Restoration *(fr. Restauration; sp. Restauracion) n.*

Definition: Restoration is one of the terms under the umbrella of 'conservation' (cf. *Conservation*) and is closely related to 'remedial conservation' (cf. *Remedial conservation*). It has historically been understood as physical interventions on an artefact to return it to its original condition or a former state, to bring it back to what is considered a good condition or, depending on the character of the piece, a functional state. In contemporary conservation, restoration comprises the actions carried out directly on damaged or deteriorated material fabric of an artefact with the aim of facilitating its appreciation, understanding and use, while respecting its tangible and intangible properties.

Evolution of the definition and approaches of 'restoration'
Restoration comes from Late Latin *restaurationem*, which appears at the end of the 13th century. In the 16th century, it was defined as 'restoring to a former state', 'bringing back into activity'; in 1660, it was defined as 'bringing back into a good condition', with the association of the word *repair (réparation* in French) (*TLFI*).

The French antiquary Aubin-Louis Millin (1806) defined the verb 'to restore' as to re-establish a building, to bring it back to a good condition, as well as returning a mutilated figure to its initial state. He used the metaphor 'desire to repair the outrages of time' and warned about the danger of wrong interpretations of the 'initial state', providing examples of resulting 'unintended fakes'. Millin was probably one of the first to recommend the identification of restored elements in engraved illustrations, also raising the issue that some restorers take pride in indiscernible interventions. At the end of the 19th century, French art writer Henry Havard (1887) discussed the meanings and evolution of the words *restauration* and *restaurateur*, relating to the secret nature of interventions as well as the evaluation of their success based on their indiscernible nature. He also defined the goal of a restoration intervention as returning the object to its original appearance, and offered clear distinctions between terms related to restoration, such as *repair*. In the 1830s, French architectural theorist Quatremère de Quincy praised the success of the restoration of the Arch de Titus (first century AD) in re-establishing the monument as a whole while not misleading the viewer; the approach was not to recreate all the sculpted motifs or to reuse original materials.

The history of restoration took a turn during the 19th century, especially through the contrasting ideas of French architect Eugène-Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc and English art critic John Ruskin. Viollet-le-Duc (1854) provided a detailed definition of the word *restauration*, including thoughts on the evolving meaning of the word: 'The term and the thing itself are both modern. To restore a building is not to preserve it, to repair, or rebuild it; it is to reinstate it in a condition of completeness which could never have existed at any given time'. He has been associated with the concept of 'unity of style', based on his desire to bring a building to a complete state, even if that meant removing former interventions or recreating missing elements by copy or conjecture.

John Ruskin (1849) embraced a radically different approach to the meaning of *restoration*: 'Neither by the public, nor by those who have the care of public monuments, is the true meaning of the word *restoration* understood. It means the most total destruction which a building can suffer: a destruction out of which no remnants can be gathered: a destruction accompanied with false description of the thing destroyed. Do not let us deceive ourselves in this important matter; it is *impossible*, as impossible as to raise the dead, to restore anything that has ever been great or beautiful in architecture'. Ruskin was in favour of a strict maintenance of the monument, paving the way to what is now called preventive conservation (cf. *Preventive*

conservation). The dissemination of his theses was carried by the *Society for the Protection of Ancient Building*, founded in 1877 by William Morris. However, such debates were not new in England and could already be seen in the late 18th century, when antiquary John Milner (*Dissertation on the Modern art of Altering Ancient Cathedrals as Exemplified in the Cathedral of Salisbury*, London, 1798) strongly opposed the interventions of the architect James Wyatt on several English cathedrals.

From restoration to conservation

In 1893, Camillo Boito, using the Plato's dialogues model, demonstrated the limits of the opposed views of Ruskin and Viollet-le-Duc, highlighting the difficult choices the restorer has to make and the possibility of a balanced approach (Boito, 2000).

Also at the turn of the century, art historians Georg Dehio and Alois Riegl highly influenced the evolution of the field through their opposition to principles and interventive practices of restoration observed in the 19th century. Through his well-known slogan 'Conserve, do not restore', Dehio (1905) advocated for the preservation of historic monuments, as much as possible without replacements, in order to preserve the authenticity of form and material. For Dehio, monument preservation and restoration 'are often mistaken for one another, although they are antipodes. Monument preservation wants to preserve the existing, restoration wants to recreate the non-existent. The distinction is decisive' (Georg Dehio. *Monument Protection and Monument Preservation in the Nineteenth Century*, 1905). Riegl ([1903] 1984), on the other hand, distinguished several 'values' attached to a historical monument, outlining their competing nature in relation to preservation. He offered a form of analytical grid guiding the decision-making of an intervention, demonstrating the necessary balance in between the values to be preserved, based on the nature of the artefact.

Sixty years later, Cesare Brandi ([1963] 2005) offered an insightful perspective on what restoration entails. While Riegl had distinguished between artistic and historical values, focusing on monuments, Brandi referred to aesthetic and historical *instances* (*"istanze"*), looking primarily at paintings. The particularity of Brandi's approach is in the very nature of the work of art, which is not defined in terms of substance, but by the awareness it generates in the viewer experiencing it. Brandi distinguished between two time periods in the life of an artwork: the time of its creation (*duration*) and the time of its life (*interval*), itself punctuated by many *instants*, which correspond to the moments where the artwork 'strikes an individual consciousness'. For a conservator, it is essential to differentiate between these two periods as not only is it impossible to go back to the first but it should not even be attempted. As soon as the creation of an object is accomplished, the piece begins its life, suffers the natural alterations of time, as well as human interventions. What is left is the original idea, which is transmitted to us through the material object; the original as a whole has been altered on different levels. This idea allows for the further distinction between originality and authenticity, the latter encompassing the whole life of the object, not only the time of creation (cf. *Authenticity*). While earlier approaches of restoration aimed at a return to an ideal original state, contemporary conservation strives to preserve an artefact as a whole, including traces of age, as well as its intangible value.

