中心 (ICCROM) 保存的几封信件，可以发现《威尼斯宪章》的文本主要由四个人起草：担任大会报告员的勒迈尔，时任 ICCROM 副主任的比利时艺术史学家保罗·菲利波 (Paul Philippot, 1925—2016)，大会秘书长、意大利建筑师加佐拉和法国建筑师让·索尼耶 (Jean Sonnier, 1913—2004)<sup>[12]</sup>。根据同一文献来源可知，《威尼斯宪章》的主要参考资料是雅典会议 (1931) 的结论<sup>[13]</sup>、帕内和加佐拉<sup>[14]</sup>对意大利《修复宪章》(Carta del Restauro, 1932) 的批判性重读，以及勒迈尔在 1960 年代初为比利时皇家古迹遗址委员会撰写的一份《纪念物<sup>③</sup>保护和修复指导原则大纲》(Esquisse de Principes Directeurs en Matière de Conservation et de Restauration des Monuments Anciens)<sup>[15]</sup>。当然，这些并不是唯一的参考资料。在这一过程中发挥了重要作用的还有切萨

(1921-1997)。Rapporteur for the drafting of the Venice Charter in 1964, and author of the French version of the Nara Document on Authenticity thirty years later, Lemaire was the first Secretary General (1965-1975) and second President of ICOMOS (1975-1981). As such, he was closely involved in the evolution of heritage principles and practices during these decades of expansion of the notion of heritage and globalization of debates. His archives provide a behind-the-scenes look at these developments and show that, far from being documents of universal truth, the sets of principle on which our reflections are based are more a matter of tinkering in search of an impossible consensus.

### 1. Authenticity and the Venice Charter

R.M. Lemaire's archives enable to retrace part of the process of writing the Venice Charter, based on several drafts written during the congress, and exchanges of correspondence in the months that followed, during which Lemaire was responsible for finalizing the document. From these archives, combined with those of Piero Gazzola and Roberto Pane and a few letters conserved at ICCROM, it emerges that the text was mainly drafted by four people: Lemaire, playing the role of rapporteur, Paul Philippot, a Belgian art historian, then deputy director of ICCROM, the Italian architect Piero Gazzola, secretary general of the congress, and the French architect Jean Sonnier<sup>[12]</sup>. According to the same sources, the main references for the document were the conclusions of the Athens Conference (1931)<sup>[13]</sup>, a critical rereading by Roberto Pane and Piero Gazzola<sup>[14]</sup> of the Italian Restoration Charter (1932) and a document written by R. M. Lemaire in the early 1960s for the Belgian Royal Commission for Monuments and Sites<sup>[15]</sup>. Of course, they were not the only ones. The theory of Cesare Brandi<sup>[16]</sup>, of which Philippot was a close

③ 译者注：出于“monument”这一概念的特殊性，除了会议和机构等专有名词的约定俗成译法外，本文一律将其译为“纪念物”。

雷·布兰迪(Cesare Brandi, 1906—1988)<sup>[16]</sup>的理论——菲利波是其密切合作者，以及勒迈尔提前准备的第二届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议第一场大会的总体报告——其中汇编了与会者对建立学说相关问题之发言的反馈<sup>[17]</sup>。

尽管早在20世纪初，“真实性”一词就出现在许多关于历史纪念物的欧洲理论文本中<sup>[18]</sup>，但它却没有出现在雅典会议<sup>[19]</sup>和意大利《修复宪章》<sup>[20]</sup>的结论中，这两份文献是《威尼斯宪章》的重要来源。1957年，在巴黎举行的第一届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议上，真实性作为需要保护的纪念物特征之一，出现在第四场大会的一项决议中，与历史性、美感和“情感考古学”<sup>[21]</sup>并列。但这次会议没有通过任何宪章，且其国际性甚至比26年前的雅典会议还要低。因此，真实性被明确写入国际文件，是1964年《威尼斯宪章》出台才发生的事。该术语从第一版草稿就出现在序言和第9条中，但没有明确定义。

在第9条中，“真实”一词实际上并不涉及纪念物本身，而是指修复工作所依据的文件：“（修复工作）旨在保护和揭示纪念物的美学和历史价值，并以尊重原始材料和若干真实的文献为基础”<sup>④</sup>。既有研究已经强调，原本用法语撰写的该条款，其内容和措辞与勒迈尔在1960年代初起草的比利时《纪念物保护和修复指导原则大纲》第B9条有明显的相似之处<sup>[22]</sup>：“尊重古老的材料或原始文献必须是任何修复工作的基础之一”<sup>[23]</sup>。然而，在这个具体问题上，必须注意到两个重要的区别。首先，在比利时文本中，勒迈尔使用了“原始”而不是“真

collaborator, and the general report of the first session of the congress, prepared in advance by Lemaire and compiling the interventions of the lecturers on questions of doctrine<sup>[17]</sup>, also played an important role in the process.

Although the term ‘authenticity’ appeared in a number of European theoretical texts on historic monuments as early as the beginning of the twentieth century<sup>[18]</sup>, it was absent from the conclusions of the Athens Conference<sup>[19]</sup> and the Italian Restoration Charter<sup>[20]</sup>, two important sources of the Venice Charter. In 1957, at the First International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historical Monuments in Paris, authenticity appeared in a resolution of the fourth session as one of the characteristics of a monument to be preserved, together with historicity, beauty and ‘sentimental archaeology’<sup>[21]</sup>. But the conference, which was even less international than the one in Athens 26 years earlier, didn’t lead to the adoption of any charter. So it was not until the Venice Charter in 1964 that authenticity was explicitly inscribed in an international document. The term was present from the first draft, without being defined, in the preamble and article 9.

In article 9, the term ‘authentic’ does not actually apply to the monuments themselves, but rather to the documents on which their restoration must be based: ‘Its aim is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents’. Previous research has highlighted the obvious similarity between the content and wording of this article – originally in French – and article B9 of the document drafted by Lemaire in the early 1960s<sup>[22]</sup>: ‘Respect for the old substance or original document must be one

④ 译者注：作者引用的英文原文为“*Its aim is to preserve and reveal the aesthetic and historic value of the monument and is based on respect for original material and authentic documents*”。现有的《威尼斯宪章》中文版存在许多灵活翻译的成分，若截取并直接置入本文的翻译中，常常与作者的语境不符。如在本句中，“authentic”一词被官方中文版翻译成“确凿”，若依此，作者整段对“真实性”的论述则令人无法理解。因此，本着对本文负责的精神，译者重新翻译《威尼斯宪章》的相关引文，力求完整体现作者的观点。下同

实”一词。更重要的是，“文献”是单数而不是复数，这赋予了该句完全不同的含义。这意味着修复不仅要尊重纪念物的“古老材料”，还要尊重其作为“原始文献”的特性。这一条文本本身可能部分受到了意大利《修复宪章》第2条的启发，该条款也拒绝将假设作为修复的出发点<sup>⑤</sup> [24]。根据加佐拉和帕内的观点<sup>[25]</sup>——勒迈尔在大会总体报告中也表达了同样的看法<sup>[26]</sup>：意大利宪章中的这一具体条款涉及“尊重纪念物的真实性”，但没有明确提到这一术语。可见，在第二届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议期间，用法文起草的《威尼斯宪章》条款（以及随后几个月的英文翻译）背离了其所依据的文本的精神，将真实性标准应用于修复纪念物的文献资料，而不是纪念物本身。

另一方面，序言中对真实性的提及则有多种解读的可能：当文中说我们有责任将纪念物“以其完整丰富的真实性”<sup>⑥</sup>传给子孙后代时，这是什么意思？1994年奈良会议期间，将在五年后成为ICOMOS主席的米夏埃尔·佩策特（Michael Petzet, 1933-2019）表示，《威尼斯宪章》序言仍然提供了“对真实性可能含义的最好总结，不仅在世界遗产的语境下，而且在全部的保护工作中也是如此”。在他看来，“‘以其完整丰富的真实性’这个短语不仅承诺了材

of the bases of any restoration’<sup>[23]</sup>。However, on this specific question, two important differences must be noted. Firstly, in his Belgian text, Lemaire used the term ‘original’ rather than ‘authentic’. And more importantly, the fact that ‘document’ was singular rather than plural gives the sentence a completely different meaning. The implication is that restoration must respect not only the monument’s ‘old substance’, but also its character as an ‘original document’. This article may itself have been partly inspired by article 2 of the Italian Restoration Charter, which also rejected the hypothesis as the starting point for restoration<sup>2</sup> [24]. According to Gazzola and Pane<sup>[25]</sup>, echoed by Lemaire in his General Report<sup>[26]</sup>, this specific article of the Italian document referred to ‘respect for the authenticity of the monument’, without explicitly mentioning the term. The French drafting of the Venice Charter’s article during the congress (as well as its English translation in the months that followed) therefore departed from the spirit of the texts on which it was based, by applying the criterion of authenticity not to the monument itself, but to the source documents for its restoration.

In the preamble, on the other hand, the reference to authenticity is open to multiple interpretations: what does the text mean when it states that it is our duty to hand on ancient monuments to future generations ‘in the full richness of their authenticity’? During the Nara Conference in 1994, Michael Petzet, who would become president of ICOMOS five years later, stated that the preamble of the Venice Charter still provided ‘the best summary of what authenticity

2. ‘... the problem of restoration motivated by the reasons of art and architectural unity closely conjoined with the historical criterion, can arise only when it is based on absolutely certain data provided by the monument to be restored and not on hypotheses, on elements that are in great prevalence existing rather than on elements that are predominantly new’ (author’s translation from Italian).

