

氏名	おおば とう		
授与学位	博士(工学)		
学位授与年月日	平成27年3月25日		
学位授与の根拠法規	学位規則第4条第1項		
研究科, 専攻の名称	東北大学大学院工学研究科(博士課程) 都市・建築学専攻		
学位論文題目	A Historical Aspect of the Restoration Measure, Distinctions of Original and New Architectural Materials: A Case Study and Spreads in Italy and in the World		
指導教員	東北大学准教授 飛ヶ谷潤一郎		
論文審査委員	主査	東北大学教授 飛ヶ谷潤一郎	東北大学教授 石田壽一
		東北大学教授 五十嵐太郎	

## 論文内容要旨

The distinction of original and new architectural materials is the restoration method especially applied for reassembling archaeological monuments. These members are distinguishable, for examples, by means of using different types of architectural members or of sculpturing the newly inserted parts plane unlike the original ones with detailed ornaments. According to the Venice Charter—the international guidelines on the restorations of monuments and sites—, it regards the former material as a respectable element to achieve the intervention goal<sup>1</sup>. The genuine also has an important role; it is one of information sources to evaluate the authenticity of UNESCO World Cultural Heritage sites. These roles testify values of original materials in Europe where many historical buildings contain durable materials such as stone and bricks. In order to comprehend their importance historically, this dissertation deals with following steps until the restoration measure became the global method.

The first step discusses the restoration theory of a Roman architect, Giuseppe Valadier (1762-1839). Making old and new architectural materials different, he directed interventions of ancient monuments in Rome in the first half of nineteenth century. Why did Valadier execute the restoration measure? To solve the question, it exemplifies the intervention of the Arch of Titus with his publications and archival sources housed in the State Archive in Rome.

As a result, it clarifies “intermediate sculpturing”—his intention to new architectural materials. Valadier did not make precise copies: he had an idea to conserve the remaining structure having historical and aesthetic values through relieves recordings, for instance, the victory in the war in Jerusalem and detailed ornaments; therefore, decorations are essential components to triumphal arches. However, he rather sculpted new members simple for tracing his restoration work. In his opinion, visitors may misunderstand the historicity of the Roman arch if the new members had precise sculptures as if they were the genuine, so that the distinctions had a task to imply which parts are the original or not.

Valadier attempted to integrate old and new architectural materials: the decision-making may be due to the restoration of the

<sup>1</sup> ICOMOS. (No Date). International charter for the conservation and restoration of monuments and site (The Venice charter 1964). Retrieved from

eastern outer wall of the Colosseum. The amphitheater, reinforced by his colleges, Raffaele Stern (1734-1794), and other architects in the beginning of the nineteenth century, has a buttress and arches covered in bricks. As to this intervention, Valadier commented it “unpleasant to eyes<sup>2</sup>”; thus, he construed the buttress in the western outer wall as similar as the ancient structure. This idea also had been applied to the Arch of Titus: new architectural members harmonized with the rest of the parts in a single monument.

The intermediate sculpturing must be the solution for Valadier to materialize his intentions—respecting original materials, tracing the restoration, and having the architectural proportion. For this reason, he has differentiated old and new architectural materials in the interventions of ancient Roman monuments.

The second step, the spread of the restoration measure, targets the restoration theory of Camillo Boito (1836-1914) proposed 6 articles regarding of the architectural interventions in the fourth congress of Italian engineers and architects in Rome in 1883. Today, both his work and an additional article, the Article 7, presented by other participants are known as the first restoration charter in Italy<sup>3</sup>. The dissertation explores the context of his thought not only from verbal minutes of the first, second, third, and fourth congresses, but also from his publications.

It was essential to establish the restoration guidelines in the national level after the foundation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. The proceeding of third congress notes that a participant, Gennaro Gaudiosi (?-?), stated the legal necessity for architectural conservation. Besides, Boito asked the congress as the government will have issued the law<sup>4</sup>.

