Restoration in its broadest sense, is a Greek word that was destined for wide application beyond Greece. This term was initially limited to Orthodox circles, but much later it spread throughout the world of architectural conservation. In both cases the meaning assigned to the word correspondent to an attempt to put an end to heretical views and to oblige all to return to 'correct' beliefs, espoused by the majority. Since 843 A.D., which marks the end of a long controversy, αναστήλωσις has been connected with the triumph of restored Orthodoxy over Iconoclasm. This victory was an event of no less importance to Byzantine history than to Byzantine art, and is still celebrated by Orthodox churches as the αναστήλωσις των ειχόνων, the restoration of the icons.

In 1931, in 1957 and again in 1964, an internationally transliterated form of the same word - i.e. anastylosis (English and German), anastylose (French)- though deviated from its original spelling and etymology\(^1\), was chosen as an alternative to reconstruction, which was exorcised and condemned as pure heresy. At the same time, anastylosis enriched the vocabulary of architectural conservation. In most cases, however, there has been some dispute about the justification of its use.

Originally, the word was sanctioned as a term which had approximately its present meaning on Greek territory. It is likely that this occurred as a result of the strong impressions made on the members of an international conference by Nikolaos Balanos' work on the Acropolis. The conference dealt with architectural conservation and its basic principles. It was held in Athens in October 1931 and Balanos, a Greek engineer who had done extensive work on the restoration of the Acropolis monuments since 1895, participated in the conference. The meeting concluded with an important declaration, known since as the Charter of Athens. The term anastylosis appears within a parenthesis in Article 4, which refers to the treatment of ruins. Article 2 of the same document contains a!! indirect appeal to all countries represented at the meeting to abandon reconstruction. Therefore, no direct connection was made between reconstruction and anastylosis in the Charter.

\(^1\) The word αναστήλωσις does not exist in Greek. In modern Greek there exists only αναστήλωσις a noun deriving from the verb αναστήλω (αναστήλων in modern Greek). 'Αναστήλω is composed of the prefix ανά (up, Over) and the verb στήλω derived from στήλη - setle- (any upright piece of stone). Therefore, anastylosis (English, german), anastlose (French), and anastilosis (English, german), anastlose (French), and anastelosi (Italian) should be replaced with anastelosis, anastelose, and anastelosi respectively. Piero Sanpaolesi's claim (see his<<Discorso sulla metodologia del restauro dei monumenti>>. Florence, 1973. P. 210) that αναστήλωσις derives from στυλος, which he translates as “column”, is doubly wrong since there is no στυλος in Greek. There is only στύλος, which indeed means 'post, column', and this explains the existence of the γ in the present forms on the word's English, French and german transliterations. Since there is non γ in the Italian alphabet, there could only be anastilosi in the Italian language. Thus, reinstating the word's correct spelling and etymology would also endow it with a uniformity that does not exist at the present time: αναστήλωσις = anastelosis, anastelose, anastelosi.
THE CHARTER OF VENICE

Similarly, the two terms were considered separately in a text containing the conclusions of the first Congrès International des Architectes et Techniciens des Monuments Historiques held in Paris in 1957. It was seven years later in Venice that anastylosis was eventually given its present meaning. As formulated by the authors of the Charter of Venice (1964) in Article 15, the term anastylosis implies a certain treatment of a ruined monument that can "be permitted" under certain conditions. The same article states that reconstruction is to be "ruled out a priori".

Indeed, anastylosis and reconstruction appear together in precisely the same paragraph of Article 15, which deals entirely with archaeological excavations and the manner in which ruins should be cared for. Thus, in addition to what was agreed upon in Athens 33 years ago, a clear connection has been established between a ruined monument on one hand, and reconstruction or anastylosis on the other hand. The last two words were seen as two sides of the same coin and one of them, though extremely common, was sentenced to damnatio memoriae and, therefore, cast aside.

As defined in Article 15, anastylosis is nothing more than a reassembly of "existing" but "dismembered parts" which could be put together again provided that the material used for integration always be identifiable. Furthermore, "its use should be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and the reinstatement of its form".

Article 15 evokes a romantic picture of a ruined monument: some of its remains are still 'in situ' but there also exist some 'disiecta membra', none of which has been preserved in its original position. To reposition them, the restorer must first secure their integration, for all or most of them, the restorer must first secure their integration, for all or most of them are simply fragments. To do so, new cementing material must be used. This material however, must be identifiable so that experts as well as laymen can distinguish the original parts from the new ones.

To what extent and the manner in which this should be done are not specified. Obviously, this is left to the discretion of the person in charge. The decision largely depends on the specific monument, or rather the materials from which it was built, and its method of construction in addition to factors related to prevailing physical threats, new materials, technology and available skilled personnel. In any case, the goal should be to avoid the monument's falsification, a hazard to which Article 12 draws attention.

A careful examination of the last words of the final paragraph (... "its use should be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and the reinstatement of its form") leads to a new interpretation. In fact, the less new material is used in accordance with what is recommended in Article 15, the fewer and/or better preserved fragments will be finally re-used, for the new material mainly serves to secure the integration of existing fragments. To emphasize this point, Article 15 does not relate the recommended 'minimum' use of new material to an integrated
fragment, as the context might imply, but rather to the monument itself since neither conservation nor reinstatement of form regards solely fragments. Apparently, the aim is not merely to avoid producing one or more totally new 'membra' for the purpose of replacing other completely missing ones, but mainly to discourage the reerection of the monument itself.