⑤ 出于艺术和建筑统一性这一与历史标准紧密相关之动因的修复问题，只有在基于准备修复的纪念物所提供的绝对确定的数据，而不是假设；或者基于现有普遍存在的元素，而不是主要为新的元素之前提下，才允许被提出（作者译自意大利语）。

⑥ 译者注：作者引用的英文原文为“in the full richness of their authenticity”。现有《威尼斯宪章》中文版将该短语译为“真实地、完整地”，若依此，则与作者的语境不符，且会与后文对“完整性”一词的讨论发生混淆。因此，本着对本文负责的精神，译者重新翻译《威尼斯宪章》的相关引文，力求完整体现作者的观点。

料或形式上的真实性，还超越了《世界遗产公约》(World Heritage Convention, 1972) 中的‘设计、材料、工艺或环境的真实性检验’”<sup>[27]</sup>。该序言的手稿保存在勒迈尔档案中，考虑到它是菲利波在一时“灵感迸发”时写的<sup>[28]</sup>，这种开放性并不令人惊讶。作为布兰迪的密切合作伙伴，菲利波也认同布兰迪的观点，认为历史是不可逆转的，“初建时的原状是一个抽象的概念，而不是历史事实”。在他看来，“与过去的真实关系不仅必须承认历史主义之后我们与过去之间形成的不可逾越的鸿沟，还必须将这一距离融入到干预工作的实施中”。因此，与“原材料”相比，“过去的真正意见的表达”才是“保存/保护工作恰恰必须维护的”<sup>[29]</sup>。如此，序言的措辞被打造为允许对真实性问题进行广泛的阐释，可接受不同的文化愿景，这是合乎逻辑的。

菲利波笔下对真实性进行广泛解读的开放心态，是与本次会议的一大背景相契合的。与1931年的雅典会议和1957年的巴黎会议不同，第二届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议迎来了大量来自欧洲以外的专业人士。尽管欧洲人占了大会总人数的近90%，但有20名代表来自美洲，17名来自亚洲<sup>⑦</sup>。相比之下，非洲只有9名代表，澳大利亚只有3名<sup>[30]</sup>。配合大会的展览主要展示了欧洲的项目，但也包括来自阿富汗、哥伦比亚、古巴、黎巴嫩、马来西亚、墨西哥、泰国和突尼斯的项目，占据了格拉西宫(Palazzo Grassi)二楼的三个房间<sup>[31]</sup>。然而，这

could mean, not only in the context of world heritage but for preservation as a whole'. To him, 'the phrase' in the full richness of their authenticity" promise[d] more than just material or formal authenticity and exceed[ed] the "test of authenticity in design, material, workmanship or setting" that was introduced by 'the World Heritage Convention' <sup>[27]</sup>. This openness is not surprising given that the preamble, whose manuscript is conserved in the Lemaire archives, was written by Paul Philippot, 'in a moment of inspiration' <sup>[28]</sup>. As a close collaborator of Cesare Brandi, Philippot shared his view that history was irreversible and that 'the original state is an abstract idea and not a historical reality'. To him, 'an authentic relationship with the past must not only recognize the unbridgeable gap that has formed, after historicism, between us and the past ; it must also integrate this distance into the actualization of the work produced by the intervention'. So, more than the 'original material', 'the genuine voice of the past' was 'exactly what must be safeguarded by preservation/conservation' <sup>[29]</sup>. It is only logical, then, that the wording of the preamble was designed to allow a broad interpretation of the question of authenticity, amenable by different cultural visions.

This openness to a broad interpretation of authenticity, through the pen of Paul Philippot, was appropriate in the context of a conference which, unlike the Athens and Paris conferences, in 1931 and 1957, had welcomed a significant number of professionals from outside Europe. Although Europeans accounted for almost 90% of the assembly, a good twenty delegates came from America and seventeen from Asia<sup>3</sup>. By contrast, Africa had just nine delegates, and Australia three <sup>[30]</sup>. The accompanying exhibition, which mostly featured European projects, also included projects

3. The only delegate from China was a diplomat, Chen-Kwei Chu.

⑦ 来自中国的唯一代表是一名外交官——楚臣桂（音）（Chen-Kwei Chu）。

种国际开放性在讨论《威尼斯宪章》时需要加以特别审视。我们已经看到，宪章是由4名欧洲人组成的小圈子起草的。同样的审视也适用于宪章官方版本底部列出的23个名字，他们是“参与了起草委员会工作”的大会与会者。没有任何资料能让我们明确了解该委员会的确切职责或其组建的条件。该委员会代表了大会的听众，成员也大多是欧洲人，其中8人是意大利人、法国人或比利时人。与他们一起，新任墨西哥城国家人类学和历史研究所殖民古迹部负责人卡洛斯·弗洛雷斯·马里尼(Carlos Flores Marini, 1937-2015)、秘鲁建筑师维克多·皮门特尔(Victor Pimentel)和突尼斯国家考古和艺术研究所所长穆斯塔法·兹比斯(Mostafa Zbiss, 1913-2003)扩大了委员会成员的地理范围。但这并不意味着他们也扩大了委员会的文化框架。尽管皮门特尔和弗洛雷斯·马里尼都来自拉丁美洲，但在大会召开前的几年里，他们都在意大利罗马一大(La Sapienza)专门学习修复。来自西班牙安达卢西亚的兹比斯，则在突尼斯接受了法国殖民语境下的培训。此外，档案中保存的大会结束时提交的宪章版本底部，并没有出现兹比斯和皮门特尔的名字<sup>[32]</sup>，这意味着它们是在事后被加上去的。事实上，档案记录表明他们的作用更多是象征性的，而不是实际性的。

第二届历史古迹建筑师及技师国际会议期间，在勒迈尔敲定《威尼斯宪章》文本的几个月里，他只与欧洲的同事们沟通过。他们有些是这个“起草委员会”的成员，有些不是<sup>[33]</sup>。这也许可以解释为什么尽管其序言具有开放

from Afghanistan, Colombia, Cuba, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mexico, Thailand and Tunisia, occupying three rooms on the first floor of Palazzo Grassi<sup>[31]</sup>. However, this international openness needs to be put into perspective when it comes to the Venice Charter, which we have seen was drafted by a group of four Europeans. The same is true of the twenty-three names that appear at the bottom of the official version of the charter, listing the congress participants who ‘took part in the work of the drafting committee’. No source enable us to specify the exact role of this committee, or the terms of its composition. Representative of the congress audience, its members too were mostly European; eight of them were Italian, French or Belgian. Alongside them, Carlos Flores Marini, recently appointed head of the Colonial Monuments Department of the National Institute of Anthropology and History in Mexico City, Peruvian architect Victor Pimentel and Mostafa Zbiss, Director of the National Institute of Archaeology and Art in Tunis, broadened the commission’s geographical scope. But that does not imply that they also broadened its cultural framework. Although originally from Latin America, both Pimentel and Flores Marini had specialized in restoration at La Sapienza in Rome in the years leading up to the congress. Zbiss, originally from Andalusia (Spain), was trained in Tunisia in a French colonial context. Furthermore, neither Zbiss’s nor Pimentel’s name appeared at the bottom of the version of the charter presented at the end of the congress, conserved in the archives<sup>[32]</sup>, which means that they were added afterwards. In fact, the archives suggest a role that was more symbolic than operational.

When he was finalizing the text in the months during the congress, Lemaire only corresponded with European colleagues, either members of this ‘drafting committee’ or not<sup>[33]</sup>. This may explain why, despite the openness of the preamble, the

性，但宪章的内容本身却反映出欧洲人对纪念物之物质性和形式的执着——虽然没有明确提到真实性。在1994年初于卑尔根组织的奈良会议筹备工作坊上，勒迈尔本人解释说：“1964年的威尼斯大会并没有明确讨论真实性的概念，人们想当然地认为这个概念的含义没有问题。此外，1964年大会的参与者们也没有意识到国际遗产保护的复杂性，主要因为他们中的95%都是欧洲人”<sup>[34]</sup>。华沙大学教授扬·扎克瓦托维茨（Jan Zachwatowicz, 1900—1983）等人在大会上明确表达了这种关于真实性的共同观点。此人在波兰的战后复建期间非常活跃，他认为“一处历史纪念物的最大价值在于其真实性——形式的真实性，以及物质和材料的真实性”<sup>[35]</sup>。正如在总体报告中引用了他的话的勒迈尔一样，他认为“历史纪念物的真实性和其中原始内容的不可侵犯性”事关根本<sup>[36]</sup>。

随着越来越多的国家和文化开始引用《威尼斯宪章》，这种对物质性的执着很快造成了麻烦。这个问题在ICOMOS启动的一次修改宪章的磋商过程中已经出现，当时距宪章通过仅十年。尽管当时主要的关注点是如何将宪章的原则应用于历史城市这一具体情况<sup>[37]</sup>，但勒迈尔档案中保存的信件也见证了其他的言论。时任联合国教科文组织文化部（Department of Culture of UNESCO）古迹遗址事务负责人、《威尼斯宪章》签署人之一的黑洛希·戴福库<sup>⑧</sup>（Hiroshi Daifuku, 1920—2012）在评论宪章的法语版时写道：

very content of the charter, while not explicitly referring to authenticity, reflects a very European attachment to the materiality and form of monuments. During the workshop organized in Bergen in early 1994, in order to prepare the Nara conference, Lemaire himself explained that ‘there was no explicit discussion on the concept of authenticity during the Congress in Venice in 1964. It was assumed that the meaning of the concept was not problematic. Moreover the congress participants in 1964 did not realize the complexity of international preservation, mainly because 95 % of the participants were Europeans’<sup>[34]</sup>. This common point of view about authenticity was clearly expressed during the congress among others by Jan Zachwatowicz, professor at Warsaw University. Very active during the reconstruction period, he was of the opinion that ‘the greatest value of a historic monument lies in its authenticity - authenticity of form as much as of matter and material’<sup>[35]</sup>. Like Lemaire, who quoted him in his general report, he considered ‘the authenticity of the historic monument and the inviolability of what is original in it’ to be essential<sup>[36]</sup>.

