

**International Workshop**

**Chair of the History and Theory of Architecture Prof. Dr. Maarten Delbeke**

**Restoration and Promotion of Architectural Monuments in Central and Eastern Europe in the 19th and First Half of the 20th Centuries**

**Venue: Room RZ F 21, IFW RZ Building, Clausiusstrasse 59, CH-8092, Zürich**

**Program**

**7 July 9.00 – 16.15**

**9.00 – 9.20: Welcome and introduction**

**9.20 – 10.30: Ottoman Empire and the Turkish State**

1. Belgin Turan Özkaya, Middle East Technical University

*Hagia Sophia as “cosmopolitan heritage” in the nineteenth century*

2. Ümit Firat Açıkgöz, American University of Beirut

*Predicaments of Heritage: Negotiating Architectural Preservation in Post-Ottoman/Early Republican Istanbul (1923-1949)*

10.30 – 10.50 Coffee Break

**10.50 – 12.35: Habsburg Galicia**

3. Magdalena Kunińska, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

*The political and theoretical context for the activities of Paweł Popiel (1807–1892) as the conservator in Galicia against the discourse of the multinational empire*

4. Tomasz Torbus, Gdansk University

*Reconstructions, Deconstructions, (Over)Interpretations – the case of the Royal Castle at Wawel in Cracow 1908-1945.*

5. Olha Zarechnyuk, Center for Urban History of East Central Europe (Lviv, Ukraine)

*History is More than Beauty: Reassessing Lviv's Architectural Heritage in the Late Habsburg Period*

12.35 – 13.35 Lunch

**13.35 – 14.45: Habsburg Dalmatia**

6. Jiayao Jiang, ICCROM (International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property), Rome

*Vicko Andrić and the restoration projects for Split: The Italian approach in the Dalmatian context*

7. Jonathan Blower, Independent Researcher

*The Episcopium Question  
Imperialism and Irredentism in the Custodianship of Diocletian's Palace, 1850–1924*

14.45 – 15.05 Coffee Break

**15.05 – 16.15: 20th Century Hungary**

8. Deodáth Zuh, LERN, Institute of Philosophy, Budapest

*Heritage destruction, heritage creation, and the lost art of classicism.  
Reshaping early 19th-century Hungarian cityscapes before and after the First World War*

9. Helka Dzsacsóvszki, Technical University of Munich

*Restoration of the Medieval Royal Palace of Esztergom, 1934-1938:  
Methodological influences and ministerial patronage for the promotion of national identities*

17.30 – 19.00 Optional Walking Tour of Zürich

19.00: Dinner

**8 July: 9.00 – 12.45**

**9.00 – 10.45: The Balkans in the 19th and 20th Century**

10. Katarina Jevtic-Novakovic, Academy of Technical and Art Applied Studies Belgrade,  
Gordana Fontana-Giusti, University of Kent, UK

*The Restoration and Promotion of Architectural Monuments in Serbia and the Role  
of Jovan Sterija Popovic and the National Museum*

11. Cosmin Minea, ETH, Zürich

*Restorations, the Politics of Heritage and Studies About Historical Monuments in Modern  
Romania (1860-1940)*

12. Laura Demeter, Otto Friedrich University Bamberg

*Heritage restoration and protection in Romania's changing political context (1919-1948)*

10.45 – 11.00 Coffee Break

**11.00 – 12.45: The Russian Empire and the Russian State**

13. Natia Natsvlishvili, George Chubinashvili National Research Centre for Georgian Art  
History and Heritage Preservation (Tbilisi, Georgia)

*Imperialism and Architectural Restoration: The Case of Manglisi Cathedral*

14. Igor Demchenko, University of Kassel

*The Rise of "Scientific Restoration" in the First Soviet Decade*

15. Katharina Schwinde PhD; Ettersberg Foundation, Weimar

*Monument Protection and Promotion of Architectural Monuments in the Solovetsky Forced  
Labour Camp 1920–1939*

12.45: Lunch followed by an optional trip nearby Zurich

## **List of Abstracts**

**Belgin Turan Özkaya**  
**Middle East Technical University**

### **Hagia Sophia as “cosmopolitan heritage” in the nineteenth century**

Considered an unsurpassable structural and architectural marvel with splendid mosaic decoration, almost 1,500-year-old Hagia Sophia had been built in Constantinople by Justinian in the sixth century and served as a major cathedral and the patriarchal seat of Eastern Christendom almost uninterrupted for more than nine centuries. After being taken by the Ottomans in 1453, it was converted into an imperial mosque and maintained that status five centuries until 1934. Within the legal system of the newly founded secular state of the Republic of Turkey, the successor to the Ottoman Empire, Hagia Sophia’s official status was changed again with the aim of establishing a museum.

