INTERACTION BETWEEN ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND SYMBOLIC WORLDVIEW: CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES
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Like no other types of cultural heritage, architectural heritage is open for permanent exposure to the society. Our diverse visualized past is revealed in buildings, we just need to learn to read it. However, in Lithuania the immediate cognition process is loaded with the shadow of uncertainty created by heritage conservation. Carried out research has shown that when reconstructing and restoring the architectural heritage, the focus has been paid to restoration of the older and more coherent architectural forms and compositions, often notwithstanding the lack of reliable scientific information. In such a way, many of the old buildings that convey knowledge about our past, instead of becoming objective information senders, have become distinctive symbols, embodying vision of the past of heritage conservation experts. Therefore, when observing Gothic, Renaissance and Baroque buildings in nature it is impossible to distinguish what is real and what is created during the performance reconstruction and restoration works. Even monographs on Lithuanian architectural history, where the results of conservation are not addressed, do not help to solve those issues. The buildings, undergone works of heritage conservation instead of being objective witnesses of the past, have become the field of expression of symbolic values. In fact, many of encrypted intangible meanings and stories consist in objects of architectural heritage; their disclosure extends the field of cognition as well as contributes to the development of identity. However, a significant problem lies in the fact that heritage conservation itself which is equated to discourse of information as objective as possible from the first half of the 20th century in the international discourse, became the consolidation tool for symbolic worldview in Lithuania. Therefore, such a situation greatly complicates cognition of our architectural history. Therefore, the purpose of this article is to distinguish the most symptomatic ways of expression of symbolic vision of the past in architectural heritage conservation and to reveal the main reasons that determined the dominance of the symbolic meanings in the plane of architectural heritage.

Authentic materials (both physical substance as well as scientific information) and the intersection problems of the symbolic vision are multifaceted. This article will be limited to just a few important aspects of the deployment with the focus on:

- following issues of creative interpretations in the architectural heritage conservation;
- issues of authentic information destruction;
- issues of heritage conservation work documentation;
- search of historical and cultural reasons that have matured friendly environment for symbolic perceptions of architectural heritage.

The article focuses on the works of architecture heritage conservation performed with the masonry during the Soviet period. This choice was determined
by the exclusivity of the period in throughout entire context of preservation and restoration of the old Lithuanian architecture. Namely after the Second World War complex architectural heritage conservation processes were started, majority of complex reconstruction and restoration works were carried out. During the Soviet period, the distinctive twofold architectural heritage treatment, partly scientific, partly symbolic, emerged, therefore, the buildings that became textbook examples do not always reflect the actual properties of a specific style. The result of heritage conservation processes: authentic, scientifically based and simply designed architectural information has been spreading with equal rights in the public discourse so far. As the recent topicalities have shown, such a diametrically opposite interpretation of the heritage and its conservation tradition has been continuing till nowadays. Old buildings are still often regarded as the field of symbolic expression. In this case, the authentic information about heritage conservation is required to the extent how it can be justified by prior expectations, and data gaps are filled with creativity. Re-creation of the Grand Duke’s Palace of Vilnius’ Lower castle², Siesikai Castle³ are the best examples of this trend.

It would be difficult to expect that this article could change the trend that occurred in the second half of the 19th century and have finally formed during the last decades and have established a tradition of symbolic architectural treatment. However, promotion of the information based on research is one of the ways to attenuate the influence of negative stereotypes.

PROBLEMS OF FOLLOWING THE CREATIVE INTERPRETATIONS IN ARCHITECTURE HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Throughout the centuries old buildings have gone through the stage of change inspired by a number of wars, fires, and other natural factors of life, but all architectural layers are equally authentic, transmitting information from its time. Meanwhile, conservation works are often focused on the re-creation of structure and composition of one or more stages of the building’s life. Often, the lack of reliable scientific information ensuring re-creation of architectural composition of a specific era is faced to. Although in the second half of the 19th century the creation of missing elements, copying as bad method of the reconstruction and restoration reasoning⁴ were discussed in Europe, however, lack of scientific information in the heritage conservation of architectural objects is often ignored in the second half of the 20th century and the 21st century in Lithuania. In such cases, two ways⁵ similar but not reflecting international heritage conservation provisions for filling scientific information gaps are employed, i.e. combination of research and creative interpretation and free creative interpretation. Both of these ways are clearly contrary to the fundamental international heritage conservation provisions set out in the Charter of Venice⁶, however, it is quite easily moved from the scientific heritage conservation into the creative sphere in Lithuania. When there is a lack of data about archaeological, architectural and iconographic⁷ studies of specific architectural composition or details, they are simply created. In order to illustrate such behaviour, several different interpretations of the use cases, highly revealing of the peculiarities of prevalent trends, may be distinguished from many examples.

One of them is an oriel of attic staircase arising above the junction of northern wall of Kaunas’ old presbytery and western avant-corps (project author – restorer Dalija Zareckienė) (Fig. 1).