This attachment to materiality would soon become problematic, as the number of countries and cultures referring to the Venice Charter increased. The issue already emerged during the consultation process for a revision of the Charter, launched by ICOMOS just ten years after its adoption. Although the main focus was on adapting the Charter's principles to the specific case of historic cities<sup>[37]</sup>, the correspondence preserved in the Lemaire collection also bears witness to other remarks. Commenting on the French version, Hiroshi Daifuku, then in charge of Monuments and sites at the Department of Culture of UNESCO and a signatory of the Venice Charter wrote :

⑧ 译者注：Daifuku为美籍日裔学者，其名字的汉字从未出现在公开场合，因此遵循日文版《威尼斯宪章》等日本官方文件中翻译其名逻辑，采取音译。



宪章的特性有点过于欧洲式，甚至地中海式，其中许多原则适用于砖石建筑。在北欧、亚洲大部 and 北美，许多珍贵的纪念物都是用木头建造的。第9条开篇即规定“修复是一项必须保持特例性的工作”<sup>⑨</sup>，这很难适用于木质纪念物的情况。……对“古代材料”的使用也会引起问题。……第12条规定，必须以与原始部分明显区别的方式替换缺失部分，这同样很难适用于木质纪念物。如果不给木头上漆，随着时间的推移，风化可能会使新木头很快变得像旧木头。……另一个因素是，由于木材是一种有机材料，木质遗址很难保存。……因此，为此类纪念物进行重建或建造保护大棚涉及重大且不可避免的改动，与用非有机材料建造的纪念物<sup>⑩</sup>有显著区别<sup>⑪</sup> [38]。

本着同样的精神，ICOMOS 执行委员会成员小林文次（1918—1983）不仅强调了木建筑的特殊性，还强调了与有形纪念物、建筑群或遗址相关的“任何非物质遗产”的重要性。他特别提到了“仪式、节日、戏剧、舞蹈和音乐”。他坚持认为“建筑以及包括工具在内的建造技术应该得到保护，这些传统技师应该得到培养”<sup>[39]</sup>。在代表波兰古迹遗址保护协会委员会提交的评论中，斯坦尼斯劳斯·洛伦茨（Stanislas

*The charter is a little too European, even Mediterranean in character, and many of its principles are applicable to masonry and stone construction. In northern Europe, much of Asia and North America, many valuable monuments are made of wood. Article 9, which states at the outset that 'restoration is an operation which must remain exceptional in character...' <sup>4</sup> is difficult to apply to the case of wooden monuments. (...) The use of 'ancient substance' can also raise problems. (...) Article 12, according to which missing parts must be replaced in such a way that they stand out from the original parts, is also difficult to apply in the case of wooden monuments. If the wood is not painted, it is possible that, over time, the patina will cause a new piece of wood to quickly resemble older pieces. (...) Another factor is that because wood is an organic material, it is difficult to conserve wooden ruins (...) Hence the fact that rebuilding or constructing shelters for this type of monument involves major and unavoidable changes, and constitutes a marked difference from monuments built from non-organic material*  
[38, author's translation from French]

In the same spirit, Bunji Kobayashi, a member of the ICOMOS executive committee, drew attention not only to the specificity of wooden buildings, but also to the importance of 'any intangible heritage' connected to tangible monuments, groups of buildings or sites. He cited in particular 'rituals, festivals, dramas, dances and music'. He insisted that 'buildings as well as construction techniques including tools should be conserved,

4. This sentence, which opens article 9 in the original French version of the charter, is replaced in the official English version by 'The process of restoration is a highly specialized operation'. This is a major discrepancy between these two versions of the charter, which had an impact on further translations.

⑨ 这句话是法语版宪章第9条的开头，但在官方英语版中被替换为“修复过程是一项高度专业化的操作（the process of restoration is a highly specialised operation）”。这是宪章两个版本之间的一个重大差异，对后续翻译产生了影响。译者注：“特例性的工作”指并非经常性、普遍性的措施。

⑩ 译者注：此段文字中的“monument”一词均译为“纪念物”，考虑到作者原文是翻译自法语，而法语中的“monument”更贴近于“纪念物”。

⑪ 作者译自法语。

Lorentz, 1899—1991) 建议对有关复建的第 9 条进行补充或阐释：

在有最高理由证明正当的情况下，例如发生灾难、建造事故、战争或敌对行动造成的损失，可能有必要重建历史和文化的古代纪念物。此类复建，无论涉及全部或部分真实物质的损失，都必须按照修复诸条款中规定的原则进行<sup>[40]</sup>。

上述三个例子足以说明，1970 年代后半期关于修改《威尼斯宪章》的辩论中，已经浮现出 1994 年奈良会议将要讨论的要点。这一过程与联合国教科文组织对起草《实施〈世界遗产公约〉操作指南》(*Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention*，以下简称《操作指南》) 的思考是同时发生的，该指南中将会出现公约文本并没有提到的真实性的概念。考虑到 ICOMOS 已被认定为联合国教科文组织关于建成遗产问题的咨询机构，以上两个过程也部分涉及相同的参与者。

## 二、走向《奈良文件》

与《威尼斯宪章》一样，《奈良文件》起草过程的部分记录也被收录在勒迈尔的档案中。勒迈尔负责起草文件的法文版，加拿大人赫布·斯托韦尔(Herb Stovel, 1948-2012)负责起草英文版。与先用法语起草然后翻译成英文的《威尼斯宪章》不同，《奈良文件》是用两种语言共同起草的。档案记录说明了这项联合工作的难度，不仅是因为语言，而最重要的是因为两位作者之间的文化和代际差异。

and such traditional technicians should be trained'<sup>[39]</sup>. In the commentary submitted on behalf of the Polish ICOMOS Committee, Stanislas Lorentz proposed an addition or commentary to be added to article 9 concerning reconstructions:

*In circumstances justified by supreme reasons, such as cataclysms, a construction accident, losses caused by war operations, or a hostile operation, it may be necessary to rebuild ancient monuments of history and culture. Reconstructions of this kind, whether involving total or partial loss of authentic substance, must be carried out in accordance with the principles set out in the articles dealing with restoration* <sup>[40, author's translation from French]</sup>.

These three examples suffice to illustrate that the main points for discussion at the 1994 Nara conference had already emerged from debates on adapting the Venice Charter in the second half of the 1970s. This process was contemporaneous with UNESCO's reflections on the drafting of operational guidelines for the implementation of the World heritage Convention (1972), where the concept of authenticity, absent from the text of the convention itself, would appear. These two processes also partly involved the same actors, ICOMOS having been recognized as UNESCO's consultative body on questions of built heritage.

## 2. Towards the Nara Document on Authenticity

As with the Venice Charter, part of the process of drafting the Nara Document is documented in the R. M. Lemaire archives. Lemaire was in charge of drafting the French version, while the Canadian Herb Stovel (1948-2012) was responsible for the English version. Unlike the Venice Charter, first drafted in French and then translated into English, the Nara Document was jointly drafted in both languages. The archives illustrate the difficulties of this joint work, not only for linguistic reasons, but also and above all because of the cultural and

作为 1975 至 1981 年 ICOMOS 的主席，勒迈尔从一开始就参与了《操作指南》的讨论。选择“真实性”而不是“完整性”作为标准，似乎应该归功于他。正如斯托韦尔在他的一篇文章中回忆的那样，起初，秘书长欧内斯特·艾伦·康纳利（Ernest Allen Connally, 1921-1999）在 1976 年世界遗产委员会最早的系列讨论中引入了完整性的概念。自 1950 年以来，完整性就一直在美国国家公园管理局的管理手册中被使用，其定义为“一种意味着原始工艺、原始位置以及非物质的感觉和关联等元素的综合品质”<sup>[41]</sup>。1976 年 5 月在瑞士莫尔日组织的关于公约实施的一场非正式咨询会议的报告确实提到：

除了评估一项财产（property）<sup>⑫</sup>固有特征的拟议标准外，与会者认为，列入《世界遗产名录》的财产还应满足“完整性”（针对文化和自然财产）和“统一性”（针对文化财产）的标准。对于所有自然财产和那些将根据艺术价值、关联性价值和典型性的标准进行评估的文化财产来说，“完整性”标准被认为尤其重要<sup>[42]</sup>。

勒迈尔没有出席 1976 年的这次会议。但斯托韦尔根据康纳利的记录指出，一年后的 1977 年 3 月，在巴黎举行的一场世界遗产筹备会议上，勒迈尔提议将完整性改称为真实性，“因为他担心完整性一词的使用也许会将入选资格局限在那些具有纯粹原始设计或形式的纪念物上”。斯托韦尔强调，康纳利对勒迈尔的意图曾表示怀疑<sup>[43]</sup>，而根据勒迈尔当时的文章，康纳利的疑虑可能是对的。在 1976 年关于“记忆

generational gap between the two authors.