In July 2020, the change in the use and legal status of Hagia Sophia from museum to mosque implemented by a ruling of the Turkish Council of State, privileging fifteenth-century Ottoman endowment law over that of the current state and decreed by the Turkish President caused national and international pandemonium. Before and after the conversion decision, outcries regarding the future protection and accessibility of the edifice, except for Sunni men, and its decoration were voiced.

Since then, Hagia Sophia, which was primarily a tourist destination as part of the UNESCO World Heritage Site “Historic Areas of Istanbul” located on the edge of Europe became a global cause célèbre. The building complex, despite the oft-repeated claim, never functioned as a proper museum. Yet, with an interesting turn of events it was started to be viewed solely in the light of its presumed former functions and froze as either cathedral, mosque, or museum in the minds of the global public. Moreover, Hagia Sophia’s conversion into a “museum” is attributed exclusively to Turkish Republican authorities, overlooking its gradual transformation into a “monument” in the Ottoman era.

In my paper, I argue that apart from its life as a major religious and civic complex in Ottoman İstanbul with a stupendous library, a parallel process of “monumentalization” and “aestheticization” of Hagia Sophia as an historical and artistic artifact was taking place already in the nineteenth century, as it was started to be seen as an example of *asar-ı atika* and *asar-ı nefise*, the newly developing concepts of ancient and artistic works. While Gaspare and Giuseppe Fossati’s mid nineteenth-century “restoration” and the concurrent reception of

Hagia Sophia as a “monument” by an international public are well known and much studied, the Ottoman agency in that undertaking and the contemporary local perception of Hagia Sophia have been overlooked. My contention is that in addition to the much celebrated “restoration,” through diverse, what I call proto-cultural heritage practices, such as organization as a tourist site, documentation, production of postcards, paintings, and souvenirs, Hagia Sophia has emerged as a “historical monument” in the nineteenth century beyond the national framework, which may shed light on our current discussions of transnational heritage.

**Ümit Firat Açıköz**

**American University of Beirut**

### **Predicaments of Heritage: Negotiating Architectural Preservation in Post-Ottoman/Early Republican Istanbul (1923-1949)**

Early republican Istanbul was a tapestry of monuments evoking myriad and often conflicting memories of patrons, architects, or the periods in which they were built (such as Roman/Byzantine, the “Ottoman Golden Age” of the sixteenth century, or the “Ottoman decline” of the nineteenth century). Different monuments instilled pride, shame, or anxiety in different people of Istanbul, who grappled with questions over how to deal with this multi-layered heritage: Is every old building part of the national heritage? Is there any room in republican Istanbul for the monuments and memories of the non-Muslim Ottomans, who had, historically, constituted around half of the city’s population? Should the secular nationalist republic preserve the monuments and memories of the theocratic and multinational Ottoman Empire? Given that urban modernization (opening of large streets, public squares, and parks) would inevitably entail the elimination of some monuments, which ones can or cannot be sacrificed?

This paper examines the public debates over historical monuments and their preservation in early republican Istanbul. It shows how local and national institutions, foreign architects of global stature, and residents of Istanbul turned historical monuments into a platform whereby they negotiated diverse notions of heritage, modernity, and identity. My analysis of these transnational encounters brings to the forefront the residents of Istanbul, and their appropriations of global and national approaches to heritage. It demonstrates that the reconfiguration of Istanbul’s architectural heritage was a product of a complex constellation of local, national, and global factors; a constellation where local institutions and individuals played a crucial role. This paper draws on a wide range of mostly untapped sources to trace public debates over historical monuments: municipal council minutes, local archives on historical patrimony, architects’ archives, literary pieces, newspapers, and satirical magazines.