In the original and supplemented architecture research material there is no information about these important architectural fragments⁸. Its presence was indicated by remaining traces of spiral staircases⁹. Comparing the 1966 restoration project material with the reconstructed oriel in nature, it can be stated the remains of found staircase suggested its approximate width, however, the voxel shape, height, number of windows, roof form in the absence of data are created newly. In this case, the hypothetical small staircase oriel rising above the junction of the walls is integrated into a single composite whole harmoniously – small voxel height, reserved form and the careful architectural expression, corresponding to façade composition, determine harmony.
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In the same way a problem of reconstruction of the main building with a gable of eastern mannerism forms was dealt with at Rotušės sq. No. 28, Kaunas (project author – restorer Liuda Perevičienė) (Fig. 2). The first layer of the architectural detail has been almost preserved, while the second has been destroyed. In the lower layer fragments of damaged frieze band, cornice provided enough data for restoration. There was almost no information for reconstruction of the lost layer: the former width was indicated by the thickening of the wall in the middle of lower layer, and the height and the layout of architectural elements has been restored creatively interpreting the authentic information of the first layer\(^{10}\). However, the closeness of so restored elements to the former authenticity is questionable.

The restoration of the first floor window openings on the street facade of a house in Vilnius, Pilies str. No. 13 should be evaluated in the same way (Fig. 3). Lack of data and the desire to restore a complete gothic facade determined the use of improvisation upon the topic of poor remains. The surviving upper lintels and elements of small niches incorporated over them were the only starting points for creativity. The author of the project Elena Urbonienė clearly identifies that it is improvisation, whilst raising the

\(^{10}\)
I. ŠIUOLAIKINĖ KULTŪROS PAVELDO REFLEKSIJA

The method of reliance on analogy should be distinguished as widely spread in Lithuanian architectural heritage conservation. In this case, the remaining gaps of information are filled with copying of similar details representing reproducible period. Geographical distribution of details to be copied can vary: it can be the same object, a building in the same city, architectural heritage of other Lithuanian cities, examples from foreign countries. Improvisational character is also vivid in use of analogies. As one of the most prominent case of reliance on analogies in Trakai Island Castle is a restoration of the donjon fronts. (Fig. 4). As the project material shows, several restoration options have been designed for a compositionally important element. The implemented project is based on the gable composition of St. Nicholas church in Vilnius\textsuperscript{12}. Reliance on analogies should be regarded as a negative act of heritage conservation, however, it should be noted that in this case the architect – restorer Bronislovas Krūminis did not chose the easiest way by schematically copying a compositionally important architectural element, but creatively composed arched niches “borrowed” from the gable of Vilnius Church.

In accordance with the provisions of international heritage conservation, it is obvious that in case of these exceptional examples, such a small amount of initial information about the form should have stopped the restoration opportunities and helped to avoid falsification of the past. An essential problem of a creative solution lies in these buildings now; it is very difficult to evaluate objectively to what extent improvisation is right or rather close to authentic. In such cases, there is a move from the scientific field to a discussion upon a variety of opportunities, to be more specific, into speculation sphere. It can be assumed that improvising upon topics of authentic remains the version close to original was obtained, but on the other hand, it can be assumed that the reconstructed fragment does not repeat former image. The situation could change only after finding reliable archival data or iconographic materials. Meanwhile, without the new objective scientific information there is no answer to this question. Only one thing is certain, that such creative solutions to missing information, understood as the

issue that “no one has expressed the desire to assess accurately to what extent that improvisation is correct so far”\textsuperscript{11}.

Fig. 3. Reconstructed street facade of a house in Vilnius, Pilies str. No. 13
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Perception of architectural heritage as a field of symbolic expression is obviously revealed by the use of creative interpretations for restoration of lost elements when gaps of objective information lying in the building are filled with imaginary signs from a restorative period. Such behaviour suggests that the buildings are incomprehensible as authentic witnesses of a certain period; they are deployed for creation of new stories about the past. Quite often this method, which is not stressed by international heritage conservation provisions, is followed when the building is in ruins. Therefore, such a way of problem solution was used in the reconstruction of Trakai Island Castle. So far, the validity of reconstruction of the staircase of the palace leading from the courtyard to the galleries remains uncertain (Fig. 5). It is known that in the interwar period there was no available authentic information on their shape and location, so it was decided to leave the only way to access the gallery, i.e. the narrow staircase of the donjon. In the Soviet documents it was impossible to find any information about validity of the restoration of this element, therefore, it can be assumed that when constructing the staircase rising from the courtyard to the gallery, there was a solution found that allowed to use them under their direct purpose and at the same time it was tried to integrate into the overall architectural composition harmoniously.

Restoration of the western casemate wall was also problematic. The building had only little ruins of the first floor left (Fig. 6), so there was no information about the height and form of the roof, as well as it was not known whether the defensive parapet surrounded the entire building, or if it was merely pointing to the outside of the castle.

The architect-restorer Stanislavas Mikulionis proposed to cover the building with a monopitch roof, to fit the defensive parapet on the outside, however, in the meeting of the Scientific Methodological Cultural Heritage Protection Council it was agreed to make the roof four-sloped and to directed shooting holes in the defensive parapet to all four sides. One of the most important factors which determined such a choice was fragments of architectural details, found during archaeological research, which showed that it was a fancy building, so it was decided that

![Fig. 4. Reconstructed southern donjon facade of Trakai Island Castle](image)

![Fig. 5. Reconstructed courtyard of Trakai Island Castle](image)
the shape of the roof had to be the same as the residential palace\textsuperscript{14} (Fig. 6, 7). It should be noted that the roof of residential palace was established on the same principle of creativeness\textsuperscript{15}.