As President of ICOMOS between 1975 and 1981, Raymond Lemaire had been involved in discussions on the World Heritage Convention's operational guidelines from the outset. It seems that the choice of the term 'authenticity' rather than 'integrity' as a criteria should be attributed to him. As Herb Stovel recalls in one of his articles, Secretary General Ernest Allen Connally had initially imported the notion of integrity into the first discussions of the World Heritage Committee, taking place in 1976. Integrity had been used since the 1950s in the US National Park Service administration manual and was defined as 'a composite quality connoting original workmanship, original location, and intangible elements of feeling and association'<sup>[41]</sup>. The report of an informal consultation meeting on the implementation of the convention, organized in Morges (Switzerland) in May 1976 indeeds mentioned that

*In addition to the criteria proposed for evaluating the inherent characteristics of a property, participants felt that the properties included in the WHL should also meet the criteria of 'integrity' (for cultural and natural properties) and of 'unity' (for cultural property). The criterion of 'integrity' was considered to be of particular importance for all natural properties and for those cultural properties that were to be judged according to the criteria of artistic value, associative value and typicality<sup>[42]</sup>.*

Raymond Lemaire did not attend this 1976 meeting. But according to Stovel, based on Connally's records, it was one year later, during a World Heritage preparatory meeting in Paris, in March 1977, that he proposed to rename integrity, authenticity, 'out of concern that the use of integrity might seem to restrict eligibility of monuments to those with purity of original design

⑫ 译者注：在《操作指南》的中文版中，“property”一词均译作“遗产”。然而后文中包含对该词区别于“heritage”之应用的讨论，因此，此处特译作“财产”以示区分。

与连续性”的一篇文章中，勒迈尔宣称，过去的证言这一价值“只能通过将其变为现实的形式和物质的真实性保存下来”<sup>[44]</sup>。因此，勒迈尔坚持使用“真实性”而不是“完整性”的原因尚不清楚，尤其考虑到在他的写作中这两个术语可互换使用。对于斯托韦尔来说，“真实性概念之于勒迈尔等 ICOMOS 先驱的吸引力，是基于这一概念在保护方面具有极大实用性这一假设”<sup>[45]</sup>。但无论如何，其结果是《操作指南》在第一版中纳入了“设计、材料、工艺和环境真实性的检验”这段话，并明确指出“真实性不仅限于对原始形式和结构的考量，还包括随时间推移进行的所有后续修改和添加，这些修改和添加本身具有艺术或历史价值”。完整性的条件则被限定于自然遗产<sup>[46]</sup>。真实性与完整性的这种混淆将在接下来的几十年里一直存续<sup>[47]</sup>。此外，真实性的检验很快便受到了考验，这发生在关于将复建或高度修复后的古迹列为世界遗产的辩论中，例如波兰的华沙老城或法国的卡尔卡松城堡<sup>[48]</sup>。回过头来看，ICOMOS 主席勒迈尔与其秘书长康纳利不同观念之间的这段过往，似乎也预示 1994 至 1995 年勒迈尔与斯托韦尔在起草《奈良文件》时遇到的文化难题。

### 三、起草两份《奈良文件》

在 2015 年发表的一篇文章中，克里斯蒂娜·卡梅伦 (Christina Cameron) 和稻叶信子详细描述了 1990 年代初的一系列事件，它们引发

or form’. As Stovel underlines, Connally was dubious of Lemaire’s intent <sup>[43]</sup>, and based on the latter’s contemporary writings he might have been right. In a 1976 text on ‘memory and continuity’, Lemaire declared that the value of testimonies of the past was ‘preserved only through the authenticity of the forms and substance that materialize it’ <sup>[44]</sup>. So the reason why Lemaire insisted that ‘authenticity’ be used rather than ‘integrity’ remains unclear, especially since his writings used the two terms interchangeably. To Stovel, ‘the attraction of ICOMOS pioneers like Raymond Lemaire to the authenticity concept was based on the premise that this concept was of great practical utility on conservation’ <sup>[45]</sup>. But in any case, the result was the inclusion of the ‘test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship and setting’ in the first version of the Operational Guidelines, with the precision that ‘authenticity does not limit consideration to original form and structure but includes all subsequent modifications and additions over the course of time, which in themselves possess artistic or historical values’. The condition of integrity was limited to natural properties <sup>[46]</sup>. This confusion between authenticity and integrity was to persist over the following decades <sup>[47]</sup>. In addition, the test of authenticity was soon put to the test by debates over the inclusion on the world heritage list of reconstructed or highly restored sites, such as the old center of Warsaw or the ramparts of Carcassonne, France <sup>[48]</sup>. But in retrospect, this episode between the conceptions of Lemaire, President of ICOMOS, and those of his Secretary General Ernest A. Connally also appears to foreshadow the cultural difficulties encountered during the drafting of the Nara document between Lemaire and Stovel in 1994 and 1995.

### 3. Drafting two Nara documents

In an article published in 2015, Christina Cameron and Nobuko Inaba described in detail the successive events that led to the organization

了对真实性的有组织辩论，并以 1994 年初在卑尔根举行的预备工作坊和 9 个月后的奈良会议为高潮。基于斯托韦尔的档案和其个人关系，他们还能够追溯两次活动期间辩论的演变，以及《奈良文件》从会议时的第一版到 1995 年发布期间，其起草过程中的困难<sup>[49]</sup>。勒迈尔的档案可以为以上事实作出补充，并为他们的叙述增加精准度。

勒迈尔和斯托韦尔有一些共同点，但他们的个人情况却截然不同。他们的共通之处在于都致力于保护领域的专业教学，勒迈尔在鲁汶和布鲁日执教，斯托韦尔则在蒙特利尔和渥太华。两人都在 ICCROM 任教，与 ICOMOS 的合作也将他们联系在一起，他们都曾担任秘书长，勒迈尔从 1965 至 1975 年，斯托韦尔从 1990 至 1993 年。他们还都是《世界遗产公约》的联合国教科文组织专家<sup>[50]</sup>。但除了这些相似处以外，他们的关注点和专业领域相对来说是不同的。勒迈尔主要对纪念性砖石建筑和欧洲历史城区的未来感兴趣，而斯托韦尔则更关注乡土遗产、木构建筑和文化景观。在为奈良会议做准备的卑尔根工作坊上，他们分别提交的论文彰显了这些不同的视角。

勒迈尔的论文标题已经揭示了其观点的明确性。这篇题为《真实性与纪念性遗产》(Authenticity and monumental heritage)<sup>[51]</sup>的文章实际上是为 1993 年“石质和其他材质保护国际大会”的“修复伦理”部分撰写的，这场会议由联合国教科文组织和国际建筑材料、系统

of a structured debate on authenticity in the early 1990s, culminating in a preparatory workshop in Bergen in early 1994 and the Nara conference nine months later. On the basis of Herb Stovel's archives and personal contacts, they were also able to trace the evolution of the debates during both events, as well as the difficulties in the drafting process of the Nara Document from the first version during the conference to its publication in 1995<sup>[49]</sup>. Lemaire's archives complement and add precision to their account.

Raymond Lemaire and Herb Stovel shared some common features, but their profiles were quite different. What they had in common was a commitment to specialized teaching in the field of conservation, in Lemaire's case in Louvain and Bruges, and in Stovel's in Montreal and Ottawa. Both also taught at ICCROM. Their involvement with ICOMOS also linked them, since they both served as Secretary General, Lemaire from 1965 to 1975 and Stovel from 1990 to 1993. They were also both UNESCO experts on the World Heritage Convention<sup>[50]</sup>. But beyond these similarities, their interests and areas of expertise were relatively different. While Lemaire was mainly interested in the future of monumental brick and stone architecture, and of European historic centers, Stovel focused more on vernacular heritage, wooden architecture and cultural landscapes. The papers they respectively presented at the Bergen seminar in preparation for the Nara conference illustrate these different points of view.

The title of Raymond Lemaire's paper already revealed the specificity of his vision. Entitled 'Authenticity and monumental heritage'<sup>[51]</sup>, it had in fact been written for the 'ethics of restoration' section of the 'International Congress on the Conservation of Stone and Other Materials', organized jointly by UNESCO and RILEM<sup>5</sup> in

5. RILEM, founded in 1947, stood for 'Réunion Internationale des Laboratoires d'Essais et de Recherches sur les Matériaux et les Constructions' (International Association of Testing and Research Laboratories for Materials and Constructions).