Why did Boito suggest the restoration measure in the fourth congress? According to the introduction of his proposals, he regarded monuments as historical records, so that it was mandatory to conserve them. In fact, he brought the idea from his colleague, Giuseppe Mongeri (1812-1888)<sup>5</sup>. In spite of the general concept of architectural monuments, Boito had an idea to restore them based on their building types: the ancient, the medieval, and the Renaissance<sup>6</sup>. In reference to its first category, each architectural material has “an intrinsic importance<sup>7</sup>” making them valuable; therefore, they must be preserved. For proving their worth, he suggested the distinctions of architectural materials in different eras, exemplifying past interventions such as outer walls of the Colosseum and triumphal arches executed in the first half of nineteenth centuries. These examples prove that Boito brought the idea from past activities in Italy.

The focus in the third step is the global spread through the influence of Gustavo Giovannoni (1873-1947) in the international experts conference for the protection and the conservation of artistic and historical monuments. Held in Athens in October 1931,

[http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice\\_e.pdf](http://www.international.icomos.org/charters/venice_e.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Valadier, Giuseppe. (1833). *Opere di architettura e di ornament* (p.15). Rome, Italy: Unknown Publisher.

<sup>3</sup> Ceschi, Carlo. (1970). *Teoria e storia del restauro* (p.109). Rome, Italy: Mario Bulzoni editore.

<sup>4</sup> Unknown Author. (1880). *Atti del terzo congresso degli ingegneri ed architetti italiani radunato in Napoli nel settembre del 1879* (p.134). Naples, Italy: R. Stabilimento tipografico del cav. Francesco Giannini.

<sup>5</sup> Stolfi, Giuseppe. (1992). Boito, gli altri e il moderno pensiero sul restauro. In Bozzoni, Corrado, Carbonara, Giovanni and Villetti, Gabriella (ed.). *Saggi in onore di Renato Bonelli* (vol.2, pp.937). Rome, Italy: Multigrafica.

<sup>6</sup> Boito, Camillo. (1872). *Rassegna artistica. Venezia ne' suoi vecchi edifici*. Direzione della Nuova Antologia (ed.). *Nuova Antologia di scienze, lettere ed arti* (vol.20, p.925). Rome, Italy: Direzione della Nuova Antologia.

<sup>7</sup> Boito, Camillo. (1893). *Questioni pratiche di belle arti: Restauri, concorsi, legislazione, professione, insegnamento* (pp.15-16). Milan, Italy: Ulrico Hoepli.

so-called the Athens Conference was organized by the International Museum Offices, one of Institute on the League of Nations, with approximately 120 attendances from Europe and the United States. Why did Giovannoni contribute to diffuse the restoration measure abroad? To understand his work, it used a new source, the verbal minutes of the meeting.

On October 25, participants visited the Athenian Acropolis where excavations and restorations were taken place: Nicolas Balanos—the director of the Acropolis activities—provided an opportunity for the conference to present and to discuss about the on-going works. One of them was the restoration of the northern colonnade of the Parthenon bombarded in 1687. While the Greek engineer decided reassembling fallen original marbles (anastylosis) on the site, it required to prepare new architectural materials. A well-known fact was that the mission of Thomas Bruce (1766-1841), the Lord Elgin, took away a large number of marbles including a drum and a Doric capital of the northern colonnade<sup>8</sup> to the United Kingdom.

The proceeding of the Athens Conference records that Balanos explained on substitutive members to participants. Although he initially attempted to use Pentelic marble—the same materials of the genuine, he abandoned it due to some problems<sup>9</sup>. For this reason, the Greek engineer chose limestone of Piraeus covered with iron beams. On the surface he put cement colored as equal as the ancient materials<sup>10</sup>. As to the substitution, the official document records many disagreements from participants: some of them had anxiety on physical alterations of both iron and cement that would have been damaged to the ancient monument. Among them Giovannoni suggested to insert another stone materials instead of cement, so that it would have been easy to distinguish original and new architectural members. The conference adopted these opinions, and they became elements to be a part of the general conclusion of the Athens Conference. In reference to the ruined monuments, it notes, “steps should be taken to reinstate any original fragments that may be recovered (anastylosis) . . . the new materials used for this purpose should in all cases be recognisable<sup>11</sup>.” This sentence shows that the restoration measure was the proposal from Giovannoni, and this fact demonstrates the Italian influence to the restoration guidelines for archaeological monuments internationally.