The reconstruction of courtyard facade composition was complicated as well. Knowing that the data on the second floor of the building almost has not remained, it can be assumed\textsuperscript{16} that when designing the roof canopy, covering the gallery, there was a search for optimal decision reflecting utilitarian purpose of this element and at the same time it was tried to adjust to the overall facade composition (Fig. 7, 8). The gently shaped gallery and slender pillars supporting the porch slightly do not match to the relatively large scale of the facade. In order to create a livelier composition of western casemates, in the centre of a long courtyard wall (71.40 m), it was decided to equip the balcony and the door on the outside wall of a staircase cell of a shooting roof and cover all staircase with the gable roof stuffed into a building roof\textsuperscript{17}. Reconstruction of the building cornice was a creative process also\textsuperscript{18}.

Therefore all of these elements of western casemate wall facades were assembled on the basis of aesthetic elements. When assessing in art criticism perspective, it can be said that through the staircase balcony

---

*Fig. 6. Interwar building ruins of south-westward forecastle of Trakai Island Castle. Mostly ruined part is western casemates*

*Fig. 7. Reconstructed southern part of the western casemates of Trakai Island Castle*
and the roof, the composition of courtyard facade divided into two parts became more expressive, took on the regularity and clarity, however it should be noted that the use of such coinages contradict to the principles of heritage conservation.

There are restoration examples of creative reasoning inside the western casemate wall as well. The small hole similar to the donjon or the rooflight in the forecastle tower’s staircase, remaining in the narrow room on the second floor of the building, inspired the idea that there was a staircase leading from the first floor of the attic\textsuperscript{19}. As any authentic data testifying staircase shape was absent, they are designed by improvisation. On the grounds of the same creative principle it was further decided to install the door leading to adjacent rooms in a room on the second floor staircase, even though there was no information about their presence. On the basis of this fact that rooflights were found and reconstructed in the west wall on the second floor of other two rear rooms rebuilt next to the north-west tower, it was decided that the rooms had “some sort of extraordinary purpose”; therefore, it was decided to combine them in an improvised doorway\textsuperscript{20}. At the
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\caption{Reconstructed northern part of the western casemates}
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\caption{Trakai engraving by T. Makovskis. The beginning of the 17\textsuperscript{th} c.}
\end{figure}
First glance it might seem that the examples should be attributed to the group of creative interpretations, inspired by scientific information, however, closer inspection makes clear that authentic information in these cases was secondary, and the elements inspired by it were created without any reliable scientific basis.

A slightly different situation arose when reconstructing the forecastle gate tower. The restoration of the building was inspired by the engraving of Tomas Makovskis (Fig. 9), but in the absence of any authentic data on the previous image (Fig. 6), the facade composition was created (Fig. 10).

The entrance hole was fitted on the first floor of the tower, cannon firing hole was bricked in the outer wall (the southern) on the third floor, the shooting shelter was made on the top. Thus, only the most necessary architectural elements responding to the entry and defensive functions were composed in the new facade. It should be noted that only the restored brick external facade of entrance gate tower slightly stands out from the general context. The masonry of Trakai Island Castle buildings was mixed: the lower parts were built of stones of various sizes (this type of masonry was the main), and the top was of the bricks. Due to adjustment of those different materials (rough stone masonry and flat surface bricks), quite static compositions of most of the castle walls became more vibrant. The same principle of masonry was applied when rebuilding the walls also. It can be assumed that in the case of the entrance gate tower using only bricks for walls, it was intended to show that any authentic information was left in the building, i.e. it was not reconstructed but it was built. This treatment responds to the Venice Charter Article 12 which states that replacements of missing parts must be distinguishable from the original, but at the same time pointing out that they must link them with the whole. In the case of the entrance tower, this complex task was resolved satisfactorily, although dissonance could be gentler, but viewer is quite understandably informed about the true situation in the building.

The restoration of buildings did not manage without referring to creative work. Desire to restore the more complete selected stylistic composition was usually due to such a situation. Only in such a way it was possible to fulfil the entire restoration concept of the Gothic compositions of the street facade in the house in Aušros vartų str. No. 6 (Fig. 11). According to the author of the restoration project Evaldas Purlys, the most complicated problem was
the restoration of the first floor facade. At the end of the 19th century previous facade composition was destroyed by cutting the large display windows without leaving the slightest trace here. When preparing the restoration project there was a dilemma whether the windows should be installed on the first floor. At first the project author decided to install them, while the experts of Monuments Restoration Design Institute after considering this problem suggested the idea of surrender, however, the final decision was made by the architect – restorer E. Purlys who implemented his initial idea. Hence, little windows of the same shape were bricked in the deepened semi-circular arched niches on the first floor. Thus, any decision would be purely hypothetical in this case as no data about semblance of the Gothic composition on the first floor looked like available.