**Magdalena Kunińska**  
**Jagiellonian University**  
**Cracow**

**The political and theoretical context for the activities of Paweł Popiel (1807–1892) as the conservator in Galicia against the discourse of the multinational empire**

The beginnings of institutional and academic preservation of monuments, including the urgent problem of inventory and collecting sources, have a deep political roots. Paweł Popiel, a conservative lawyer, politician and theorist, was one of the prominent persons for the development of art history in former Poland. As a conservator in Galicia and a collaborator of the Central Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale he provided a political and theoretical context for art historical studies and restoration of monuments falling within the central politics of the unity of nations and the strategy of loyalty within the map of differentiated national styles. The notion of a nation with its characteristic and separate artistic tradition was one of the central points of the studies, creation and preservation of „Polish” monuments. The main topics of political and theoretical thought of Popiel will be analysed in submitted paper and the role of so-called “Popiel’s dinners” in building Cracow group of archaeologists and art historians will also be described, as a central topic for the problem of revaluation of Polish monuments in order to promote their role in sustaining the national identity within a Habsburg Empire.

**Tomasz Torbus**  
**Gdansk University**

**Reconstructions, Deconstructions, (Over)Interpretations – the case of the Royal Castle at Wawel in Cracow 1908-1945.**

The gothic Royal Castle at the Wawel in Cracow were rebuild and expanded in years 1449-1548, mostly in the reign of Sigismund the Old from the Jagiellonian Dynasty. The result was a four wings Italian like palazzo with arcaded courtyard constructed basically by four architects, among them the most prominent was Bartholomeo Berrecci from Tuscany, probably the pupil of Michelangelo in the workshop for the burial memorial of the pope Julius II. In terms of chronology in the adoption of Renaissance forms, the innovative character of the architecture, its monumentality and, last but not least, the state of preservation, we are dealing with the reference building for Renaissance secular architecture in Central Europe.

Heavily dilapidated and misused by the Austrian army, it was purchased in 1908 in a national fundraising campaign and restored over the next 30 years. From that time these paradigmatic structure for Polish residential architecture constituted a vivid centre of the

crystallization of Polish historical and national awareness. The reconstruction of the castle by Galician conservators after 1908 were opposed by such personalities of the Vienna School like Max Dvořák and Alois Riedl; in the polemics the opponents used both national and art historical arguments (original and fake building substance). Dvořák warned that this act [the reconstruction] was “as irreverent as trying to restore the appearance of youth to an old man by wigs, make-ups and colourful clothes”. Showing this discussion I focus on the problem of political manipulation. Comparing, I see the political appropriation in other big residences reconstructed in the same time in France, Prussia (Germany) and Austria-Hungary – Pierrefonds, Königsburg (Konigsbourg), Marienburg (Malbork), Karlstein (Karlštejn) and Vajdahunyad (Hunedoara).

**Olha Zarechnyuk**

**Center for Urban History of East Central Europe (Lviv, Ukraine)**

### **History is More than Beauty: Reassessing Lviv’s Architectural Heritage in the Late Habsburg Period**

Stressing historical rather than artistic value became a trend in the late Habsburg Lviv, a city that had been popularly considered artless and inferior in terms of its architectural heritage since the mid-nineteenth century when official monument conservation institutions were established in the Austrian Empire. One of the crucial actors of this trend was Dr Aleksander Czołowski, a renowned historian, head of the Lviv Municipal Archive since 1891 and a monument conservator. He successfully campaigned to save some of the oldest Lviv architectural heritage that was dismissed as bland and unworthy of preservation both generally and by his fellow conservation professionals.

In this paper I analyse two such cases in the early 1900s: St Onuphrius Monastery and Gunpowder Tower in Lviv. Both fortification structures from the 1550s were facing threats of demolition from modern development and became subject of heated public discussions. Amidst various arguments for and against preservation voiced by various actors and stakeholders, it was Czołowski’s role and expertise that became decisive. I focus on 1) how he constructed his historical arguments in order to legitimise and further promote this heritage, including his usage of the Bulwark Myth to Lviv’s history, a highly problematic approach that led to exclusion rather than inclusion on ethnic terms, 2) how restoration of these monuments was thought of in terms of making the buildings more appealing to the public (e.g. through stylistic restoration). Stylistic restoration, although dismissed at the Second Congress of Galician Conservators in Przemyśl (1904), was still widely practised in Lviv until WWI and should be analysed as a way of overcoming the supposed artistic inferiority of the city. Eventually, I argue that these two cases played a substantial role for

further reassessment of Lviv and its architectural heritage, creating an image of a stronghold on the outskirts of European civilisation.