This dissertation concludes with a destructive aspect of the authenticity concept evaluated original architectural materials historically. In the case of the Arch of Titus, it used to belong to the convent of the Frances of Rome (Santa Francesca Romana) contributed to sustain the arch structure laterally. However, the French Empire broke it with other buildings in the 1810's for returning the ancient view in the Roman Forum. The historical fact tells that the project resulted to victimize the post-ancient constructions. How can we record these disappeared buildings that has supported cultural heritage once? This documentation must be the new role to evaluate the historicity of each heritage.

<sup>8</sup> The Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities. (1908). *A guide to the sculpture of the Parthenon in the British Museum*. (p.133) London: Unknown Publisher.

<sup>9</sup> L'Office International des Musées. (1931f). *Proces – Verbaux*. In *Conference internationale d'experts pour la protection et la conservation des monuments d'art et d'histoire*. (OIM.4.1931, p.134).

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> L'Office International des Musées. (No Date). *La conservation des monuments d'art et d'histoire*, Les dossiers de l'Office International des Musées (p.20). Paris: L'Office International des Musées.

# 論文審査結果の要旨

本研究は、ユネスコの世界文化遺産を評価する上で重要な指針となるオーセンティシティー（真実性）に関する情報資料を用いて、建物の材料を尊重する考えの変遷を明らかにしたものである。著者がアテネ会議の会議録（公文書）を発見したことにより、既往の研究では扱われなかった同会議に参加した建築家や技術者による建築保存・修復に関する議論の過程が明らかにされ、あわせて考古モニュメントの修復工法・新旧の建材の識別が国際的に支持されるようになった以下の三つの過程が実証的に示された。

序論では、本研究の背景や目的、既往研究の紹介、全体構成等について説明されている。

第1章と第2章では第一の過程として、古代ローマのモニュメントの修復工法が、ティトゥス帝の凱旋門の修復やコロッセオの外壁の補強事業を通じて、イタリアでは早くも19世紀前半から実施されたものの、当初材もしくは当初の構造の保存を重視する現代の修復理論に付随する負の面、すなわち後補の建物の破壊を伴っていた点が指摘されている。

第3章では、これらの作業を指揮した建築家ジュゼッペ・ヴァラディエーの修復理論に着目して、建物の新材を当初材と調和させる一方で、異なる建材の使用や彫刻の簡略化によって両建材の違いも明示しながら、修復の痕跡を留めるように提案したことが指摘されている。そして、この工法がイタリアにおけるモニュメントの修復の根幹として、1883年に開催されたイタリア技師建築家会議の際に位置づけられてゆく過程が、第二の過程として詳細に示されている。

第4章では、建築家カミッロ・ボイトの提案による新旧の建材の識別がイタリアにおける最初の修復憲章に記載されることになった点、そして第三の過程として1931年にアテネで行われた国際会議（アテネ会議）の総合決議において同識別法を実施することが明文化された背景には、参加者のイタリア人建築家グスターヴォ・ジョヴァンノーニが貢献した点が明らかにされている。

最後に結論として、以上三つの過程を経てイタリアの修復思想が、国際的に反映されていったことが示され、古代ローマのティトゥス帝の凱旋門やコロッセオなどの事例に見られたように、古代（当初材）を優先することなく、破壊された後補の建物を記録することの重要性が提案されている。

本研究では建築保存・修復の歴史において、新旧の部材の扱いについてイタリアの方針が国際的に普及するにいたるほど重要な役割を果たした過程が実証的に示されていて、後のヴェネツィア憲章で指針となったオーセンティシティーとの関連性が明らかにされた意義は大きく、建築史学の分野に少なからぬ貢献をした。

よって、本論文は博士（工学）の学位論文として合格と認める。