和结构实验室和专家联盟 (RILEM)<sup>⑬</sup>在巴黎联合举办<sup>[52]</sup>。尽管没有给出定义，勒迈尔从一开始就宣称，真实性的概念“是整个现代历史纪念物保护和修复学说的基础”，他提出对信息传递过程中真实和真诚的概念进行思考：“如果信息在从发送者传递到接收者的过程中没有经过任何改变，哪怕是细微的差异，它便是真实的……这种在最初就已经很复杂的信息，随着时间的推移，可能会发生改变、修改、增加或丢失，对这些改动进行识别，并正确地理解和解读它，以便与原始信息相区分，这是十分重要的。”对他来说，与文学或音乐不同，造型艺术，包括建筑，直接通过形式在空间中表达自己，无需转录或解释作为中介。因此，它们的真实性“本质上取决于”对创作者意图中的“初始形式没有任何修改或改变”。然而，这种改变是不可避免的，它们会改变原始信息的含义，或者导致信息的重叠以至抹去原始信息。但另一方面，它们也可以被看作是作品历史中真实的阶段。勒迈尔看到了这两种真实性——形式和历史之间的冲突，在此基础上，他还把作品在创作所在的社会中之意义的真实性加入考量。本文的大部分内容是对这三种类型的真实性——形式、历史和意义进行仲裁。他的观点随后变得更为清晰，在他眼中，纪念物作为一件艺术品的价值要优先于其他方面，从哲学上讲，作为艺术品的价值是“本质性的”，而其他两个是“偶然性的”。他还指出，19世纪那些“荒唐至极的”修复工作，“往往抹去了纪念物历史的所有痕迹，只留下对修复建筑师想象形式的记录，与原始的形式真实性没有任何联系”，这导致了后世更青睐文献价值的反应，而这一观点令人遗憾地被《威尼斯宪章》表达了出来。

1993 in Paris<sup>[52]</sup>. Declaring from the outset that the concept of authenticity ‘lies at the very basis of the whole modern doctrine of the conservation and restoration of historic monuments’, while remaining undefined, Lemaire proposed a reflection on the notion of truth and sincerity in the transmission of a message. ‘A message is authentic if it is transmitted without alteration, even in its nuances, from sender to receiver (...) Over time, this message, already complex at its origin, may undergo alterations, modifications, additions or losses that it is important to recognize and distinguish from the original message, and to understand and interpret correctly’. For him, unlike literature or music, the plastic arts, including architecture, express themselves in space through form, directly, without the intermediary of transcription or interpretation. Their authenticity is therefore ‘essentially determined by the absence of any modification or alteration of the initial forms’ intended by the creator. Such alterations are inevitable, however, altering the meaning of the original message, or resulting in an imbrication of messages that can even erase the original one. But on the other hand, they can also be seen as genuine stages in the history of the work. Lemaire saw a conflict between these two types of authenticity, formal and historical, to which he added the authenticity of the work’s significance within the society in which it was created. Most of the article is an arbitration between these three types of authenticity: form, history and meaning. It soon becomes clear that, in his eyes, the value as a work of art takes precedence over the other aspects of monuments, the first being ‘essential’ and the other two ‘accidental’, philosophically speaking. He also pointed out that the ‘outrageous’ restorations of the 19th century, which ‘often erased all traces of the monument’s

⑬ 国际建筑材料、系统和结构实验室和专家联盟成立于1947年，其缩写“RILEM”代表“Réunion Internationale des Laboratoires d’Essais et de Recherches sur les Matériaux et les Constructions”。

结果是：历史真实性已处于优先于形式真实性的地位。对1964年《威尼斯宪章》的咬文嚼字式解读——因此也是滥用的解读——导致了这样的观点。虽然这让历史学家们感到满意，但显然它无法满足那些认为纪念物首先是一件艺术品的人，这些艺术品的主要作用是传达美学信息，而不是提供无可挑剔的历史坐标。这种冲突的情况，以及基于一种或另一种选择而产生的相对重要性，解释了对《威尼斯宪章》原则的不同甚至有时对立的解读<sup>⑭[53]</sup>。

如此，仅基于对纪念性建筑（帕台农神庙）或艺术品（拉奥孔雕塑）的讨论，勒迈尔的观点在这篇文章中得到了非常清晰的表达。但他承认，以与帕台农神庙形成鲜明对比的伊势神宫为例，这种观点也许并非所有文化都能认同。

从这一事态中可以得出的结论是根本性的：对“纪念物”的真实性或其他价值来说，不存在单一、稳定的概念，无论其性质为何——建筑、绘画、雕塑作品或任何其他造型表达。它们不仅因文化而异，而且因同一文化内部思想的演变而不同。有一点是明确的：“纪念物”的真实性不是一个具有绝对或明确内容的概念。相反，它是一个本质上与某一文化相关的观念，并受该文化所有差异和演变造成之不可捉摸的变化的影响<sup>⑮[54]</sup>。

history, leaving a formal record of it that had no connection with the original formal truth other than that imagined by the restorer architect', led to a reaction in favor of documentary value, a point of view regrettably expressed by the Venice Charter.

The result: historical authenticity has taken precedence over formal authenticity. The literal, and therefore abusive, interpretation of the 1964 Venice Charter leads to this view of the question. While this satisfies historians, it is not obvious that it satisfies those for whom a monument is first and foremost a work of art, whose main role is to convey an aesthetic message and not to provide irreproachable historical coordinates. This conflicting situation, and the relative importance accorded to one or other of these alternatives, explains the varied and sometimes opposing interpretations of the principles of the Venice Charter <sup>[53, author's translation from French]</sup>.

Lemaire's point of view was thus very clearly expressed in this article, based exclusively on examples of monumental architecture (the Parthenon) or works of art (the Laocoon). He admitted, however, that this point of view may not be shared by all cultures, taking the example of the Ise sanctuary in contrast to that of the Parthenon.

The conclusion to be drawn from this state of affairs is fundamental: there is no single, stable concept of authenticity or other values of the 'monument', whatever its nature: work of architecture, painting, sculpture or any other plastic expression. They vary not only from culture to culture, but also according to the evolution of ideas within the same culture. One thing is clear: the authenticity of a 'monument' is not a concept with absolute or definitive content. On the contrary, it is a notion essentially linked to a culture, and is subject to all the vagaries of its disparities and evolution. <sup>[54, author's translation from French]</sup>

⑭⑮ 作者译自法语。

斯托韦尔的文章《关于真实性的说明》(Notes on Authenticity) 则截然不同，它以更直接的可操作性为目标。该文旨在“帮助制定讨论议程，使我们在保护实践中能够更加清晰、更具实践意义地使用真实性的概念”，它不仅探讨了理论问题，还提出了“源自北美对遗产和保护的特有合理看法而产生的真实性问题和关切”。与勒迈尔不同，他的思考涵盖了广泛的遗产范围，不仅包括纪念物，还包括乡土建筑、文化景观和工业遗产等新兴的类别。斯托韦尔还强调，遗产概念的扩大是与辩论的民主化以及分析和呈现过去这一过程的大众化相辅相成的。他的“地域性反思”通过实际案例推动了这些辩论，例如安东尼岛的原住民遗址、北美小城镇的主要街道、里多运河走廊，以及为展示国家历史而大量复建的古迹<sup>[55]</sup>。

研讨会结束时，14 名工作坊的参与者开始着手组织奈良会议，并作出决定，奈良会议的科学委员会将由尤嘎·尤基莱托 (Jukka Jokilehto) (ICCROM)、克努特·埃纳尔·拉森 (Knut Einar Larsen) 和尼尔斯·玛尔施泰因 (Nils Marstein) (研讨会组织者)、益田兼房 (日本文化厅) 和斯托韦尔 (ICOMOS) 组成。勒迈尔只是一位预期的主题演讲者<sup>[56]</sup>。然而，在会议前夕，斯托韦尔坚持要求勒迈尔加入科学委员会，这样就不会所有的决定都由英语人士作出，否则会损害结果的可信度<sup>[57]</sup>。如此，勒迈尔和斯托韦尔成为了奈良会议的共同报告员，而与斯托韦尔不同<sup>[58]</sup>，勒迈尔没有发表任何自己的演讲。

Herb Stovel's contribution, 'Notes on Authenticity', was very different, with a more directly operative objective. Aiming to 'help structure an agenda for discussion which will bring greater clarity and practical sense to our use of the authenticity concept in conservation practice', it not only addressed theoretical questions, but also presented 'authenticity issues and concerns which arise from specific perceptions of heritage and conservation valid in North America'. In contrast to Lemaire's, his reflections covered a broad heritage spectrum, encompassing not only monuments, but also emerging categories such as vernacular architecture, cultural landscapes and industrial heritage. Stovel also stressed that the broadening of the notion of heritage went hand in hand with the democratization of debate and the popularization of the processes involved in analyzing and presenting the past. His 'regional reflections' fueled these debates with practical cases, such as the native sites of Anthony Island, the Main streets of small North American towns, the Rideau Canal corridor and historic sites that had been largely rebuilt to showcase the nation's history<sup>[55]</sup>.

At the end of the seminar, the fourteen workshop participants worked on the organization of the Nara symposium. It was decided that the scientific committee would comprise Jukka Jokilehto (ICCROM), Knut Einar Larsen and Nils Marstein (organisers of the seminar), Kanefusa Masada (Agency for cultural affairs, Japan) and Herb Stovel, for ICOMOS. Raymond Lemaire was only one of the prospective keynote speakers<sup>[56]</sup>. However, in the run-up to the conference, Herb Stovel insisted that Lemaire be included on the scientific committee, so that not all the decisions would be taken by English speakers, which would undermine the credibility of the results<sup>[57]</sup>. As a consequence, Lemaire and Stovel found themselves co-rapporteurs of the



1994年11月1—6日，奈良会议聚集了46名经过精心挑选的与会者，以代表尽可能广泛的文化多样性。《奈良文件》分几个阶段起草：两位报告员用法语和英语起草了初稿，之后一个由15人组成的“科学管理小组”对文件进行了进一步的完善。在参考斯托韦尔档案的基础上，出席了该会议的卡梅伦指出讨论非常困难，因为人们表达了各种截然不同的观点。毫不意外，勒迈尔同一些人一道，认为纪念性遗产要比加拿大或澳大利亚原住民社区的非物质文化遗产或普通遗产更为重要<sup>[59]</sup>，尤基莱托和斯托韦尔都向本文作者口头证实了他的这一立场。最后，该文件的两个版本均由卡梅伦（英文）和阿兹丁·拜绍乌什（Azidine Beschaouch）与迪尼·本巴鲁（Dinu Bumbaru）（法文）编辑，在讨论的最后一天提交给大会。然而，由于法语版和英语版显示出很大不同，勒迈尔和斯托韦尔被要求在接下来的几个月里纠正“翻译上的不一致”<sup>[60]</sup>。

勒迈尔档案中保存了《奈良文件》法文和英文的几个前后相继的版本。从第一稿开始，就可以注意到一些术语上的差异。这些差异可能看起来很小，但它们在一定程度上揭示了对遗产的不同看法，这与我们在勒迈尔和斯托韦尔的个人学术背景以及他们在卑尔根工作坊各自的论点中所注意到的一致。最重要的不同在于对思考对象的命名方式。在两个版本中，“遗产”“文化财产”和“文化遗产”等术语在两种语言中始终占主导地位。但在第9和第11条中，法语版本使用了“作品”（*oeuvre*）一词，该词具有很强的艺术内涵，从而排斥了遗产的广义定义。第13条中，“纪念物”和“遗址”这两

symposium, and Lemaire, unlike Stovel<sup>[58]</sup>, did not present any talk of his own.