**Jiayao Jiang,**

**ICCROM (International Center for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property), Rome(Italy)**

### **Vicko Andrić and the restoration projects for Split: The Italian approach in the Dalmatian context**

In 1854, the Central commission in Vienna established the Department for Conservation in Split and gave the position of main conservator to Vicko Andrić (1793-1866), an architect from Split and a student of the Sapienza university in Rome and the Accademia San Luca, headed at the time by Antonio Canova. Some famous Italian architects in the 19<sup>th</sup> century had great influences on Andrić's educational formation, such as Basilio Mazzoni and Carlo Fea. Having completed his architectural studies in Italy, Andrić involved in some researches and conservation projects of ancient Roman constructions. Those experience became crucial when Andrić came back to Croatia and started the restoration projects for Split.

Being considered as the first Croatian conservator, Andrić opened up a new chapter of research on Diocletian's palace, his period can be thought of as the beginning of scientific interpretation of ancient remains of imperial buildings, on the basis of architectural drawings and archaeological research. Andrić planned projects for the restoration of Diocletian's palace. He focused his efforts on clearing out the basement levels, insulating and restoring the mausoleum with the plans for a new cathedral, reconstructing Diocletian's water supply system, as well as the city's wells and infrastructure. He studied and documented Split Cathedral and its bell tower, and in 1852, he completed his drawings and graphic reconstruction of Diocletian's mausoleum in the richly illustrated map "*Tempio di Giove del Palazzo di Diocleziano in Spalato*". In 1853, Andrić was appointed a conservator for the Split and Zadar countries.

Through Vicko Andrić and his works in Split, this paper discusses the ancient monuments reconstruction principles in Dalmatia in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It compares Vicko Andrić with Robert Adam, a British architect in the 18<sup>th</sup> century who published works about Diocletian's palace in Split based on intensive studies. The paper reveals the changes of conservation principles showed in different projects. Vicko Andrić combined Adam's concept of "natural desire" with the integration of the style and aspects of the time in the restoration work, showing an influence of the Italian approach to antiquities conservation.



**Jonathan Blower**  
**Independent Researcher**

**The Episcopium Question**  
**Imperialism and Irredentism in the Custodianship of Diocletian's Palace, 1850–1924**

This paper traces the history of Austria's custodianship of the Palace of Diocletian, with a particular focus on a seventeenth-century bishop's residence that once stood at the centre of the palace complex, partially obscuring the mausoleum of its imperial Roman patron. While the mausoleum of Diocletian still stands, the bishop's residence does not – it was destroyed by fire in 1924, several years after the creation of Yugoslavia. The general consensus now is that the fire was started deliberately, probably by a local resident, though the reasons for the supposed arson attack remain obscure. This paper moots political motivations, citing separatist and anti-Austrian sentiment in the Balkans as the principal aggravating factors. Until about 1903, Austrian cultural politics and destructive restoration work at the Palace of Diocletian were generally well received in Split. After 1903, archaeologists and conservators from Vienna suddenly found that their presence in Dalmatia was less welcome. This change in attitudes likely had as much to do with nationality politics as it did with the major shift in preservation policy introduced that year by Alois Riegl, whose conservative innovations might have been beneficial for Split under different political circumstances. In the event, his energetic engagement only inflamed an already heated situation, as Dalmatian allegiances started to abandon their Austrian emperor in favour of his third-century prototype, Diocletian.

