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1. WSTĘP

1.1. PRZEDMIOT OPRACOWANIA I UZasadnienie Podjęcia Tematu


W ostatnich dekadach wzrosło zainteresowanie geografów krajobrazem, w tym szczególnie krajobrazem kulturowym. Fakt ten znajduje potwierdzenie w wielu pracach teoretycznych oraz w sferze aplikacyjnej. Świadczy to o aktualności i ważności tej problematyki oraz o jej dużej atrakcyjności naukowej. Kraj obraz kulturowy stanowi bowiem bardzo dziki temat badawczy i otwiera przed geografami praktycznie nieograniczone możliwości interpretacyjne. Wynika to z dużej mierze z permanentnej cechy kraj obrazów przyrodniczych i kulturowych, jaką jest zmienność (Pietrzak, 2008; Wojciechowski, 2010). Charakter zmian odzwierciedla naturalną ewolucję układów przyrodniczych (Troll, 1950; Richling, Solon, 1996, 2011), na którą nakładają się sekwencje zmian wynikających z różnorodnych sposobów użytkowania i gospodarowania w następstwie postępu cywilizacyjnego (Sauer, 1925; Dobrowolska, 1976).

Rosnąca popularność krajobrazu kulturowego jako przedmiotu badawczego skłoniła autorkę do refeleksji nad pochodzeniem terminu, jego miejscem i rolą w geografii. Refleksja ta pozwoliła na podjęcie szczegółowych badań nad zakresem znaczeń, genezą i ewolucją kraj obrazów kulturowych, co dało podstawę do opracowania szczegółowej terminologii i nowych metod badawczych kraj obrazu kulturowego. To z kolei było podstawą do przedstawienia propozycji kilku typologii kraj obrazów kulturowych, a także modelu oceny ich wartości. W ten sposób niniejsza praca akcentuje przede wszystkim aspekt ewolucyjny i typologiczny oraz askologiczny kraj obrazu kulturowego.

Tak zarysowane zadanie zostało podjęte w atmosferze naukowego dyskursu jaki toczy się od dłuższego czasu wokół pojęcia kraj obrazu (w tym kulturowego), o zakres znaczeń, kierunki badawcze, typologię, metody i kryteria jego wielostronnej oceny. Na obecnym etapie wiedzy o kraj obrazie kulturowym trudnym wydaje się znaleźć porozumienia między geografami fizycznymi, bliskimi ekologii kraj obrazu a geografami społeczno–ekonomicznymi, bliskimi geografii kultury (Kowalczyk, 2007).
**Abstract**

Landscape is one of major research categories in geography. However, it is not a very hermetic notion, specific and restricted only for geographic studies. Because of its wide semantic scope, the notion landscape is also a subject for research for other scientific fields (mainly landscape architecture, sociology, archaeology, economic history) and many artistic fields. Moreover, as a notion within basic geographic education, it is commonly understood and used intuitively, thus being absorbed by the common language.

**Cultural landscape** is landscape transformed by man as a result of civilizational progress. It is an evolutionary consequence of natural landscapes – differing in terms of zones and altitudes, which have existed on Earth since the Neolithic Age. In the process of landscape transformation, an important part is played by a combination of natural, socio-economic, political and civilizational factors, whose position, rank (hierarchy) and strength of influence differ in time.

**Cultural landscape** – perceived as an elementary subset of the anthropogenic landscape (often treated as a synonym, although ambiguously, by other authors), developed in the historic process of management of natural lands by man. It comprises a number of subtypes (quasi-cultural, agricultural, pastureland, urban settlement, rural settlement, forest management, water management, mining, industrial, tourist, post-mining landscape, etc.) which differ in their origin, structure, functions and dominating shaping factors, which has their physiognomic reflection in a different spatial layout, typical of a given subtype. It can be assumed that the cultural landscape is a historically shaped section of the geographical space, created as a result of combined environmental and cultural influences, making up a specific structure, with regional individuality perceived as peculiar physiognomy. According to this definition, landscape is an image of a region, and by analyzing its components and interpreting the evolutionary factors, it is possible to read its history and predict (forecast) its future development.