Scientific conservation laboratories appeared after the First World War, with the aim to better assess how artefacts were created, by whom, where and when, as well as how they aged, allowing a broader understanding of cultural heritage. International conferences were organised, professional organisations created, charters written. Among those, the 1964 Venice Charter defines both conservation and restoration, outlining that both aim to safeguard monuments 'no less as works of art than as historical evidence'. Article 9 states that 'the process of restoration is a highly specialised operation. 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. It must stop at the point where conjecture begins, and in this case, moreover, any extra work which is indispensable must be distinct from the architectural

composition and must bear a contemporary stamp. The restoration, in any case, must be preceded and followed by an archaeological and historical study of the monument' (ICOMOS, 1964). Further charters and conference documents have since highlighted evolving views on what restoration and conservation mean on an international scale.

Restoration and cultural context
During the past few decades, cultural differences between restoration and conservation have been highlighted. In fact, the terminology itself is meaningful. For instance, Western countries now define restoration as the interventive part of conservation, the physical actions carried out when absolutely necessary, potentially with a negative connotation associated with altering the materiality of the artefact. In other cultures, the authenticity of an artefact may be more linked to its intangible nature with the material only being a carrier of intentionality (see *Authenticity*). This is evident, for example, in the Postprints of *Revisiting Authenticity in the Asian Context* (Wijesuriya, 2018), which demonstrate how Western approaches to conservation are not universal. Several countries, including China, use the term restoration as an equivalent to conservation, and practitioners there call themselves restorers, not conservators.

Different approaches and perceptions have always existed even within a singular culture. Reflecting on the terminology of the terms restoration and restorers is enlightening. Havard (1887), cited earlier, defined the restorer as an 'artist, craftsman or technician whose profession consists in restoring artworks, furniture or objects of curiosity. Restorers are divided into diverse specialties, depending on the nature of the restorations they give their preference to. The most skilled restore paintings, others restore, more specifically, porcelains and faiences; others furniture, bronzes, pieces of silverware.' He also highlighted the discrepancy in the choice of terminology when qualifying interventions: a painting is *restored* while a piece of furniture is *repaired*. To a lesser degree, this hierarchy still exists, especially in areas that are not considered as major specialties within academic training programmes.

The choice of terminology can also highlight sensitivities to the connotation of a word: in France, when a clear cleavage appeared in between restoration and conservation, the practitioners traditionally called 'restorers' – in a country where the term *conservateurs* was already associated with *curators* – were named *conservateurs-restaurateurs*. This also reveals the underlying basis for the emergence of the term 'remedial conservation' (see. *Remedial conservation*), whose scope overlaps with the that of restoration, as they both refer to a physical action on the artefact.

Conclusion
The evolution of the meaning of the word 'restoration' reflects differences in our relationship with cultural heritage, geographically and historically. As Paul Philippot eloquently stated: 'Restoration, before becoming a technical problem, is first of all a cultural problem, and the first is only the consequence of the second' (Philippot, 1985). The evolving semantics used in the field of cultural heritage preservation raises challenges regarding the inclusion of diverse cultures; some still use the word 'restoration' without any pejorative connotation, inclusive of the intangible aspect of cultural heritage, and not limited to a physical action on its materiality. We must be careful that the use of terminology does not become obtuse and exclude, even if unintentionally, cultures that approach preservation with different goals and values.

<div style="text-align:right">Stéphanie Auffret, Renata F. Peters and Hélia Marçal.</div>

References:

Boito, C., Mandosio, Jean-Marc, & Choay, Françoise. (2000). *Conserver ou restaurer : Les dilemmes du patrimoine / Camillo Boito ; traduit de l'italien par Jean-Marc Mandosio ; présenté par Françoise Choay.* (Collection Tranches de villes). Besançon: Editions de l'Imprimeur.

Brandi, C. (2005). Theory of restoration. In Basile, G. (Ed.) Theory of restoration. Firenze: Nardini Editore. Original work published 1963.

Havard, H. (1887). *Dictionnaire de l'ameublement et de la décoration depuis le XIIIe siècle jusqu'à nos jours.* Paris: Ancienne maison Quantin, Librairies-imprimeries réunies, May & Motteroz.

International Council of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). (1964). *International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites (The Venice Charter).* Retrieved from: https://www.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf

Millin, A. (1806). *Dictionnaire des beaux-arts, par A.L. Millin.* Paris: De l'Imprimerie de Crapelet, chez Desray.

Philippot, P. (1985). "La conservation des œuvres d'art: Problème de politique culturelle." *Annales d'histoire de l'art et archéologie: Publication annuelle de la Section d'histoire de l'art et d'archéologie de l'Université libre de Bruxelles 7* (1985), p. 7.

Riegl, A. (1984). *Le culte moderne des monuments : Son essence et sa genèse / Aloïs Riegl ; traduit de l'allemand par Daniel Wieczorek ; avant-propos de Françoise Choay.* (Espacements). Paris: Editions du Seuil. Original work published 1903.

Ruskin, J. (1849). *The seven lamps of architecture: With illustrations, drawn and etched by the author.* London: Smith, Elder and Co.

Viollet-Le-Duc, E. (1882). *Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle.* France: A. Morel, 1875. English edition *On Restoration* (London, 1875), pp. 9-17, 20-22, 27-28, 35-50, 62-65, 67-69, 71.

Wijesuriya, G., & Sweet, J. (2018). *Revisiting authenticity in the Asian context.* Rome: International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and the Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM).

See Conservation, Repair, Restitution, Rehabilitation, Renovation, Reconstruction, Reintegration.