The Nara conference brought together 46 participants, carefully selected to represent the widest possible cultural diversity, from November 1 to 6, 1994. The Nara Document was drafted in several stages: after a first draft by the two rapporteurs, in French and English, a ‘scientific management group’ of 15 people further developed the document. Cristina Cameron, who was present at the meeting, and drawing on Herb Stovel’s archives, explained that the discussions were very difficult, with a wide range of very different points of view being expressed. Not surprisingly, Lemaire was among those who considered monumental heritage to be superior to the intangible or modest heritage of native communities in Canada or Australia<sup>[59]</sup>, a position confirmed orally to the author of this article by both Jukka Jokilehto and Herb Stovel. Finally, both versions of the document were edited by Christina Cameron (English) and Azidine Beschaouch with Dinu Bumbaru (French), before being submitted to the assembly on the last day of the colloquium. However, as the French and English versions appeared to be quite different, Lemaire and Stovel were asked to correct the ‘translation inconsistencies’ over the following months<sup>[60]</sup>.

The Lemaire archives conserve several successive versions of the document, in French and English. From the very first draft, a number of terminological discrepancies can be noted. These may appear minor, but they reveal partly different visions of heritage, in line with what we have noted about the profiles of Lemaire and Stovel and their respective contributions to the Bergen workshop. The most significant is the way in which the very object of the reflections was named. In both versions, the terms ‘heritage’, ‘cultural properties’ and ‘cultural heritage’ consistently dominated in both languages.

个术语在两种语言中都有使用，它们在接下来的英文版本中将被“文化遗产”取代，却在最终的法语版本中得到保留<sup>[61][62]</sup>。还应当注意的是，这些初稿在两种语言的版本中都包含了一个额外的小标题“真实性的各个方面”，将第13条和最终版本中没有的第14条结组在一起。第14条明确指出“对真实性的评估表明了真实性各个不同方面与纪念物和遗址之遗产价值相关联的相对重要性”，在由“科学管理小组”修订时，这一条款被删除。

法文版和英文版都脱胎于此番修订以及大会倒数第二天完成的定稿，其内容与1995年发布的版本非常接近。英文版的序言改动很小，然而除第7条以外的其他所有条款都经过了大量改写。法文版中，标题为“价值与真实性”的第9至12条修改最少，而序言和其他条款则大部分被重新修订。因此，大会结束时，两份文件仍然存在许多差异。带着这些遗留问题，它们被提交给了1994年12月在泰国普吉岛举行的第18届世界遗产大会。虽被提交，文件中却说明，其文本“仍可能发生变化，以确保英文版和法文版之间没有差异”<sup>[63]</sup>。

档案记录显示，勒迈尔在联合起草两版文件的磋商后非常不快。会议结束一周后，他向时任ICOMOS秘书长的比利时同胞让-路易·吕

However, in articles 9 and 11, the French version used the term ‘oeuvre’, with a strong artistic connotation, thus excluding a broad definition of heritage. In article 13, the terms ‘monument’ and ‘site’ were used in both languages, but would be replaced by ‘cultural heritage’ in the next English version while remaining in the definitive French version<sup>[61, 62]</sup>. It should also be noted that these first drafts included, in both languages, an additional subtitle, ‘Aspects of authenticity’, grouping together article 13 and an article 14 absent from the final version. Specifying that ‘the assessment of authenticity is indicative of the relative importance of the various aspects of authenticity in relation to the heritage values of monuments and sites’, this article was deleted when the document was revised by the ‘scientific management group’.

Both the French and English versions emerged from the revision process, and from the final edition on the penultimate day of the congress, in a state very close to that which would be published in 1995. In the English version, the preamble underwent very few changes, while all the articles, with the exception of article 7, were largely reworded. In French, articles 9 to 12, under the heading ‘Values and Authenticity’, underwent the fewest corrections, while the preamble and other articles were largely reformulated. At the end of the congress, therefore, there were still many differences between the two documents, and it was with this reservation that they were presented to the 18th session of the World Heritage Committee in Phuket (Thailand), in December 1994. However the document stated that the texts were ‘still subject to change to ensure that they are no differences between the English and the French versions’<sup>[63]</sup>.

The archives bear witness to the fact that Lemaire came out of the negotiations on the joint drafting of the two versions of the document very

克桑(Jean-Louis Luxen) 透露,他认为文件“有些条款只是重复,有些则多余且不明确”,“想要一个好的文本,我们必须重新思考、重新组织和重写所有内容”。他还补充说,如果是“在他的时代”,他会不顾别人的意见自行这样操作,这清楚地表明,与二十年前自己担任 ICOMOS 主席时相比,他觉得不再能跟得上当前辩论发展的步伐<sup>[64]</sup>。令他特别沮丧的是,与 1964 年威尼斯会议不同,本次的辩论主要由英语人士主导,他谴责这些人缺乏“抽象和哲学的智力天性”。在这一点上,他似乎赞同弗朗索瓦丝·肖艾(Françoise Choay)的观点,后者认为法语更适合讨论哲学问题,而英语更适合解释实际问题<sup>[65]</sup>。

在 1995 年开始的几个月,勒迈尔和斯托韦尔继续就两个版本的定稿远程沟通,试图进一步调和它们。然而,这些交流只是让情况更加紧张。他们的分歧点之一是在文件内或文件后附加一些定义。斯托韦尔热衷于至少对“保护”和“文化遗产”这两个术语进行定义,并朝这个方向多次修改了文件,包括在序言中增加一个附加条款。此举也会使文件避免包含 13 个条款,也许是出于迷信的原因,这对某些人来说是个问题<sup>⑩[66]</sup>。勒迈尔则非常不愿意添加定义,因为他觉得如此庄严的宣言容不下定义的存在,这种定义针对的“更多地是政治管理者而不是专家”。他对斯托韦尔希望作为文件附录添加的“后续建议”也同样保持冷淡。这些因素足以表明勒迈尔和斯托韦尔对文本本身的性质有不同看法:对勒迈尔来说它是庄严的宣言,对斯托韦尔则是操作文件。勒迈尔还拒绝放弃“作品”一词而选择“文化遗产”,他认为这种表达方式不符合宣言的目标,因为宣言“既不涉及绘画,也不涉及雕塑、文学或音乐”,

unhappy. A week after the congress, he confided to his compatriot Jean-Louis Luxen, then Secretary General of ICOMOS, that in his opinion, ‘some articles are simply repetitions, others are redundant and unclear’ and that ‘to have a good text we would have to rethink, recompose and rewrite everything’. The fact that he added that ‘in his day’ he would have taken the liberty of doing so, clearly indicates that he no longer felt in step with the evolution of the debates since the time when he himself had chaired ICOMOS, twenty years earlier <sup>[64]</sup>. He was particularly frustrated by the fact that, unlike during the 1964 Venice, the debates were largely dominated by English speakers, whose lack of ‘intellectual disposition for abstraction and philosophy’ he deplored. In this, he seems to have shared the opinion of Françoise Choay, who felt that French was better suited to discussing philosophical issues, while English was more suited to explaining practical problems <sup>[65]</sup>.

During the first months of 1995, Lemaire and Stovel continued to communicate remotely on the finalization of the two versions, trying to harmonize them even further. However, these exchanges only served to make the situation increasingly tense. One of the points of disagreement was the addition of definitions, within or following the document. Herb Stovel was keen that at least the terms ‘conservation’ and ‘cultural heritage’ should be defined, and revised the document several times in this direction, including by creating an additional article within the preamble. The addition of an article would also have prevented the document from having thirteen articles, which was problematic for some <sup>[66]</sup>, maybe for reasons of superstition. Lemaire, for his part, was very reluctant to add definitions, which he felt had no place in such a solemn declaration, addressed ‘much more to political managers than to specialists’. He was equally

⑩ 译者注:“13”在西方文化中是一个不吉利的数字。

而这些都是“文化遗产”一词的表现形式。“纪念物和城市遗产”这个提法也许会让感觉合适，但斯托韦尔和拉森当然不会接受<sup>[67]</sup>。

1995年6月，拉森不想再拖延会议论文集的出版，包括《奈良文件》的法文和英文文本。他决定放弃版本调和，而是根据勒迈尔的文本出版法文版，根据斯托韦尔的文本出版英文版，这就与大会通过的两个版本非常接近了。因此，“作品”一词被保留在法文版中，而“纪念物”和“遗址”则出现在英文版中。另一方面，斯托韦尔起草的定义和建议也由他自己在本巴鲁的协助下翻译成法语，不顾勒迈尔的建议，作为附录添加在法文版中。他还计划增加第三个附录，内容是对最终文本的评论。它将明确指出“《奈良文件》的最终文本包含用法文或英文撰写的条文”，以及“对该文件的最完整理解需要阅读法文和英文两个版本。尽管如此，两个版本将被视为等效的”<sup>[68]</sup>。但最终版本中并未包含该附录。

reticent about the ‘suggestions for follow-up’ that Stovel wished to add as an appendix to the document. These elements suffice to demonstrate the different views of Lemaire and Stovel on the nature of the text itself: a solemn declaration for one, an operational document for the other. Lemaire also refused to abandon the word ‘oeuvre’ in favor of ‘cultural heritage’, because he felt that this expression did not fit in with the declaration’s objective, as it concerned ‘neither painting, nor sculpture, nor literature, nor music’, all expressions of ‘cultural heritage’. ‘Monumental and urban heritage’ might have suited him, but would of course not have been accepted by Stovel and Larsen<sup>[67]</sup>.