**Deodáth Zuh**  
**LERN, Institute of Philosophy, Budapest**

**Heritage destruction, heritage creation, and the lost art of classicism.**  
**Reshaping early 19th-century Hungarian cityscapes before and after the First World War**

The classicist visual culture of historical Hungary has been the blind spot of local heritage management at the end of the 19th century. Refurbishing, rebuilding, or even 'perfecting' medieval, and renaissance buildings became the top priority of Hungarian professionals until the 1910s. It is interesting to see, however, that classicist assets were even less considered in the successor states of historical Hungary. At the one hand, baroque architecture and decorative arts constituted the primary sources of inspiration for post-war reconstruction in

the newly constituted kingless Kingdom of Hungary. Historical styles were deployed to refill the gaps in the country's lost architectural heritage determined by war and territorial changes. On the other hand, through the Transilvanian regionalism of Károly Koós and his followers, a less romantic and more modern patriotism began to thrive. Consequently, they kept on promoting the idiosyncratic image of the 'specifically Transylvanian', an ideological framework created mostly in interwar Romania. Meanwhile, on the newly acquired territories, the Romanian national state invested in the common Romanian heritage as reflected by the national style first envisaged by Ion Mincu, or later – mostly after 1933 – in international Modernism with some art deco accents. In addition, Romanian professional art history was on a quest for salvaging the most important testimonies of medieval Romanian presence in Transylvania. Reflecting these major factors, formerly booming Austro-Hungarian cities like Budapest and Oradea (Nagyvárad) kept on destroying the testimonies of their 19th-century development equally before and after the First World War. In this talk, I will make a big picture assessment of this phenomenon underpinned by a short history of how the late baroque and classicist city of Oradea was giving way to modern and national styles. The seminal call of the architect, Virgil Borbíró (Bierbauer) in 1948 for the salvation of Eastern and Central European classicist heritage came at the point when this tendency became mostly and generally irreversible.

**Helka Dzsacsovszki**  
**Technical University of Munich**

### **Restoration of the Medieval Royal Palace of Esztergom, 1934-1938: Methodological influences and ministerial patronage for the promotion of national identities**

The restoration of the medieval royal palace in Esztergom, Hungary between 1934 and 1938 is a pioneering example in Hungarian monument protection. The modern conservation methods applied by the architects demonstrate strong affinities with similar Italian directions at the time. Hungarian monument protection fostered strong professional ties with Italy during the interwar period under the leadership of Tibor Gerevich who was the president of the National Committee of Monuments and director of the Hungarian Institute in Rome at the time. Gerevich, along with architects István Genthon, Kálmán Lux and Géza Lux shared the restoration principles put forward in the Italian Carta del Restauro relating to the use of modern materials and technologies in the restoration of historical monuments. The architects restored only those parts of the building where archaeological and historical research supported an authentic recreation, marking any additions to the architectural elements for aesthetic or structural reasons with clearly distinguishable materials including brick and reinforced concrete. The project is also showcasing the opportunities inherent in cultural heritage for promoting national identities aligning with government politics. Gyula Gömbös, the Hungarian minister of war and later prime minister of the country, visited the site and mobilised funds from the state budget, recognising the symbolic associations his patronage

would entail with the medieval kingdom of Hungary. This presentation will draw on accounts of the architects and monument professionals involved alongside contemporary architectural drawings to elucidate the applied methods in the restoration of the medieval royal palace of Esztergom and highlight through its example how architectural monuments played a key role in the formation of cultural identities.

**Laura Demeter**

**Otto Friedrich University Bamberg**

### **Heritage restoration and protection in Romania's changing political context (1919-1948)**

The creation of Great Romania in 1918 following the First World War and inclusion of the territories from the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, meant for the newly created Romanian nation-state the inclusion of territories inhabited by various ethnic and religious groups, such as Hungarian and German-Saxon. In 1919 Romania issued a new legislation concerning the protection of historic monuments, which predominately considered religious and antiquities heritage as subject of protection.

Informed by archival documentation, this paper aims to discuss heritage preservation and restoration projects in Romania after 1919 in a changing political context, until the coming to power of the communist regime in 1948. A particular attention will be given to questioning firstly whether the principles of heritage restoration coined by the adopted legislation, considered the diverse cultural and religious heritage of the newly integrated territories. Secondly, to what extent the pursued urban modernization of the interwar period equally problematised the integration and restoration of religious heritages, including those of the religious minorities. Finally, the paper analyses on selected case studies, the impact of the Second World War on how to deal with the damages of the war, and with religious heritage and changing narratives in a newly created political context.

