

“Complicated Heritage”: Problematic Character of Reconstruction of the Grand Duke’s Palace of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania

Alfredas Bumblauskas

The article analyses the problematic nature of reconstruction of the Grand Duke’s Palace, destroyed in 1801, which has become an object of discordant opinions and visions. The analysis focuses on reasons for tensions and motivations behind individual positions. Sources for tensions are found at several levels: heritage protection, axiological, practical, as well as historical consciousness. The article features a discussion on the dissonance between disapproval for heritage reconstruction declared in doctrine heritage protection texts and real reconstruction practice present in the world, i.e. between the ambition to pursue the principle of heritage uniqueness (non-reconstructability) and the need to solve problems of national identity. This particular case causes even more complications since reconstruction is situated in a historic place of Vilnius – a World Heritage object. In proposals for authentic remains of the Grand Duke’s Palace (cellars unearthed during archaeological dig), a conflict is seen between two groups representing different value systems – the traditional and the liberal one. The traditionalists, who nourish the national history discourse and consider the Duke’s Palace to be the symbol of statehood, have proposed to “augment” the building to the authentic remains and respectively put forward the purpose based on traditional museum conception. The liberals, who are against the idea of “reanimation” of the past, question the building’s significance to statehood and attack the very principle of “augmentation”. The article highlights practical problems that became apparent after a scientifically unmotivated political decision to reconstruct the Duke’s Palace was taken in 2001. These are as follows: insufficient scientific information necessary for reconstruction, lack of conceptual theoretical grounding for the reconstruction project, uncertainty of the idea of a “centre of historical culture” declared by the Lithuanian Government, aimed to become the underlying purpose conception. Furthermore, incongruity between a halfway architectural building project based on the idea of “image restoration” and proposed unidirectional traditionalist museum ideas for its purpose remains unsolved. The article reveals the existence of two contemporary historical consciousnesses of Lithuanians based respectively on concepts of traditional history and historical culture as well as two different views towards reconstruction and purpose. The predominance of the traditional historical consciousness resulted in elimination of historical culture line represented by the workgroup of the Faculty of History at Vilnius University. Proponents of the latter line sought to solve problems of reconstruction and purpose by searching for halfway decisions based on the contemporary theoretical thought.

Development Guidelines for the Concept of Reconstruction and Purpose of the Grand Duke's Palace (The Grand Duchy of Lithuania)

*Alfredas Bumblauskas, Rasa Čėpaitienė,
Justina Poškienė, Rūta Šermukšnytė, Romas Vaštokas*

The study conducted by the working group of the Faculty of History, Vilnius university, elaborated on *the Concepts of Reconstruction and Purpose of the Duke's Palace of the Great Duchy of Lithuania*, approved by the Government of the Republic of Lithuania (approved by resolution No 1235 on 17 10 2001). The laconic character of the concept and uniqueness of the situation (erection of a new building over authentic remains of the past) within Lithuanian cultural context causes problems for recreation and application of the Duke's Palace; these processes are accompanied by emerging discordant views. Taking into account the current state of recreation (insufficient amount of scientific data; reliance on the idea of "image recreation" and implicit principle of "hypotheses' grading" in the reconstruction project), while analyzing theoretical problems of implementation (lack of theoretical grounding being the major one), evaluating dominant visions of reconstruction and proper adjustment, as well as seeking for optimal compromise among them, the study proposes an original conception for tackling the problem. As a starting point for conceptual propositions and practical decisions modern theoretical thought is selected – ideas that have been nurtured by theories of historical culture, heritage protection, socio-cultural anthropology and museology. The idea of the centre of historical culture becomes the central pivot of the conception. Based on this idea, the Grand Duke's Palace is perceived as a monument for "living" past while recreation is conceived as a need to orient oneself in the present and future via interpretation of the past, as an exhibit of our own reconstructional consciousness. This idea makes it impossible to separate the reconstruction concept from the adjustment/application concept. Besides, it transforms the whole object into a single media node, i.e. a combination of informational means, every element of which holds informational charge about our historical consciousness. Reconstruction of the Berlin city palace is chosen as an analogue for the purpose of the Grand Duke's Palace. Application principles of the Berlin city palace's reconstruction were discussed by specialists in 2001. Based on these insights, analogies and searching for common affinities among different visions, the study formulates pilotage proposals for the purpose of the Grand Duke's palace that are grounded on separating coexisting functional models (thematic threads) and on the principle of "hypotheses' grading".