In June 1995, Larsen, not wishing to further delay the publication of the conference proceedings, including the text of the document in French and English, decided to forego harmonization of the versions, and to publish the French text on the basis of Lemaire’s work, and the English text on the basis of Stovel’s work thus remaining very close to the versions adopted at the congress. The word ‘oeuvre’ therefore remained in the French version, as did ‘monument’ and ‘site’. On the other hand, the definitions and suggestions drafted by Herb Stovel were translated into French by the latter, assisted by Dinu Bumbaru, and included as an appendix against Lemaire’s advice. It was planned to add a third appendix, consisting of a commentary on the final text. It would have specified that ‘the final text of the Nara document contains articles that were written in French or English’ and that ‘the most complete appreciation of the document invites reading both its French and English versions. Nevertheless, both texts will be considered equivalent’<sup>[68]</sup>. However, this appendix was not included in the final version.

#### 四、结论：普世主义的挑战

正如斯托韦尔本人所强调的那样，“《奈良文件》标志着一种思想转变的最后阶段——从最初由《威尼斯宪章》提出的对普世的国际绝对原则的信念，转向接受对保护的评判必然是相对性的和因地制宜的”<sup>[69]</sup>。仅仅用两种语言来制定一套表达这一理念的原则就已经非常困难，这表明在不同文化中，就有效表述而达成共识是不可能的。这个问题以另一种方式出现在《威尼斯宪章》中：在大会期间，该宪章由一个没有盎格鲁-撒克逊文化代表的工作组仅用法语起草，因此，它曾有一个非正式的工作译本，供不懂法语的大会成员使用。根据勒迈尔的回忆，这个译本是由联合国教科文组织的参会代表戴福库编写的<sup>[70]</sup>，但原稿从未被发现。直到会议结束后的几个月，时任英国古建筑保护学会（Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings）会长的第十一代格拉夫顿公爵休·菲茨罗伊（Hugh FitzRoy, 11<sup>th</sup> Duke of Grafton, 1919-2011）<sup>[71]</sup>才编写了官方英文译本。粗略研究一下这一版本和法语原文，就会发现它们不仅在语言上存在差异，而且在暗含的原则上也存在差异。由于随后的翻译都是以这两个版本为基础的——从1965年5月在ICOMOS第一次大会上与法文和英文版本一起提交的西班牙语和俄语译本开始，这种差异愈演愈烈，令人对宪章普世性的本质产生怀疑。此外，即使宪章的序言指出“各国负有责任在各自的文化和传统体系内应用这一规划”，但在1970年代中期启动的修订过程中收到的一些评论认为，这种应用并不总是可行的<sup>[72]</sup>。即便如此，《威尼斯宪章》从未得到修订。在这种背景下，《奈良文件》是对它进行“扩充”的一种方式，“以回应当代世界对文化遗产不断扩大的关注和兴趣范围”<sup>[73]</sup>。正如斯托韦尔倡议附加的“后续建议”所表明的那样，这份文件仅仅是一个起点，旨在继续扩大对话，“以提高全球对每种文化的不同表现形式和价值观的尊重和理解”<sup>[74]</sup>。

#### 4. Conclusion : the challenge of universalism

As Herb Stovel himself underlined, ‘the Nara Document marked the final stage of the move from belief in universal international absolutes, first introduced by the Venice Charter, toward acceptance of conservation judgments as necessarily relative and contextual’<sup>[69]</sup>. The difficulty of formulating, in just two languages, a set of principles to express this very idea illustrates the impossibility of reaching a consensus on a valid formulation within different cultures. The problem arose in another way with the Venice Charter: drafted during the congress in French only, by a working group that included no representatives of Anglo-Saxon culture, it was the subject of an unofficial working translation intended for members of the assembly who did not speak French. According to Lemaire’s recollection, this translation was produced by the UNESCO representative at the conference, Hiroshi Daifuku<sup>[70]</sup>, but it has never been found. It is only in the months following the conference that the official English translation was produced by Lord Euston, then President of the Society of Ancient Buildings in Great Britain<sup>[71]</sup>. A cursory examination of this version and the French original reveals disparities not only in language but also in underlying principles. As subsequent translations were based on these two versions – starting with the Spanish and Russian translations, presented with them at the ICOMOS first General Assembly in May 1965, such discrepancies only proliferated, casting doubt on the Charter’s universal nature. Moreover, even if the preamble of the document stated that ‘each country’ was ‘responsible for applying the plan within the framework of its own culture and traditions’, some comments received during the revision process launched in the mid 1970’s, suggested that such an application was not always possible<sup>[72]</sup>. However, the Venice Charter was never revised. In this context the Nara Document was a

《威尼斯宪章》和《奈良文件》是过去 60 年来世界遗产史上的两个重要里程碑。因此，通过个人的经历来看待它们似乎有些狭隘或不合适。然而，勒迈尔的档案揭示了这两份文件的制定和接受过程，有时为我们的认识增添了新的内容，有时则限定或澄清了某些重要观点。当然，勒迈尔也并不是一个普通的参与者，他在起草这两份文件时担任报告员，并在 1965 至 1981 年担任 ICOMOS 的秘书长和主席，彼时的遗产世界正在经历快速变化，其范围不断扩大，全球化程度不断提高。考虑到这一时代背景，他的档案可谓十分丰富。但是，除此之外，通过一个单独个体的经历来观察这种全球现象，也让我们能够感知到这些有时看似无形的原则文件背后的人为因素。档案记录揭示了这些在外部看来可能是绝对的、某种程度上完美的过程或事物，其背后的试验和错误、怀疑、分歧、遗憾和僵局。这种观察方法还引导我们从建设性的角度，对它们进行另一种更为批判性的审视。因为尊重这些花时间分享经验、谈判和妥协以促进文化间对话的人士所做的工作，也意味着要敢于让它继续发展进化。直到职业生涯的尽头，勒迈尔仍对《威尼斯宪章》的修订从未实现而感到遗憾。1981 年 ICOMOS 在罗马举行的全体大会上重申了 1964 年版文件的有效性，1983 年他坚称《威尼斯宪章》的走运造成了“思维迟钝以及对观点和事实的发展和多样性的忽视”这种风险<sup>[75]</sup>。我们应该在《威尼斯宪章》颁布的每一个周年纪念上记住这个教训。

way to ‘extend it in response to the expanding scope of cultural heritage concerns and interests in our contemporary world’<sup>[73]</sup>. As the ‘suggestions for follow-up’ added on Herb Stovel’s initiative made clear, the document was only intended as a starting point for a dialogue that was to continue to expand, ‘in order to improve global respect and understanding for the diverse expressions and values of each culture’<sup>[74]</sup>. The Venice Charter and the Nara Document have been two of the fundamental milestones in the history of heritage over the last six decades, on a global scale. Viewing them through the experience of a single individual may therefore seem narrow or inappropriate. And yet, Raymond Lemaire’s archives shed light on the making and reception of both documents, sometimes adding new elements, or qualifying or clarifying certain important points. Of course, Lemaire was not just any actor, since he served as rapporteur during the drafting of both documents, and held the positions of Secretary General and then President of ICOMOS from 1965 to 1981, at a time when the world of heritage was undergoing rapid change in terms of the extension of its scope and globalization. His archives are therefore particularly rich concerning this period. But beyond this aspect, observing such global phenomena through the experience of a single individual, allows us to perceive the human factor behind these documents of principles that can sometimes appear disembodied. Archives reveal trials and errors, doubts, disagreements, regrets, deadlocks, beyond what may appear, from the outside, as absolute and somehow perfect processes or objects. This approach also leads us to take another, more critical look at them, in the constructive sense of the term. Because respecting the work of these men and women who have taken the time to share their experiences, to negotiate, and to make compromises to facilitate dialogue between cultures, also means daring to

make it evolve. Right up to the end of his career, Raymond Lemaire regretted that the revision of the Venice Charter never came to fruition. In 1983, after the ICOMOS had reaffirmed the validity of the document during its 1981 General assembly in Rome, he insisted that the charter's good fortune created a risk of 'intellectual torpor and of inattention to the evolution and diversity of opinions and facts' <sup>[75]</sup>. A lesson we should remember on each of its anniversaries.