Recent decades have seen increased interest of geographers in landscape, including particularly cultural landscape. That fact is reflected both in theoretical papers and in the application area. This proves the up-to-date status and importance of the subject matter and its high academic attractiveness. This is so because cultural landscape is an attractive research subject and opens practically unlimited interpretation possibilities for geographers. This mainly results from the permanent feature of landscapes, both natural and cultural, namely variability.

Growing popularity of cultural landscape as a research subject has encouraged the author to discuss the origin of the notion, and its position and role in geography. The considerations made it possible to take up detailed studies of the scope of the notions, origins and evolution of cultural landscapes, which set the foundations for working out detailed terminology and new research methods for cultural landscape. That, in turn, resulted in a suggestion for several typologies of cultural landscapes, as well as a model of assessment of their value. Thus, this paper first of all emphasizes the evolutionary, typological, and axiological aspects of cultural landscape.
What was an additional reason for taking up the research was to point to possible diffusion directions of research methods between landscape geography, anthropogeography, cultural geography, landscape architecture and sociology, in search of the most efficient solution models.

In her paper, the author attempts to discuss the mentioned matters in more detail, put typologies in conceptual order, and point to possibilities of wider participation of geographers in application research, with reference to sustainable development (in the environmental, economic and social aspects). The paper deals with landscape in tangible (material, morphological, substantial) terms. It mainly concerns the physiognomic layer of cultural landscape and is supplemented with studies regarding its structure and functions. The author considers landscape as an evolutionary formation of the geosphere on one hand, and as a result of economic and historic events of communities living in a given territory on the other hand. Thus, an attempt is made to bridge the research by physical geographers and socioeconomic geographers, taking into account achievements of other areas of science and practical actions. It should be emphasized that the tangible approach presented in the paper is one of the many research approaches to cultural landscape and suggests other interpretations which are applied (classical, physico-geographic, semiotic or aesthetic approaches).

The following preconditions-theses were set in the paper:

1. Cultural landscape is an evolutionary formation – it developed from natural landscape, and its structure, functions and physiognomy are subject to transformation along with the development of the anthroposphere.

2. Transformation of cultural landscapes is becoming quicker and quicker, which results from the impact of an increasing number of anthropogenic factors (increasing rate of matter and energy circulation in landscapes), which, in turn, are the result of growing needs and possibilities of the man.

3. Cultural landscape is a peculiar heritage of each region, as it is a register of actions of communities of many historic periods in the geographical space; it is therefore the witness of tradition and identity of local communities with the region.

4. In the functional and genetic approach, cultural landscape is a typological unit (e.g. forest, agricultural, settlement, mining landscapes, etc.), but clear borders within particular types may be helpful in distinguishing regions.

5. In specific cases, cultural landscape may be identified with the image (physiognomy) of a region.

The main research task was: to work out the typology of cultural landscapes and the model of assessment of their value (in relation to the tradition and direction of changes).

The following specific objectives were set, aiming at carrying out the research task consisting in working out the typology of cultural landscapes:

- theoretical-methodological objective: to put order in terminology, review and assess the current state and direction of studies; to define and specify notions used in the paper; to work out author's methods of landscape analysis;
- to work out the typology of landscape-forming factors;
- to define relations between landscape-forming factors and the spatial structure and functions of cultural landscapes;
- to discuss environmental, social, economic, technical, legal, political and aesthetic relations occurring in the past and at present in cultural landscapes in selected cases of cultural landscapes;
- to work out a map of functional types of cultural landscapes of Poland.

The following specific objectives were the steps that led to assessment of the value of cultural landscapes:

- to work out research models of cultural landscapes for assessment of their value;
- to work out assessment criteria of cultural landscapes;
- to assess selected cultural landscapes using the point-grading method;
- to analyze the stages of formation of cultural landscapes in selected regions;
- to analyze factors which shape the identity of cultural landscape, including its characteristic features;
- to analyze the degree of preservation of characteristic features of cultural landscape as an indicator of preservation or vanishing of the tradition and identity and preservation of the quality of cultural landscape.