Zoning the Reliability of the Reconstruction of the Grand Duke's Palace (The Grand Duchy of Lithuania)

Alfredas Bumblauskas, Justina Poškienė, Rūta Šermukšnytė

This study, prepared by a workgroup of the Faculty of History, Vilnius University, is another document of a consistent and purposeful activity in the attempt to reconstruct the Grand Duke's Palace of the Great Duchy of Lithuania. The study empirically verifies and corrects the three zone principle (authenticity – hypothesis (reasonable – pilotage) – modernity). The principle had to tackle theoretical and practical problems related to the purpose of the future Grand Duke's Palace that arise due to lack of scientific information necessary for reconstruction, unequal degree of its reliability, confrontations among different visions related to the building's purpose. Another function of the principle was to consolidate the concept of reconstruction (based on the principle of "hypotheses' grading" found in architects' projects) and the concept of purpose into a solid conception. In order to assess the zoning of the building's reconstruction reliability, the study features both qualitative and quantitative analysis of the current state of archaeological, architectural, historical, as well as art criticism-related research. The qualitative analysis, which was performed after publicly published reports and publications had been assessed, shows what knowledge has been acquired, what the state of knowledge systematization and generalization is and to what extent reconstruction is based on objective knowledge. The quantitative analysis, carried out in the form of a questionnaire survey, evaluates the data available to specialists but not to the general public. Conclusions of the comparative analysis (cartogram of reconstruction reliability) of the latter research do not confirm that the three zone principle is implicitly present in reconstruction and purpose of the Grand Duke's Palace and thus forces to correct this principle accordingly. In addition to that, the obtained data reveal incongruity between architects' and researchers' data, which suggests excessive optimism on architects' side. In summarizing the results of research and the current reconstruction situation, the workgroup of Vilnius University proposes to be honest towards future visitors of the Grand Duke's Palace and, following theoretical principles of contemporary heritage protection, museology and history, to reveal how modern decisions have been made.

The study's appendices contain lists of the main documents, research reports in various fields, as well as bibliography related to the Grand Duke's Palace and its reconstruction.

Heritage Conservation and Interdisciplinary Context

Rasa Čepaitienė

The paper analyses problems of disciplinary definition of heritage protection. It searches for theoretical interfaces with other social-humanitarian sciences. Eloquent parallels are observed in them that allow to show similarities in the development of such disciplines as history, archeology, museology, heritage protection and the like. Much attention is paid to the analysis of changes in heritage protection conceptions within the socio-cultural context.

In addition, the paper discusses the question of professional historian's participation in the process of heritage protection. Three main theoretical-methodological perspectives of such historian's connection with the field are identified: 1) *historian-auxiliary worker*, who is useful in heritage research as gatherer of data on specific heritage valuables but stays poorly integrated in the heritage protection process; 2) *historian of ideas*, who analyses history of the heritage protection idea; 3) *historian-interpret*, who actively participates in the heritage protection process, seeks to influence or mould society's historical culture via interpretation of specific objects. Considering the latter – the newest – historian's function, the paper devotes much attention to the problem of heritage interpretations.

Authenticity of Cultural Heritage: Relativistic Perspective

Salvijus Kulevičius

The paper analyses one of the most problematic and relevant categories in contemporary heritage protection – authenticity. It seeks to establish a common denominator (model) for authenticity concepts, which could help define the place and meaning of category in the phenomenon of heritage protection. The establishment of the model is encumbered by the prevailing ethnocentric attitude towards the phenomenon – in many studies, due to the lack of relativistic and comparativistic approach, a subjective authenticity concept of one society is presented as universal and objective. It is namely the perception of relativity of authenticity concepts that helps to distance oneself from subjective interpretations of the phenomenon in question and to identify common denominators of the category.