**Katarina Jevtic-Novakovic, Academy of Technical and Art Applied Studies Belgrade, Serbia**  
**Gordana Fontana-Giusti, University of Kent, UK**

### ***The Restoration and Promotion of Architectural Monuments in Serbia and the Role of Jovan Sterija Popovic and the National Museum***

With the return of Serbian statehood at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the emergence of the modern state, the awareness of the importance of cultural heritage, its preservation and restoration flourished. *The Prince's Order* (1836) marks the beginning of the

protection of historical monuments in Serbia, as the inventory of the churches and monasteries was undertaken and the renovation of buildings began (Studenica, Raca, Rakovica) including the first fresco restoration conducted at Manasija, 1844. (*Srbske novine*, 16/Feb/1844)

The first legal act, the ‘Decree on the Protection of Antiquities’ (February 1844), approved by the national council and Prince Alexander, was proposed by Jovan Sterija Popovic, the minister of education, who established the Serbian National Museum, Belgrade in May of the same year.

Born in Vrsac, Vojvodina, then Habsburg Empire, having studied in Budapest and Kežmarok Slovakia, Popovic (1806-1856) became a writer, lawyer, and pedagogue, who was a leading intellectual and best playwright at the time. Under his guidance the Museum had collected, preserved, and promoted antiquities of Serbia. Organized as both an institution of protection and of research, the museum has enhanced the knowledge of history and national identity. Indeed, the ethnographic department grew to become a separate Ethnographic Museum (1901) focusing on revitalization of crafts in Serbia. It was admired by Le Corbusier when he visited it in 1911.

The paper analyses the cultural context of Belgrade, its relationship to intellectuals in central Europe, its urbanisation and the strengthening of the civil society by focusing on the contribution of Sterija Popovic and his circle to the emerging science of heritage restoration and promotion of monuments. Based on collaborative archival research (in Archives of Serbia; National Library, Belgrade; Matica Srpska, Novi Sad, British Library, London) this paper demonstrates the relationship between the enlightened individuals and the restoration and promotion of monuments and how it impacted the society at the time.

**Cosmin Minea**

**ETH, Zürich, Chair for the History and Theory of Architecture Prof. Dr. Maarten Delbeke**

### **Restorations and Revival of Historical Monuments in interwar Romania**

In Romania, the Commission for Historical Monuments was founded in 1892 out of a desire to change restoration practices and promote Romanian architects in the new and lucrative profession of restorer. However, even if they claimed to overcome the principle of reviving the ‘initial’ monument, made famous in the 19th century by the French architect Eugene Viollet-le-Duc, the practice of the Romanian architects tells a different story. The role of monuments as visual cues for the national history and the emphasis placed on the mythical figure of the founder often made architects to take as model for their restoration the image of the monument in the dedication fresco and this almost always led to the reconstruction of the roof, towers, rebuilding of visible parts and removal of later additions. Indeed, the twentieth-century restorations in Romania did not differ in their methods from the nineteenth century

ones, but rather in their ideological underpinnings. If for architects such as André Lecomte du Noüy (1844-1914) or Ion Mincu (1851-1912), restorations were meant to show the European nature of the Romanian culture, in the twentieth century the restorations were used to support a distinct national historical narrative. The growing nationalism became an even more significant factor after 1918, when Romania attempted to emphasize 'its' heritage in the newly-acquired, multi-ethnic territory of Transylvania. A key role was played by the spread of the Neo-Romanian buildings in Transylvania, most prominently the imposing Orthodox cathedrals, inspired by the historical monuments in Wallachia and Moldavia, and that meant to overshadow Catholic or Protestant churches. All in all, the paper seeks to assess how architecture contributed to the development of the public discourse about the past and how were historical monuments used to integrate a new, multi-ethnic territory within the nation-state of Romania.

**Natia Natsvlishvili**

**George Chubinashvili National Research Centre for Georgian Art History and Heritage Preservation (Tbilisi, Georgia)**

### **Imperialism and Architectural Restoration: The Case of Manglisi Cathedral**

History of restoration of Medieval architectural monuments in the nineteenth-century Georgia was largely determined by two crucial events, the Russian conquest of Eastern Georgia in 1801 and the abolition of the autocephaly of the Georgian Church in 1811. In the name of a common faith, the Russian Church Administration was in charge of the renovation of Medieval Georgian religious buildings using this process as an instrument for imperial propaganda.