The analysis models and the models of assessment of the value of cultural landscape which were developed were verified using three case studies: Żuławy Wiślane, the Vistula valley in Mazovia and the Częstochowa Upland. The regions were selected using the following criteria:

- the selected regions represent (in most of their area) the same functional type of cultural landscape – rural and agricultural;
- the features of spatial layout of the selected regions have preserved the record of evolutionary changes through the history of use (cultural overlaying);
- both natural and cultural landscapes of those regions were mostly developed in conditions of extremely different hydrological regimes, which determined the use of landscapes: Żuławy – excess, and the Częstochowa Upland – shortage of surface water, Mazovia – intermittent type with variable conditions (frequent floods in the Vistula valley and the Warsaw Valley); the common feature of the regions is hydrotechnical use of landscapes;
- Żuławy Wiślane and the Vistula valley in Masovia are additionally related through the episode of Haulander settlement, which was the main landscape-forming factor in these regions. A point-grading method was applied in evaluation of the value of these landscapes;
- author's own methods of regional analysis ("landscape biography") and the method of landscape stratigraphy were used in evaluation of the landscape of the Częstochowa Upland.

The subject of the paper was limited with scopes resulting from the objectives. **The material scope** – includes cultural landscape sensu largo considered in terms of geography of culture, humanist geography, anthropogeography and regional geography; the background for the considerations is the landscape layer (studied using methods of landscape geography) and cultural heritage (studied using methods of landscape architecture and history of arts).

**The spatial scope** – was determined in two scales: for the first task of the paper, that is working out the typology of landscapes, which, according to the author's intentions, should be universal – the spatial scope includes the area of Poland and selected areas (countries, cities) of Europe, northern Africa and Asia. The regions were selected so that they could precisely represent the distinguished types of cultural landscape models, and also present the impact of landscape-forming factors; moreover, the author knows them from her own direct observations. For the task consisting in assessment of the condition of cultural landscape, the spatial scope was precisely limited to selected regions of Poland: Złowiw Wielkie, Mazovia and the Częstochowa Upland (the regions were selected according to the key described above).

**Time scope** – for the first objective of the paper, it is the time of development of cultural landscape (millennia). In actual terms, it is a period which can be subjected to scientific analysis by studying source materials and field research. For assessment of the value of cultural landscape and the state of its preservation, the time scope of the research is determined by the period of reliable cartographic materials, that is de facto the last two centuries (late 19th – early 21st centuries). The background for the time scope is the historic times (since the Middle Age), or even prehistory, reconstructed basing on the known results of studies in other scientific fields (mainly history and archaeology). For the aesthetic assessment, the time scope was delimited by the lifespan of the living generations.

Due to the adopted interdisciplinary scope of problem, it is necessary to apply the so-called methodological pluralism. It is impossible to carry out interpretation of the social and cultural layers set in the natural environment using a uniform method.

The theoretical part applied the following methods: the genetic method consisting in determining the chronology of cultural elements existing in cultural landscape. Using this method made it possible to separate contemporary elements of cultural landscape from historic ones, and distinguish preserved forms and landscape relics not related to current use of the region. The empiric method made it possible to work out a study of landscape transformations in selected regions and to study spatial transformations in the historical process. The evolutionary method consisted in chronological research of the historic process of man's adaptation to the natural conditions. It was based on the assumption that contemporary cultural elements are transitional and are a certain stage in landscape transformation. New processes and phenomena were also analyzed in the same environmental background in a given time period. The method made it possible to reconstruct each stage of human activities on the surface of Earth and determine which landscape changes were characteristic of each stage. The mentioned methods included several principles which were applied in interpretation of changes in cultural landscape. An assumption was made, that there might have been intervals between development stages of landscapes of various regions, resulting from gaps in development of particular cultures. Not all regions showed simple (evolutionary) sequence of forms and stages of land management. Lack of regular cultural overlaying was often reported. Thus, varying numbers of "cultural layers" (evolution stages) were found in the analyzed regions. Additionally, lengths of cultural stages were also different, which required determining the chronology of cultural layers. This led to creation of the author's method of so-called landscape stratigraphy. The notion of landscape stratigraphy means the system of cultural layers resulting from particular communities functioning in a given area, which are possible to be put in chronological order. The author's other methods of cultural landscape research were also used in the paper: the factor analysis method, and the value analysis method, which are described in more detail in the chapter on research models of landscape (Ch. 6) and were verified in selected regions (empiric studies). Also, the author used the method which is well known in regional geography – the method of analysis of cultural landscape as a region, referred to as "landscape biography" in this paper.