The idea of compatibility should be considered the foundation of heritage authenticity category, that is, the comparison of the present (the object which is here and now) with the ideal state. Specific heritage protection programs differ in what is chosen as the basis for compatibility. It could be the past, an aesthetic cannon, traditional pattern of life, etc. Besides, relativistic perspective discloses eurocentric nature of international heritage protection principles. Regardless of the above stated generality of heritage protection principles, 21st century is still known for embracing heritage protections, which are incompatible with the European heritage protection, based on materialistic concept of authenticity. The most vivid examples could be the Japanese heritage protection, based on cognition (knowledge) authenticity, and heritage protection of North American countries, based on authenticity of significance. Besides, the analysis of authenticity concept in the course of time makes us reflect on the paradigmatic concept of heritage protection.

Relativism today is not merely a theoretical principle – starting with the 90-ies of last century attempts have taken to consolidate it as a factor of heritage protection practice. This principle manifests itself as recognition of variety of approaches towards heritage protection. Nevertheless, it raises new challenges to heritage protection, such as resolution of conflicts related to intersection of various approaches towards the same object.

**The Phenomenon of Cultural Heritage Reconstruction
and its Expression in Europe and Lithuania in the Period from the
Second Half of the 20th Century to the Beginning of the 21st Century**

Agnė Rymkevičiūtė

Reconstruction as a specific action of “preserving” heritage – more accurately, as an action of restoring its original state – is highly limited in contemporary heritage protection; it is only justified in exceptional cases. Restoration of historical monuments and sites has become especially important in the 20th century, after the two world wars had destructed a number of historical sites and separate objects.

The objective of this research is the phenomenon of cultural heritage restoration. The phenomenality of this process is revealed by the most prominent restoration examples of the second half of 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century that are, however, little known in Lithuania. Special attention should be paid to the restoration of objects and sites that were destructed during the Second World War.

It has often been the case (and still is) that practical restoration activities of cultural heritage objects and sites would be in conflict with the perception of restoration, traceable in heritage law and works by theoreticians. Consequently, the following question emerges – why are certain heritage objects and sites restored and how is it done? Why does their importance increase in some periods? Why and how did the attitude towards restoration of heritage objects change in heritage law and theory? One of the main uncertainties surrounding the analysis of these questions is the definition of concepts. The juridical term of restoration does not always equal the meaning of concepts used to describe the same phenomenon that are found in theory as well as practical matters (namely in Lithuania). The answer to these questions would help to understand the phenomenon of heritage objects’ restoration – why and how does it happen?

TEKSTŲ AUTORIAI

Alfredas Bumblauskas

Profesorius, daktaras
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel. (8~5) 268 72 88
El. paštas: alfredas.bumblauskas@if.vu.lt

Rasa Čepaitienė

Daktarė, mokslo darbuotoja
Lietuvos istorijos instituto XX a. istorijos
skyrius
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Kražių g. 5, LT-01108 Vilnius
Tel. (8~5) 275 97 23
El. paštas: rasac@mail.lt

Salvijus Kulevičius

Doktorantas
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel. 8 614 74 265
El. paštas: salvijus4@yahoo.com

Justina Poškienė

Daktarė
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel. (8~5) 268 72 53
El. paštas: justina.poskiene@if.vu.lt

Agnė Rymkevičiūtė

Magistrė
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel. 8 605 60 059
El. paštas: agne.rymkeviciute@mb.vu.lt

Rūta Šermukšnytė

Daktarė
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
Universiteto g. 7, LT-01513 Vilnius
Tel. 8 689 58 088
El. paštas: jurgsliau@takas.lt

Romas Vaštokas

Profesorius, daktaras
Trento (Kanada) universitetas
Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto Sociologijos
katedra
Vilniaus universiteto Istorijos teorijos ir
kultūros istorijos katedra
El. paštas: R.Vastokas@lrs.lt