As it is apparent from the examples above, creative work is quite often invoked in the reconstruction and restoration of masonry buildings. Such desperate restoration of missing details was determined by a symbolic worldview. The old buildings are perceived not as the historical witnesses of the past revealing a multi-layered objective information, but as objects that can be adjusted in order to transfer most commonly a subjective image of the past. In this case, the saying “the end justifies the means” is often followed and such architectural heritage interpretation often inspires destruction of the valuable authentic layers. Treatment of the building past based on prior, preliminary, incomplete research which is focused on the early as possible the Gothic or Renaissance, in rare case, Baroque period of the building often becomes a key obstacle preventing to grasp the building change through the course of centuries and to distinguish valuable authentic subsequent stylistic compositions. This perception of the past implies another painful issue that is the demolition of authentic details in the objects of architectural heritage.

The Destruction Problem of Authentic Information. Heritage conservation works are often focused on the restoration of the structure and composition of one or more of the building’s existence stages. These actions typically lead the disassembly of the upper layers which help to unveil and restore earlier architectural layers. Therefore, the destruction of the past signs is permanent attendant of restoration and reconstruction processes. Decisions of

Fig. 11. Reconstructed street facade of a house in Vilnius, Aušros vartų str. 6
recurring dilemmas what to destroy and what to leave out must be based on reliable scientific data. However, subjective treatment of the authentic materials emerging in symbolic thinking – visual environment, prior giving prominence to Gothic, Renaissance stylistic layers, often did not allow to assess properly the available information and the valuable authentic architectural layers of successive epochs were condemned to collapse.

The restoration which took place in Lithuania can be called facadism as in all the buildings when performing heritage conservation works, only facades were left. Ceilings, partitions, floors, doors, windows, furnaces and other details unrelated to the selected times of restoration from the 18th-19th centuries were removed from the restored objects. According to the English scientist Johan Earl, such treatment shows a misunderstanding of the building as a whole, neglecting of equal documentary importance of all elements. When restoring only the facade is left, then “the building turns into its own souvenir”24. Not multilayer historical material is considered to be valuable, no, but an integral part of the whole building both in respect of time and substance. Implementation of prepared vision of past became important for heritage conservation, i.e. when having removed all genuine signs of different periods imitation of the past was generated. Such attitude led to destruction of the main facade of Zabelo Palace in Kaunas which was authentic architectural composition characteristic to Kaunas classicism. Four different options were developed for the restoration of this facade. Next to the restoration of the entire Renaissance composition, leaving the eastern part of the Classical period unchanged, it was offered to maintain the classical architectural forms and unveil different fragments of Renaissance facade. The first version was implemented (Fig. 12). The decision was made on the assumption that architectural composition of the porch in the main facade of classical period is not known, but remaining as formed in the interwar period by using silicate bricks5. However, soon after the restoration work it was revealed that insufficient attention was paid to the collection of archival material. About a decade later documents and iconographic material were found supporting authenticity of the classicistic balcony supported by columns26. In 1933 the classical porch with columns was rebuilt retaining the old forms37, and then silicate bricks playing the crucial misleading role appeared in the columns. The authenticity of the balcony supported by columns is certified by the photograph published in the German newspaper in 191728 (Fig. 13).

The destroyed authentic classicist composition of the main facade from the end of the 18th century

![Fig. 12. Main facade of reconstructed Zabelos Palace in Kaunas](image-url)
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was changed by the forms of Renaissance architecture for the most part based on analogies and much less on data of nature research.

However, in Lithuania not only the fragments of the object meeting the concepts of heritage conservation were demolished, but also authentic signs of reproducible period. In order to understand the nature and the scope of such actions it should be better addressed to the data presented in Trakai Island Castle restoration reports. Unfortunately, the facts show that, despite the degree of the survival, the authentic elements were destroyed in all buildings of the castle. Previously scarcely surviving authentic masonry areas were most affected in the residential palace. When outfitting the door\textsuperscript{29} wiring grooves were cut, while installing alarm in the western (outer) wall\textsuperscript{30} of the palaces old authentic substance (masonry) was disassembled without any scruples. It was done the same in the donjon as well: when attaching gate hinges a considerable amount of the original masonry was destroyed and the left authentic pieces were hidden under plaster\textsuperscript{31}. A number of similar unavailing was done when rebuilding forecastle structures. In Southeast tower the rotten masonry was dismantled but not restored\textsuperscript{32}. Surviving arches remains and the lower part of the fireplace were destroyed in the triangular casemate wall; the foundation pit of the interior decorative wall was excavated destroying the cultural layer\textsuperscript{33} which had not been researched yet. In the western casemate wall in the depth of the masonry remaining original console vents were dismantled, original masonry area covered in paint, the genuine ground-floor doorway was destroyed, the remains of the lower part of the vault were disassembled inside the building\textsuperscript{34}. When fitting the roof structure of the building, the ends of the rafters were cut into the original masonry of the southwest tower\textsuperscript{35}. Transformation of the building to the museum required its negative adjustments: all premises of western casemate wall were joined in the transverse walls by cutting door openings for convenience of the visitors. Such a decision broke the structure of the building plan based on the original authentic information, because the research indicated that the premises were not connected to each other, they were accessible only from the outside\textsuperscript{36}.