The empiric part of the paper applied methods of field mapping, technical cartographic analyses, and also methods of value analysis, including point grading method. The paper is based on many years' observations and concept studies, as well as comparative studies in several regions in Poland and Europe, northern Africa and Asia. The cameral studies included studying rich reference books regarding the subject matter (both theory of landscape and empiric studies) and regions included in the research. Also, analyses of archive materials and historical resources, historic maps, modern thematic maps and digital terrain models were used.

This paper consists of two clearly marked parts. Part one includes theoretical studies of landscape and is conceptual in its character (chapters 1-7). Among other topics, it presents the historic outline of landscape studies according to various research directions and schools, basing largely on ideological sources of geography; it also defines basic notions used in the paper (chapter 2). The author discussed the origins of the notion and the scope of the meaning, analyzed main landscape research trends in geography, discussed relations between anthropogenic landscape and cultural landscape. Types and models of cultural landscape structures were analyzed and the typology of landscape-forming factors was presented (Chapter 3). The following chapter (4) discusses various procedures of ordering and typological approaches in cultural landscape research (genetic, chronological, evolutionary-functional, historic-preservation, physiognomic-perceptual typology, and typology according to the degree of transformation). Chapter 5 presents functional diversity.
and development of cultural landscapes, and chapter 6 presents suggested models of cultural landscape research: the factor analysis model, the value analysis model, and the cultural landscape stratigraphy model. This background was used to present diversity and development of main functional types of cultural landscapes. The theoretical part concludes with the suggestion for cartographic visualization of functional types of cultural landscapes of Poland – the map of cultural landscapes of Poland (chapter 7). The conceptual part emphasizes the material (tangible) form of landscape, and intentionally omits its immaterial, spiritual elements. The analyzed issues are complemented with examples from Poland and other European countries, as well as from regions of northern Africa and selected Asian countries.

The other part of the paper – empiric studies (chapter 8) – verifies the suggested models of analyses and assessment methods for the value of cultural landscapes, applied in three regions of Poland – considered as case studies (Zuławski Wislane, the Vistula Valley in Mazovia, and the Częstochowa Upland). They represent the rural and agricultural settlement type of cultural landscapes. In this part of the paper, the subject of assessment of the value of cultural landscape, besides the material form of cultural landscape, is also its immaterial, spiritual aspect, including the aesthetic, emotional and symbolic values (reference to the semiotic and aesthetic approach).

The author is aware that the presented case studies do not represent the whole range of the procedure of value assessment of cultural landscapes in Poland (e.g. urban settlement, mining, industrial, tourist landscapes, etc.), but they are an attempt of verification of the method of assessment in the assumed preconditions.

The paper leads to conclusions which can refer to three aspects: the theoretic, application and empiric dimensions.