The paper focuses on the Cathedral of Manglisi located 60 km away from Tbilisi in Lower Kartli province. Initially built in the fifth century, the cathedral was an important centre of pilgrimage due to Christological relics believed to be kept there. In 1020s, the cathedral went under major reconstruction that resulted in the significant enlargement of the building. In the following centuries, the Cathedral was damaged several times during the invasions.

In 1824, a military unit of Russian army encamped in Manglisi. Impressed by the site, Russian officers initiated renovation of the building with the support of the Exarch Isidore. Restoration works started in 1850s. It was supervised by the regiment's architect Chulkov and undertaken by Greek masons. During the restoration many inscriptions and architectural details were lost. They were replaced by new inscriptions and decorative elements in order to praise new regime. The coat of arm of Imperial Russia was inserted above the main entrance in the south façade.

On the example of the restoration of Manglisi Cathedral the paper will try to contribute to the workshop through addressing the following questions: how did the restoration of important religious buildings on conquered lands help to promote imperial identity? how heritage-friendly were methods applied during the restoration process? did the involvement of non-local people have influence on the final result of the restoration?

**Igor Demchenko**  
**University of Kassel**

### **The Rise of “Scientific Restoration” in the First Soviet Decade**

In the first decade after the Bolshevik Revolution, Russian preservationists and architectural historians encountered outstanding challenges and enjoyed exceptional opportunities. Both challenges and opportunities derived from the nature of the new Communist regime that based its legitimacy upon historic discontinuity. After 1917, the dwellings of imperial aristocracy, religious structures – Christian, Muslim, and Buddhist alike – came to symbolize the stalemate of the modernization process globally, and within the borders of the Russian Empire. De-valorized, historic buildings were very quickly losing their social and cultural function and to save them the preservationists led by the Moscow-based painter and art historian Igor Grabar (1871-1960) assumed the task of reconstituting them as aesthetic objects – the project they in fact cherished since before the Revolution, but which was resisted by the aristocracy and the religious communities. My presentation will explore the reshaping of medieval Russian architectural monuments aimed at their aesthetic enhancement and led by the Restoration Workshops organized by Igor Grabar in 1918 and closed 1934. Based on the published and unpublished materials, it will analyze the ambitions and the methodological principles of highly interventionist practices of Grabar’s Workshops. It will show that the desired outcome of the restorations was mostly consistent either with the classicist ideal of noble simplicity and calm grandeur, projected upon the medieval Russian architecture already by Petr Pokryshkin (1870-1922) the leading pre-Revolutionary preservationist of the Russian Empire, or with the “Arts and Crafts” emphasis on the texture and the expressive qualities of building materials, be it the stone, the brick or the timber. Finally, the presentation will point at the canonical status of the early Soviet preservation projects for the later Soviet discipline of “scientific restoration”, which continues into the present.

**Katharina Schwinde PhD; Ettersberg Foundation, Weimar**

### **Monument Protection and Promotion of Architectural Monuments in the Solovetsky Forced Labour Camp 1920–1939**

The Solovetsky archipelago remotely located in the White Sea in the Russian Far North and its famous monastery, which was founded in the 15th century and gained its fortress-like unique architecture in the 16th and 17th century belong to the most sacred places of Russian

Orthodoxy. Also, widely known is the fact that the Solovetsky archipelago has an infamous age-long history of exile, detention and exploitation of human labour. It was here, where in 1923 the Solovetsky Forced Labour Camp – the first Soviet Gulag – was founded and where tens of thousands of people lost their lives. While the restoration and promotion of the architectural monuments of the Solovetsky archipelago are primarily linked to the period before 1917 or to the time after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the efforts to restore and promote the architectural heritage of the islands made during Soviet-times are mostly forgotten. This seems to be especially true for the time between 1918 and 1939 when as a result of the Decree on the Separation of State and Church thousands of churches and monasteries in the country were looted and damaged and the Solovetsky monastery was converted into accommodations for thousands of prisoners.

In my paper I want to highlight this particular period by discussing the struggles architects working for the Department for Museums within the People's Committee of Education undertook to save the Solovetsky monuments from decay and their efforts to prevent the exploitation and destruction of the monastery by the Soviet Secret Police between 1920 and 1923. Furthermore, I want to shed light on the fact how even within the Forced Labour Camp a unique scientific society for local studies (*kraevedenie*) run by prisoners researched and published important papers on the restoration and promotion of the islands architectural heritage.