All these cases can be attributed to the notional category of construction via demolition\textsuperscript{37}. In this context the situation can be distinguished where authentic art heritage fragments form the 15th century surviving in the representational hall of the eastern shell of the residential palace, in the room of the third floor and the fifth floor of the donjon, were vanishing left abandoned without funding for their handling for many years. This example is attributable to the other category – the destruction by doing nothing\textsuperscript{38}. However, the result of both the heritage destruction/deterioration ways is the same – loss of the authentic material.

Documentation Problem of Heritage Conservation Works. The heritage conservation faces the destroy – leave dilemma at the same time addressing the issues how to hand down all decoded information inherent in the building for future generations and how to show the changes resulting by heritage conservation. The Union of German Historical and

\textbf{Fig. 13. The photograph of Zabielos Palace in 1917}
Archaeological Societies was one of the first to offer the decision in 1899; it formulated heritage provisions where in addition to the definition of preservation and restoration methods indicated that all works done in the object had to be registered. It is necessary to emphasize that the importance documentation of the performed work was perceived not only on the theoretical but also practical level and was applied in Lithuania that was aside the European heritage conservation processes at the time. Restoration works of St. Anne’s Church (Lithuanian: v. Onos bažnyčia) which took place in the first decade of the 20th century (project authors – restorers Józef Pius Dziekoński and Sławomir Odrzywolski) was quite thoroughly detailed in the reports published in 1904 and in 1910. An archaeologist Vandalinas Šukevičius who at his own expenses implemented the project of preservation and fragmentary restoration of Trakai Island Castle south-eastern tower in 1905 also developed a fairly detailed report on the carried out work. Thus, in the first decade of the 20th century in Lithuania the perception was unfolded that it is necessary to provide accurate information on the changes of the architectural heritage object, and it shows that the old architecture was seen as significant historical resource for contemporaries and future generations. However, the beginnings of heritage documentation, having reached Lithuania from Poland, were not destined to flourish.

The fact should be noted that during the Soviet period, which was the most active in heritage conservation of Lithuanian masonry architecture, apparently too little attention was paid to the documentation of the performed work. An examination of 380 pieces of the most important cases related to the building reconstruction, restoration and preservation processes during the Soviet period stored in the archives, revealed the poor situation of documentation of the work carried out.

Only a small part of performed reconstruction and restoration works are described in scientific reports. Although the documentation describing the validity of performed works and the process had to be developed officially, but in reality this usually extremely important work was not given neither time nor money. There are only a few exceptional cases, when the implemented heritage conservation works were examined in the reports. The fullest and clearest architectural research and restoration, reconstruction works without omitting and validity problems were revealed by D. Zareckienė in the documents drafted by S. Mikulionis. It is important to note that exclusiveness of D. Zareckienė’s scientific reports was determined by the fact that the architect had appointed several years for scientific activity, and was able to structure the works done. Possibilities of documentation of Trakai Island Castle reconstruction works were completely different. S. Mikulionis wrote most of the reports on its own initiative, as well as systematized works done by other restorers. These scientific documents reveal a wide range of the Soviet period heritage conservation field. They, in relation to other objects and reports on project material, quite well reveal the scope of work performed in Trakai Island Castle, fierce validity problems of reconstituted fragments are indicated, however, it also should be stated that the author did not manage to describe all of the important process and the reconstruction issues of the elements, therefore, considerable uncertainties remain when exploring the carried out work. On the other hand, speeches of architectural heritage conservation specialists captured in the reports of Trakai Island Castle reconstruction works disclose the prevailing trends of heritage conservation perception and evaluation. Also, it is necessary to emphasize that S. Mikulionis did not avoid for the Soviet period alien sharp observations on architectural heritage conservation and management issues.

Meanwhile, most of the other authors were focused not on consistent characterization of architectural studies and heritage conservation processes, but on chronological description of the performed works, often without specifying the basis for the restoration of architectural details or the whole composition. There is a number of non-informative examples. Majority of the restoration reports of the Vilnius University buildings belong to them as well. Quality of scientific reports, in addition to that lack of time and lack of funding, was influenced by a great variety of factors. Very often the documents summarizing all the work were written after several
years, and in the case of Trakai Island Castle even a dozen years; the architects-restorers used to work with multiple objects alongside, due to abundance of work the descriptive work processes were beginning to sink into oblivion.

So a rare object undergone heritage conservation works has a pretty clear description of the performed actions and, that is more, their validity. The underlying data on the form of restored details and composition is also rarely included into the project material. Some works in the object were not included into reports, but even more, the architectural research data was left unsummarized and not concluded into separate cases, in such cases, it is difficult to find a starting point to determine the reasonableness of the restored architecture. One of such examples is Biržai Castle: scientific documents in support of its restoration are incomplete, data of architectural studies are not generalized, in remaining historical research and design material construction (reconstruction) of such an important architectural element as the arcade of the first floor of the main facade is unexplained and unjustified. A similar situation is with Kaunas Town Hall Square buildings No. 2, 3, Raudonė Castle and some other objects where there is no restoration process data.