The conceptual studies that were carried out made it possible to:
- systematize and specify basic notions regarding cultural landscape and introduce several author’s notions used in further chapters of the paper (such as landscape stratigraphy, landscape gap, landscape intrusion);
- review main research trends and schools of cultural landscapes, which allowed for synthetic assessment of the status of research and verification of applicability of different research trends at the application level;
- develop models of spatial structures of main types of cultural landscapes as evolutionary links originating from primary natural landscape;
- identify landscape-forming factors, their typology and analysis of their relations;
- develop several possible patterns (approaches) of typologies of cultural landscapes, including the author’s physiognomic-perception and evolutionary-functional typologies;
- analyze the process of evolution of main types of cultural landscapes with particular emphasis on agricultural and rural settlement landscapes;

- develop four landscape research models: factor analysis, regional analysis ("landscape biography"), value analysis and landscape stratigraphy, which were verified in the empiric part of the paper;
- map selected layers of cultural landscape and suggest a cartographic pattern of synthesizing functional types of cultural landscapes; the suggestion only includes a few selected types of landscapes and points to the fact that further “overlapping” of layers will make the map illegible; that fact justifies the suggestion for creating maps of cultural landscapes as multi-layer virtual (multimedia, or even multi-sensory) maps, because with traditional cartographic methods, it is not possible to work out one “universal” map of cultural landscapes;
- conclude that depending on the adopted research approach, there are several possible ways of visualization; one of the new ways would be a map presenting the degree of homo- or heterogeneity of cultural landscapes; the task may seem very difficult, but from the scientific point of view it is highly fascinating; it would make it possible to transform the vertical form of cultural landscape diversity (the suggested method of landscape stratigraphy and landscape profiles) onto the horizontal form (map),
- point to the multiplicity of research approaches to cultural landscape; the knowledge (and not only information) about cultural landscape will increase with time, which will allow for making new interesting research models.

Moreover, the conceptual studies that were carried out allowed for verification of the preliminary assumptions:
- cultural landscape is an evolutionary formation;
- it is a typological notion in terms of the function it serves, natural genesis and the degree of transformation, and even in terms of perception;
- in terms of cultural genesis ("landscape biography", landscape stratigraphy), landscape is identified with the image of the region. In this approach, cultural landscape is formed as a result of "mapping" the cultural region into a physiogeographical region.

The author believes that the attempts to describe the typological or regional character of cultural landscape in an unambiguous way, made in scientific reference books, are bound to fail. Peculiar duality of approaches to cultural landscapes should rather be emphasized.

The research that was carried out led to the following practical conclusions:
- The review of foreign reference books shows two clear major directions of landscape research. These directions are: landscape ecology – a classical physisogeographical approach (only briefly mentioned in this paper), where a number of applicational tasks open up related to the need for protection of natural landscapes and assessment of anthropopressure on the landscape, and an extremely opposite direction – cultural landscape research in the semantic approach. Currently, this approach reaches Europe, including Poland. Along with the aesthetic approach, it is important also in geographic studies of conditions for improved quality of life.
Analyses of the reference books also show increased interest of Polish geographers in the subject matter of cultural landscape. One of the reasons for that increased interest might be greater opening of geography to humanist contents (anthropogeography, geography of culture), which occurred in the period after the political system transformation. After leaving the subject matter alone for about 50 years, it is possible to look at the subject of research from the distance and with an afterthought, but it is also necessary to “catch up” with the delay in the field. The interest also results from the critical look at the Polish space shaped in the post-war period and the decades of post-socialist system and economic changes.

Thematic correlation of geographic research on cultural landscape and landscape architecture research causes that cultural landscape becomes a “competitive” notion, in its positive meaning. That encourages geographers to mark their scientific appearance in that field even stronger. It also contributes to looking for common initiatives, participation in research, development and applicational programs. This correlation (cooperation) gives good effects, resulting from multidirectional outlook on the values of space and matters of protection and development of landscape. That mainly concerns areas of high environmental or cultural value. The methods of analysis and assessment patterns, which are suggested in this paper can help in diagnosing the value of particular regions.

Currently, cultural landscape interpretations are possible using computer tools and technologies, including GIS. Combination of traditional methods and modern visualization devices makes it possible to interpret cultural landscape in terms of its tradition and identity, and forecast the directions of changes. Such papers are one of the ways to open geography to practical objectives and actions. They show possible ways of application of the results of landscape research in complex geographic works concerning small areas like municipalities or counties, and in spatial planning studies, recommendations for local space management plans, assessments of impact on the environment or plans of legally protected areas.