It would suffice, therefore, to use the least possible number of integrated fragments, first to conserve the ruined monument and, second to make it more comprehensible. To serve the second purpose, the restorer is not expected to present the monument's form in a didactic way to an uninformed beholder. Doing just what is needed to help a visitor with an average education to visualize the space would be sufficient.

This, of course, does not exclude the re-use of all the existing authentic material if only a few and/or well preserved fragments have come down to us. Moreover, it does not imply that of them will be used in the event that numerous and/or minute fragments remain. It is generally recommended to use the least needed.

The restorer is expected to carefully and sensitively re-use a minimum number of fragments and/or of the best-preserved original material, and to combine them, following integration with new material, with the ruin still existing in situ. This synthesis will create with adequate precision a new image of the ruined monument which, although never before witnessed as such, will render the monument's volumes more comprehensible and effectively secure its conservation. In order to accomplish this, the restorer must possess the knowledge, precision and experience of a specialized professional and the imagination and sensitivity of an artist. Executed unskillfully, anastylosis would falsify the monument, prevent the beholder from understanding the ruin's historical phase–or be reduced to a mechanical process - a heresy akin to reconstruction.

In our opinion, it was precisely a wrong and old-fashioned interpretation of anastylosis that led to the reerection of certain monuments in Italy. This has justly been described by Carlo Ceschi as a "restauro archologico". Similar interpretation was given in Greece in relation to cases of restored classical structures to which we shall refer later in this paper. It must be acknowledged, however, that to a large extent these examples are prior to the Charter of Venice. It is curious that the last words of the final paragraph of Article 15 seem to have escaped due attention. These words are of crucial importance to any ruined monument subject to anastylosis at least as far as the principles established by the Charter's authors are concerned. The restorer is not permitted to make use of all existing fragments of the ruin unless he can prove in a convincing manner that this, along with new material needed for integration, is indeed the 'minimum' required to secure the monument's conservation and the reinstatement of its form. This implies that the Charter has already exercised some control over the archaeological approach' to anastylosis. To understand why those who deal professionally or academically with conservation in Greece -

---

including the author - have misunderstood Article 15 for so long, it must be noted that few Greeks paid serious attention to the Venice Charter. Interest in this document only grew when work was started on the Acropolis in early 1979. It is also worth observing that although the Charter was discussed in the literature as early as 1964, it has become widely known among Greek architects and archaeologists only since 1975.

Regarding reconstruction, none of its practitioners or supporters has ever claimed that they did not understand what was said against this practice in either the Charter of Athens or the Charter of Venice. Those responsible for restoration work executed in Europe prior to the drafting of the Charter of Athens were fully aware of the contents and the implications of this document.

After all, neither of the two Charters was meant to set international regulations concerning architectural conservation. Each country remained absolutely free to seek and follow a national policy for the care of its own heritage according to its "own culture and traditions", as the drafters of the Venice Charter have expressed it.

Thus, although widely condemned, reconstruction seems to have survived to some extent even after 1964, but to a much lesser extent than in its post-World War II heyday. It would be practically impossible to undertake the anastylosis of an average historic building in Europe, for building methods and materials do not lend themselves to a monument's anastylosis, since the restorer cannot reassemble the' existing but dismembered parts' of it.

Whatever one might wrongly conclude from the Greek word's etymology, anastylosis does not refer exclusively to colonnaded structures. Theoretically it can embrace any ruined monument that was originally erected with the use of regularly cut pieces of stone, granite or marble, connected to each other horizontally, vertically or otherwise with little or no mortar. Even after the monument's collapse or partial destruction, its materials pre-serve their autonomy and can constitute' existing but dismembered parts' - disiecta membra. They can be integrated and repositioned, provided that each 'membrum' has been identified with a certain part of the original building (A Greek temple provides a relevant example).

ANASTYLOSIS AND ANASTELOSEIS IN GREECE

It was Greece that provided the history of architectural conservation with some of the best known examples of harmonious anastyloseis - especially Balanos' work on the Acropolis monuments, which ceased in 1939. It should be noted that Ross, Schaubert, and Hansen offered the first examples of anastylosis on the Acropolis in 1835-36, and it is likely that their initiative influenced Balanos' conduct more than half a century later. It must be admitted, therefore, that anastylosis was practiced in the most celebrated monuments of Greece long before it was

4 SANPAOLESI PIERO, op. cit., pp. 60-61; 212-216
established as a term in other countries. In fact, there still exists no appropriate term for anastylosis in Greece as since &v-a:a-tTIAWa~ (anastelosis) may imply several other degrees of intervention, for example, preservation, consolidation, re-storation, rehabilitation or even reconstruction. All these may involve anastylosis. Furthermore, there would seem to be a failure or at least a lack of interest in establishing a term for 'restoration' other than a:yaO"t1jAwal~, for 'restoration' is the only word without a precise Greek counterpart. Specific words indeed exist for preservation, consolidation or reconstruction. It would be out of the question to express anastylosis in Greek by means of a word other than ayaati)Awal~. Greek restorers ought to reduce the multitude of meanings they traditionally attribute to avactiiAwal;, confine the latter word's use only to what was accepted in Ven-ice as anastylosis, and find or invent another word for restoration. Recent attempts to introduce the word altoxa'Caa-w;al~ (apokatastasis) were opposed by the overwhelming power of tradition and only a national conference could possibly contribute to clarifying ideas and terms related to architectural conservation.