So, complicated situation arose in Lithuania. Most of the masonry architectural heritage undergone reconstruction and restoration works, but even at the end of the 19th century, one the most important part of the process of heritage conservation – progress documentation, was emphasised but was not implemented, so future generations have lost the opportunity to learn about restoration validity of some objects. It means that when carrying on even the special investigations it is difficult to determine which restored parts of the building repeat previous form and composition, and which are interpretations of the second half of the 20th century. Therefore, objective information that lies in the buildings and symbolic projection of the re-established period become equivalent. This situation undermines the status of architecture as a unique history chronicler.

Reasons which led to dominance of significance of the symbolic architecture heritage. In order to understand better why old architectural re-creation or creation often being at odds with the scientific evidence became so important to the Lithuanians, it is useful to look at the Lithuanian heritage conservation from different historical perspectives. First of all, it should be examined how heritage was conceived in the course of the 20th century in Lithuania and what the change of this phenomenon was. During the interwar period a strange situation occurred: the regimen of President Antanas Smetona praised the time of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, surviving tangible legacy of that period was not included to promotional spread. As it was noted by historian Rasa Čepaitienė the regimen did not embraced heritage of Gothic cultural. At first glance such behaviour may seem strange, authentic remains witnessing the former greatness were left behind, while a boom of construction of monuments for Lithuanian Grand Duke Vytautas rushed throughout Lithuania in 1930. The statement of Jūratė Markevičienė can help to answer why this happened: Lithuanian history, its long lasting occupations especially encouraging the word separated from the legacy in reality nurtured a symbolic vision of the past. A specific preserved thing of the past is not so much important for this way of thinking, while memory of it is because memories cannot be taken away and destroyed. When developing further the author’s idea, it is obvious that the oppression of the Tsarist Russian Empire, ban of the Lithuanian alphabet spelling, brutal suppression of rebellions forced the Lithuanians to appreciate not labile material objects of the past, but focus on their inner world. It is very difficult “exit” such a state; it requires not only a positive socio-cultural political change, but also a considerable period of time to absorb the changes. Difficult political situation continued between the wars: fighting against the Bolsheviks, Vilnius region occupied by the Poles, the threat of Nazi Germany, the USSR pressure created quite a favourable environment for further unfolding of symbolic thinking and vision. Such a situation implied excessive prominence of national heroes, myths, folk festivals, pushing the people, authentic history and the physical signs aside, especially as the situation was conducive to the strengthening of the authoritarian regime. In
In this way indifferent attitude of the government and large part of the nation to tangible cultural heritage occurred. All things related to the native word and peasant worldview became the most important heritage objects for the Lithuanians, so the cultural heritage lacking such features was not included in the list of cherished values.

During the Soviet period, the situation of the cultural heritage conservation and management was very difficult. Although the official conservation of historical heritage made an impression of conservation, however, understanding that the cultural heritage was the opportunity for the nation to recover, to convey the traditions and remain itself, it (the cultural heritage) was saved superficially, and often wrapped into ideology and biasedly formatted values, and even destroyed. The sacred buildings were behaved with especially disrespectfully; for decades they stood deserted, were looted, often adapted for other uses. A lot of attention was paid for preservation of the secular buildings, but the reconstruction / restoration concept and its implementation often implied ignorance and destruction of authentic information. At that time the authenticity was identified with the primary form of the object.

When looking for answers to the question why it was so behaved, the Soviet socio-cultural context is needed to be looked at. Soviet ideology strands enlacing all the public and private spheres of life, were not able to permeate the consciousness and the subconscious of many people. When the nation faced the ominous threat of extinction, the Lithuanian symbolic worldview further remained a factor that ensured the survival. The romantic attitude formed and publicly promoted during the interwar period extremely idealizing the oldest Lithuanian historical times was removed from the official discourse, however, was established in people's personal surroundings as the factor promoting possibility of the survival. Inner layers of the worldview were broaden by the works written during the interwar period which were strictly prohibited, but time to time getting through the gaps of the censorship, and “Lietuvos istorija” compiled by Adolfas Šapoka in 1936 was especially popular. Thus, historical periods of the greatness and power of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania further remained the main reference points that helped not to lose the national consciousness. It is quite natural that under such conditions the oldest / primary state of the building dating back to the flourishing of Lithuania was raised above the subsequent periods and resulted in incorrect treatment of the concept of authenticity.

Lack of objective knowledge and ideological pressure during the Soviet period enabled the idealization of the prosperity of Grand Duchy of Lithuania to become a peculiar form of passive resistance. It can be argued that such a perception of past encouraged some restorers to exhibit the older possible architectural layers, often to take up creation of the hypothetical forms and details. In the area of heritage conservation prevailing symbolic worldview the shape of desired to restore period became more important than the form, and even the authenticity of substance. Therefore, when restoring the buildings there was no even an attempt to save the architectural compositions and even the old authentic designs and materials from the later, painful historical periods, and at any price it was tried to restore / create a complete Gothic, Renaissance compositions that had to testify Lithuania’s glorious past. In the context of symbolic worldview, the historical building should not broadcast objective material, but subjective spiritual information which was not required to match exactly to the reality. In this case the authentic materials (in the broad sense) are important to the extent that the past can serve for creation of the image.