In the paper, the author concludes that many contemporary economic, socioeconomic, civilizational-technological and legal processes are a serious threat for stability and diversity of cultural landscapes. Thus, a need arises to protect them and shape them in a conscious and responsible way. That need concerns first of all the areas where the degree and the rate of anthropogenization are very high, as well as regions where rapid changes took place and consequently, the tradition of sustainable management collapsed.

The empirical part showed regularities concerning the evolution of cultural landscapes of selected regions. Specific features of the cultural landscape of Żuławy Wiślane and Mazovia were primarily (at an early stage of settlement) the result of the deterministic relation of man and the environment. This relation had its reflection in the cultural landscape through characteristic (reported in the paper) features of spatial organization and indicators of vernacular architecture. Rationality of use of cultural landscape in conditions of permanent excess of water (Żuławy Wiślane) and periodic floodings (the Vistula valley within Mazovia) caused that the “landscape pattern” developed by the Haulanders was passed on from one generation to another and with time it was respected and popularized in areas of the studied regions which were not affected by the Haulander settlement. That was how a spatial tradition developed, based mainly on acknowledgment and understanding of the laws of the nature and, on the other hand, on the Haulanders’ experience. These particular technical-engineering skills, combined with biopsychic and cultural features of that population, marked a peculiar type of natural-economic determinism in the landscape. That pattern was fostered until the times of World War 2 and the post-war years. Direct damage to the land improvement system (flooding of Żuławy Wiślane as a result of destruction of the embankments) and broken cultural continuity resulting from displacement of the Haulander people (identified with German settlement) were the first causes of the fall of the cultural landscape tradition. The rules of centrally-controlled economy and collective farming, introduced after World War 2, and later somewhat forced “modernization” of the rural landscape, magnified that process. It was further deepened by social, economic and legal-administrative factors of the last two decades.

In case of both regions, the first to be damaged are the symbolic and emotional layers of the landscape. Losing the genius loci and the deep but unstable semantic layer may raise fears as to possible reclamation of the studied landscapes. It was found that in case of Żuławy Wiślane there are some more advanced projects aimed at restoring the identity and tradition of the cultural landscape. It can be expected that next years will see definite improvement of the quality of cultural landscape of this region by strengthening the values within all five studied groups of criteria. Sustainable development of the landscape of Żuławy Wiślane and its increased prestige is also supported by tourism, as the image of the region is cherished because of this new source of economic use. Revenue from tourism can be reinvested in each municipality in local projects of restoration of elements of traditional architecture – mainly arcaded houses and Memnonite cemeteries, reconstruction of parks, drainage ditches, etc. Restored cultural tolerance helps to strengthen the symbolic and emotional layers.

Successful attempts of reconstruction of regional identity have already been reported in case of Żuławy Wiślane. Villages with neo-vernacular architecture are reclaimed and new settlements are located on artificial dwelling hills, complying with the stylistic regulations of the regional architecture. Cultural landscape is becoming the symbol of the region and its recognizable image again, and proves its reviving home-likeness. In case of Mazovia, such attempts are still very small in number, but it can be expected that traditional patterns of use of cultural landscape of the Vistula valley will be “reconstructed” in the most sustainable form of use of the natural environment. Such actions will only be reasonable if the natural rhythm of landscape use in the Vistula river is restored using the technological advances. That firstly requires specific regulations regarding building laws, economic mechanisms of profitability of keeping polders, restoring extensive cattle farming and increased awareness of the
residents. These actions will make it possible to meet the objectives of sustainable development.