### List of abbreviations

ICOMOS: International Council of Monuments and Sites

ICCROM: International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (Rome)

RLICC: Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

### 参考文献:

- [1] Jokilehto J. The context of the Venice Charter (1964)[J]. Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites, 1998(4): 229–233.
- [2] Pane A. Las raíces de la Carta de Venecia[J]. Loggia, Arquitectura & Restauración, 2015(27): 8–23.
- [3] Pane A. Drafting of the Venice Charter: Historical Developments in Conservation[M]. ICOMOS Ireland Annual Maura Shaffrey Memorial Lecture 12. Dublin: ICOMOS Ireland, 2010.
- [4][12][22][33] Houbart C. The Evolution of Urban Heritage Conservation and the Role of Raymond Lemaire[M]. London: Routledge, 2024.
- [5] Araoz G F, Schmuecker B L. Discrepancies between U.S. National Preservation Policy and the Charter of Venice[C]//ICOMOS 8th General Assembly and International Symposium 'Old Cultures in New Worlds', Washington, D.C., 1987: 829–836.
- [6] Gazaneo J O. La Carta de Venezia, 30 anos despues. Una vision sudamericana[J]. Restauro, 1995(131–132): 45–56.
- [7] Jokilehto J. The Doctrine of the Venice Charter: an ICCROM Perspective[C]//The Venice Charter 1964 - 2004 - 2044?: The Fortieth Anniversary, Budapest-Pécs, Hungary, 2004. Budapest: Hungarian national committee of ICOMOS, 2005: 71–77.
- [8][37] Houbart C. Deconsecrating a doctrinal monument : Raymond M. Lemaire (1921–1997) and the Revisions of the Venice Charter[J]. Change Over Time, 2014(2): 218–243.
- [9] Lozupone A, Matero F. The Venice Charter: A bibliography[J]. Change Over Time, 2014(2): 477–485.
- [10][48][49][57][59][60][65] Cameron C, Inaba N. The Making of the Nara Document on Authenticity[J]. APT Bulletin, 2015(4): 30–37.

- [11][43][69] Stovel H. Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity[J]. APT Bulletin, 2008(2-3): 9–17.
- [13][19] The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments, 1931. <https://www.icomos.org/en/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/167-the-athens-charter-for-the-restoration-of-historic-monuments>. Accessed 17 June 2024.
- [14][25] Gazzola P, Pane R. Proposte per una carta internazionale del restauro[C]// The Monument for the Man, Records of the II International Congress of Restoration, Venice 25–31 May 1964. Padova: Marsilio, 1971: 14–19.
- [15][23] Lemaire R M. Commission royale des Monuments et des Sites. Problèmes de doctrine (Royal Commission on Monuments and Sites. Problems of Doctrine). KU Leuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4107. Available with English translation in Houbart C. The Evolution of Urban Heritage Conservation and the Role of Raymond Lemaire[M]. London: Routledge, 2024: 265–273.
- [16] Brandi C. Theory of Restoration[M]. Florence: Nardini Editore, 2005.
- [17][26][36] Lemaire R M. Rapport général[C]//The Monument for the Man, Records of the II International Congress of Restoration, Venice 25–31 May 1964. Padova: Marsilio, 1971: 147–152.
- [18] Cloquet L. La restauration des monuments anciens[J]. Revue de l'art chrétien, 1901(44): 498–503.
- [20][24] Consiglio Superiore Per Le Antichità e Belle Arti. Norme per il restauro dei monumenti (Carta italiana del Restauro, 1932). [http://www.brescianisrl.it/newsite/public/link/Carta\\_restauero\\_1932.pdf](http://www.brescianisrl.it/newsite/public/link/Carta_restauero_1932.pdf). Accessed 17 June 2024.
- [21] Iniguez F. Les rapports des architectes des monuments historiques avec es métiers d'art qui contribuent à l'entretien ou à la décoration des édifices[C]//Congrès international des architectes et techniciens des monuments historiques. Paris, 6–11 May 1957. Paris: Vincent, Fréal & Cie, 1960: 36.
- [27] Petzet M. 'In the full richness of their authenticity' - The Test of Authenticity and the New Cult of Monuments[C]//Nara Conference on Authenticity. Proceedings, Nara, 1994. UNESCO-ICCROM- ICOMOS, 1995: 85-100.
- [28] Houbart C. Interview with Paul Philippot, Chiny, Belgium, 17 July 2014.
- [29] Philippot P. Historic preservation: philosophy, criteria, guidelines, I (1972). Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural heritage. Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation institute, 1996.
- [30] People attending the congress[C]//The Monument for the Man, Records of the II International Congress of Restoration, Venice 25–31 May 1964. Padova: Marsilio, 1971: XXXVII-LIII.
- [31] Seconda mostra internazionale del restauro monumentale, Venice, Palazzo Grassi, 25 May - 25 June 1964, sl.
- [32] Deuxième congrès international des Architectes et techniciens des Monuments historiques. 1ère session. Projet de charte internationale pour la conservation et la restauration des monuments, 29 May 1964, KU Leuven, University Archive, Lemaire collection.
- [34] Outline of the Discussions[C]// Conference on Authenticity in relation to the world heritage convention. Preparatory workshop, Bergen, Norway, 31 January - 2 February 1994. Workshop Proceedings edited by Knut Einar Larsen and Nils Marstein. Tapir Publishers, 1994: 131-134.
- [35] Zachwatowisz, J. Nouveaux aspects de la théorie de la conservation des monuments historiques[C]//The Monument for the Man, Records of the II International Congress of Restoration, Venice 25–31 May 1964. Padova: Marsilio, 1971: 47-52.
- [38][72] Daifuku H. Letter to (a French colleague), 5 November 1976. KULEuven, University Archive, R.M. Lemaire collection, 4107b.
- [39] Kobayashi, B. Letter to R.M. Lemaire, 20 March 1977. KULEuven, University Archive, R.M. Lemaire collection, 4107g.
- [40] Comité national polonais de l'ICOMOS. Propositions concernant le commentaire et les amendements de la Charte de Venise de 1964. KULEuven, University Archive, R.M. Lemaire collection, 4107h.
- [41] Stovel H. Origins and Influence of the Nara Document on Authenticity[J]. APT Bulletin, 2008(2-3): 9-17.
- [42] UNESCO. Informal consultation of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations on the implementation of the convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage, Morges, 19-20 May 1976. Final report. Unesco Digital Archives, CC-76/WS/25.
- [44] Lemaire R. La mémoire et la continuité. KULEuven, Raymond Lemaire International Centre for Conservation Archive.
- [45] Stovel H. Authenticity in Conservation Decision-Making : The World Heritage Perspective[J]. Journal of Research in Architecture and Planning, 2004(3): 1- 8.
- [46] UNESCO. Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. First session, Paris, 27 June-1 July 1977. Operational guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.



- [47] Stovel H. Effective use of authenticity and integrity as world heritage qualifying conditions[J]. *City & Time*, 2007(3).
- [50] Magar V, King J. Herb Stovel. Editorial[J]. *Conversaciones...con Herb Stovel*, 2019(8): 8-11.
- [51][54] Lemaire R M. Authenticité et patrimoine monumental[C]//Conference on Authenticity in relation to the world heritage convention. Preparatory workshop, Bergen, Norway, 31 January - 2 February 1994. Workshop Proceedings edited by Knut Einar Larsen and Nils Marstein. Tapir Publishers, 1994: 83-100.
- [52][53] Lemaire R M. Authenticité et patrimoine monumental[C]// International Rilem/Unesco Congress. Conservation of stone and other materials, Paris, 1993. Paris, M.J. Thiel, 1993: 114-122.
- [55] Stovel H. Notes on Authenticity[C]//Conference on Authenticity in relation to the world heritage convention. Preparatory workshop, Bergen, Norway, 31 January - 2 February 1994. Workshop Proceedings edited by Knut Einar Larsen and Nils Marstein. Tapir Publishers, 1994: 101-116.
- [56] Larsen K E, Marstein N. Preparatory workshop. Summary Report[C]//Conference on Authenticity in relation to the world heritage convention. Preparatory workshop, Bergen, Norway, 31 January - 2 February 1994. Workshop Proceedings edited by Knut Einar Larsen and Nils Marstein. Tapir Publishers, 1994: 127-130.
- [58] Stovel H. Considerations in Framing the Authenticity Question for Conservation[C]//Nara Conference on Authenticity. Proceedings, Nara, 1994. UNESCO-ICCROM-ICOMOS, 1995: 393-398.
- [61] Document de Nara sur l'authenticité. Ébauche. 5 November 1994. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [62] Draft. Nara Document on Authenticity. 5 November 1994. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [63] UNESCO. World Heritage Committee. Eighteenth session. Phuket, Thailand, 12-17 December 1994. Information note: Nara Document on Authenticity. Experts meeting, 1-6 November 1994. 21 November 1994. UNESCO Archive (online), <https://whc.unesco.org/archive/1994/whc-94-conf003-inf8e.pdf>.
- [64] R M Lemaire to J-L Luxen, 13 November 1994. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [66] Fax from H Stovel to R M. Lemaire, 29 March 1995. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [67] Letter from R M Lemaire to H Stovel, 17 May 1995. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [68] Larsen, K E. Memorandum. Nara Conference on Authenticity. Publication of proceedings. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [70] Letter from R M Lemaire to E A Connally, 23 November 1988, KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, not filed.
- [71] Letter from R M Lemaire to A J Taylor, 7 December 1964. KULeuven, University Archive, Lemaire Collection, 4341.
- [73] Nara Document on Authenticity, 1994, art. 3.
- [74] Nara Document on Authenticity, Appendix I: Suggestions for follow-up, art. 4 and 5.
- [75] Lemaire R M. Le monument historique, sa signification et sa place dans la culture d'aujourd'hui[C]// Premier congrès international sur la conservation architecturale organisé par l'Institut des Festivals d'art internationaux à l'Université de Bâle, 28 -31 March 1983. KULeuven, RLICC Archive.