It should be noted that between Lithuania in the second half of the 20th century and France in the 19th century clear parallels of state of society and existed concepts of heritage can be observed. At the end of the 18th century – the first half of the 19th century France went through the period of dramatic changes, the global disruption. The nation tired of the destruction, especially the clerisy, desired to recover the identity disappearing in turmoil, and naturally turned to look at the architecture heritage open to all the social strata. According to John Earl’s opinion, restorers, adjusting the architecture of cathedrals and castles, created a new improved cityscape,
new links between the buildings and environment, the new artistic compositions. This embellishment of the past, creation of idealized images had to fill the void scorched by the revolution in order to help people to recover self-esteem. One hundred and fifty years later an adequate public sentimental situation occurred in Lithuania encouraging the heritage conservation professionals to behave similarly, as their French counterparts did in the 19th century.

Thus, symbolic-selective vision of the past, where the buildings were not thought to be an integral whole of all periods of existence, affected re-engineering of architectural valuables. Especially this factor resulted in the most widespread trend to restore the oldest style. Therefore, once simple compositional details were created or copied and presented as authentic ones.

It is also important that there were just the first serious reconstruction and restoration steps during the Soviet period in Lithuania. Without experience it was not possible to learn from own mistakes. The outcomes of European heritage management results could help a little in this case, as due to the Soviet Union’s strict limitation of any kind of information from democratic states, the knowledge available was very little. This striking lag of Lithuania behind Western European countries in the field of architectural heritage conservation led to a paradoxical situation. Throughout the 19th century in France, Italy, Germany, and even in England, where the idea of conservation was persistent, on the basis of the romantic attitudes many architectural heritage objects were restored, rebuilt, embelished. Therefore, in the second half of the 20th century international heritage conservation documents were accepted and scientific theory of heritage conservation was directed to countries where a large part of their historic buildings had been restored already. However, these documents gave little attention to countries where the heritage conservation in the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century due to political, economic or other reasons was not able to unfold. Therefore, it may be assumed that the restorers of Lithuanian architecture could not always rely solely on the scientific theory of heritage conservation, which had been designed for countries which already had a significant amount of reconstructed and restored objects. But such deviations from the contemporary global trends had to be not permanent, but exclusive, reasonably motivated phenomena. On the other hand in the 19th century in Europe the objects reconstructed and restored under the influence of Romanticism to this day can be still recognized as one of the most important architectural monuments, treating the attachments of Romantic period to be as an integral part of the whole. Here the assumption cannot be excluded that the live examples of restoration and their solid status in the middle of the 20th century could make a significant impact on the emerging Lithuanian heritage conservation.

Going deeper into the situation of Lithuanian heritage conservation in the context of the second half of the 20th century, it should be noted that in our case the examples of affected by the Second World War in Europe and reconstructed objects did not suit. Majority of countries started to inventory architectural heritage objects already in the 19th century, so having decided to rebuild destroyed buildings valuable scientific information was often available.

In regard to the above indicated factors, it can be assumed that, even if they were able to take advantage of other countries experiences, in some cases Lithuanian restorers would have been looking for solutions diverging from the international heritage conservation principles, as such objects like Trakai, Biržai castles which evoke national identity and romantic feelings determined original decisions. Furthermore, Lithuania is not rich with residential masonry architectural heritage, as other Western European countries, and therefore these buildings, exclusive objects of Lithuanian architectural history, are rather romanticized.

Another factor leading to inadequate treatment of cultural heritage and heritage conservation was the dominance of the architects when making decisions related to the heritage conservation. Attitude of Western European architects to heritage conservation was important till the beginning of the 20th century. After the adoption of the Athens Charter,
the situation began to change; representatives of natural and human sciences became involved to this area gradually. But in Lithuania during the Soviet period extreme lack of humanitarians was noticeable in decision making in architectural heritage protection and conservation, and as it was already mentioned, the architects-restorers had the greatest impact. The fact should be indicated that the qualifications of those specialists were not sufficient. Often architects employed in the field of heritage conservation were architectural engineering graduates and were not familiar with the essential elements of heritage, did not have enough knowledge of the history of architecture, in addition to this, the latter science was still very young. As for the architect-restorer competence, it is useful to look at the situation in Western Europe. The architects who undertook the restoration work in the 19th century under the influence of historicism direction flourishing at that time, were acquainted well with singularities of historical styles and applied own knowledge in the managed objects. Later in the 20th century considerable amount of experience of heritage conservation was already accumulated in Western European countries and the representatives in this field had the conditions to benefit from it, as well as there was the possibility to train in architects-restorers / conservatives offices. However, special architect-conservative studies were started only in the second half of the 20th century. First, bachelors in heritage conservation were started to be educated in Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden. During the seventh-eighth decades of the 20th century Master studies were started in other countries. It is clear that special education of architects in the field of heritage conservation was already accumulated in Western European countries and the representatives in this field had the conditions to benefit from it, as well as there was the possibility to train in architects-restorers / conservatives offices. However, special architect-conservative studies were started only in the second half of the 20th century. First, bachelors in heritage conservation were started to be educated in Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden. During the seventh-eighth decades of the 20th century Master studies were started in other countries. It is clear that special education of architects in the field of heritage conservation in Western Europe was concerned about late, but it should be remembered that the accumulated and in the literature summarized experience helped to ensure competence of specialists, and restorers offices were vividly conveying specific knowledge required for this profession. It is important to emphasize that in Lithuania an exceptional situation in architectural heritage conservation field stemmed not only due to lack of experience and lack of specific studies, but also due to the specific graduate recruitment system. In democratic countries the architect-conservator specialty requiring an exceptional interest in historical architecture, ancient technologies, historical – cultural context, was selected on a voluntary basis, while in Soviet Lithuania becoming a restorer was not always voluntary, because the fate of the architects who completed their studies often was decided upon by the high school board that distributed the workplaces. Therefore, it is natural that the desire of most of the architects who got into the area of heritage conservation to create overshadowed respect for the authentic material, hindered to assess conservation more than the restoration. Thus, many people who become restorers were the creators in their nature, and the creative work and heritage conservation, in principle, were diametrically opposed spheres. Architect’s aspiration was to leave own mark in the cultural environment, while the restorer had to remain the invisible trimmer of the former shape. In turn, the symbolic treatment of architectural heritage consisted of an environment conducive to the creativity unfold.