Ten stages of evolution of cultural landscapes were identified in case of the Częstochowa Upland, which were correlated with the periods of development of cultures and climatic periods. The stratigraphic profile showed three gaps in the evolution of cultural landscape, during which regeneration of semi-natural landscapes, and even primary landscapes, occurred. The system of layers of the profile shows that the cultural landscape of the Częstochowa Upland developed in an evolutionary manner until the Mesolithic age. Cultural landscape stratigraphy of the Upland showed the incomplete heterogeneous form (T2/B), with gaps, as early as in 1300 BC – an evolutionary link was missing between rural and urban settlement landscapes, in relation to adjacent areas (e.g. loess regions of the Lesser Poland). Occurrence of flint material led to very early development of mining landscapes (which are later in evolutionary terms). That caused the cultural landscape stratigraphy to have an inverted form (T2/C). In the period 1300-500 BC, cultural landscapes of the Upland already showed the heterogeneous and heterogenious form of mixed type (T3/A). Moreover, intervals in landscape use and in stationary settlement, especially in the periods 500 BC-200 AD and 300-900 AD, caused the landscape to become uniform again as a result of naturalization. Starting from the early Middle Ages (from about 900 AD), cultural landscapes developed in the heterogeneous and heterogenous form of vertical type (T3/B). Thus, they reflected a very complex style of landscape use, which served multiple functions. The analysis according to that model shows decreasing share of agricultural and pastureland landscapes, as well as rural settlement landscapes in favour of other types of landscapes which are subject to diversification. What is interesting from the point of view of ecological functions is high share of forest management landscapes and even semi-natural landscapes. It was indicated, however, also in the author’s previous papers, that this increase is a serious threat to preservation of unique traits of the natural and cultural landscape of the region. Clear conflict can be observed between environmental protection and landscape protection.

Layering of cultural landscapes indicated in the research of the Częstochowa Upland prove the high quality of landscape, because it represents various types of use and represents a long-lasting form within the distinguished types. Most of the distinguished types have functioned in the area of the Częstochowa Upland at least since the beginning of the Middle Ages (semi-natural, forest management, agricultural, and rural settlement landscapes). Also, urban settlement landscapes and water management landscapes have centuries-long traditions. Currently, a preliminary process of development of tourist landscapes is taking place, although the tourist function has been served in the region for at least 150 years.

Hence, there is a clear correlation between the stratigraphic method and the value analysis method, because the indicated old age and authenticity of cultural landscapes are among the most important criteria for assessment of their value.
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(...) Monografia jest cennym, komplementarnym i unikalowym zestawieniem koncepcji i autorskich typologii badań krajobrazowych. Praca jest wartościowym, syntetyzującym kompendium współczesnej wiedzy o krajobrazach kulturowych, wzbogaconym o autorskie modele badawcze i wzorce oceny wartości krajobrazów kulturowych. Może być wykorzystana jako kompendium wiedzy o podejściach i kierunkach badawczych krajobrazów kulturowych, jak i jako uzupełniający materiał dla studentów nauk geograficznych, ekonomicznych, politycznych i społecznych...

(ze stonu prof. Marusza G...)

(...) Tematyka badań dotyczy jednego z ważniejszych zagadnień współczesnej geografii. Problematyka przemian krajobrazu kulturowego została przedstawiona w sposób oryginalny i trafnie osadzona na pograniczu geografii krajobrazu, geografii kultury i antropogeografii. Autorka, postrzegając krajobraz kulturowo jako twór ewolucji geosfery, dokonała jego interpretacji przy wykorzystaniu różnych metod (w tym autorstwych), zawsze traktując go jako wynik przebiegu procesów społecznych i gospodarczych. Rozważania teoretyczne stały się punktem wyjścia do nakładania konceptualnego porządku w klasyfikacjach krajobrazu kulturowego. Co niezwykle ważne, Autorka nie ograniczyła się do rozważań teoretycznych, lecz na ich podstawie wykonała analizy zmian krajobrazów kulturowych trzech trafnie wybranych obszarów, i uczyniła to w porządku określonym ich historią. Przedstawiając spójną koncepcję metodologiczną wykazała swoją dojrzałość jako badacz. Pamiętając o aplikacyjnym wymiarze podjętej tematyki, zwróciła uwagę na możliwość szerszego udziału geografów w badaniach aplikacyjnych, w nawiązaniu do idei zrównoważonego rozwoju.

(ze stonu prof. Zbigniewa P...)