Taking into account all the listed factors, it can be said that some restorers were encouraged to re-create the architectural heritage by symbolic thinking, a distinctive way for resistance to the Soviet authorities, while others by active creative principle preventing a good understanding of the values lying in the heritage object.

In parallel, the paradoxical fact should be indicated that during the Soviet period there were favourable conditions emerging to move the symbolic vision, spread during the inter-war period, to the dimension of cultural heritage protection. It was started to consider the old architecture as a certain symbol of the past. The formal narratives of A. Smetona’s regime and the narratives of Soviet encountered here. Although the myths created during these historical periods covered different domains, but the principle remained the same – to create the past. Thus, the work started in the interwar period was continued, only the means of expression were replaced. A. Smetona’s regimen did not pay a lot of attention to Gothic as the style, whiles during the Soviet period the restorers turned exactly into
one of the earliest epochs of Lithuanian masonry architecture. It is necessary to emphasize the positive side of a symbolic vision. Namely inspired by it, the heritage conservation professionals consistently and thoroughly searched for the authentic deposits of old architecture and provided a valuable insights for the science of Lithuanian architectural history, brought back Gothic and Renaissance architecture into our urban landscapes. Reconstructed and restored buildings in old towns created a space for spread of identity, education, artistic – technical and economic values. In the second half of the 20th century when a majority of the nation moved from the countryside to the cities, renewed heritage objects showed and now continue reflecting the centuries-old tradition of Lithuanian cities. Hence, the field of Lithuanian identity expanded gradually also, in addition to the language, songs, and other ethnic culture heritage masonry architecture started rooting as well. So the symbolic vision of the past cannot be evaluated explicitly. Namely due to harsh conditions of existence, the nation maintains the core values ensuring its survival as a nation. In Soviet times, the architecture included in the field of those values could not escape from the actions determined by this symbolic worldview, but this worldview resulted not only in the destruction of later architectural layers, but also the disclosure and retention of the oldest layers.

At the end it is important to emphasize that in order to know your past objectively, it is very important to find out to what extent the architecture representing it is genuine. This will help us not only to distinguish between authentic and designed parts put into the restored compositions on an equal rights, will help to understand better the evolution of architecture and, thus, will allow to perceive the Soviet socio-cultural phenomenon. On the other hand, it is important to note that in the 21st century the twenty years after the Restoration of independence, Lithuanian distinctive symbolic state of mind is still vital, and today it is often not understood that the information, which does not have any matching symbolic inventions, representing own period lies in authentic historic structures, material, fragments. The authentic old architecture itself contains a lot of material and non-material information. It needs only learning to read it.

**IN LIEU OF CONCLUSIONS**

During the complicated periods of nation extinction threat, people were turning to the time of prosperity inducing the hope of survival. When understanding the lability of the material environment it was focused on the inner world which was gradually filled with the symbols guaranteeing the preservation of the identity. So, gradually not labile material objects of the past became important for the shaped symbolic worldview but the memory of them did. Naturally, the symbolic Lithuanian worldview determined by threatening political, socio-cultural conditions had a significant impact on the masonry architecture heritage conservation in Lithuania. Namely the old masonry architecture was the most visible part of the past. Therefore, when restoring the buildings it was tried to restore the older period of Lithuanian history representing the glorious past. Lack of reliable authentic data usually did not stop the restoring process, and the missing parts were created. Such a selective vision of the past gave the significance to the form as the relevant field for expression of symbols while not giving the high significance to authenticity. Even though having lost a large part of the authentic layers the architectural heritage became an important factor in the process of the nation survival.

**Notes**


31 Ibid, p. 43–44.
37 It is an active heritage destruction activity when during works of heritage conservation in the object, authentic material is specially and unadvisedly disrupted, most often as the factor, complicating the process of heritage conservation.
38 It is a passive heritage destruction activity when usually specially deserted object collapses itself.
ARCHITEKTŪROS PAVELDOTVARKOS IR SIMBOLINĖS PASAULĖJATOS SĄVEIKAI: PRIEŽASTYS IR PASEKMĖS

**Reikšminiai žodžiai:** architektūros paveldas, paveldo konservavimas, rekonstrukcija, restauravimas, paveldo naikinimas, paveldo dokumentavimas, simbolinė pasaulėjauta

**Santrauka**