

Jest to zasługą zręcznego nadania nowym elementom znamion jakby „naturalnej” dawności, starzenia się, nieregularności, swojskiego braku absolutnej symetrii i regularności oraz walorów tworu rzemieślniczego, wolnego od maszynowej i przemysłowej obróbki. Tak rozumiana „naturalność” była powszechnie akceptowana w połowie XX w. jako jednoznaczny wyraz materialnej autentyczności i dawności dzieł sztuki<sup>71</sup>. W sumie osiągnięto efekt, który był marzeniem Viollet-le-Duca: budowlę „odtworzono” w stanie, w jakim nigdy nie istniała.

Z drugiej jednak strony to odtworzenie w stanie „idealnym”, na pewno różnym od historycznej rzeczywistości gmachu, oparte było na podrabianiu, kopiowaniu, uzupełnianiu i zamienianiu. Już w 1893 r. Camillo Boito pisał, że tam, „gdzie chodzi o odbudowę fragmentów zniszczonych [...], i gdy przy tym istnieją całkowicie pewne wzorce, których przy odtwarzaniu tych elementów można się trzymać – wówczas zaleca się, aby części dodane lub odnowione, mimo że dokładnie odtwarzają kształty oryginalne, były wykonane z wyraźnie odmiennego materiału i miały wryty znak lub lepiej datę odbudowy”<sup>72</sup>. Od tego czasu elementarną zasadą konserwatorską była *transparentność* podejmowanych działań i ich efektów. Za etyczny obowiązek uznawano jasne uwidacznianie, co w toku renowacji zostało dodane. Estreicher postępował dokładnie odwrotnie, nie tylko świadomie zacierając różnice między autentycznymi fragmentami budowli a częściami nowymi i podrabiając naturalną dawność, ale na dodatek postępkę swe usprawiedliwiał cytowanym już kuriozalnym argumentem, że „nie jest zadaniem konserwatora ułatwianie rozpoznawania co jest stare, a co nowe w zabytku, bo to jest zadaniem inwentaryzatora”. Jego postawa była więc całkowicie nietransparentna, czego pozytywnie ocenić nie sposób<sup>73</sup>.

w przyp. 24); M. OMILANOWSKA, *Granice rekonstrukcji*, s. 387 (jak w przyp. 24).

<sup>71</sup> G. BANDMANN, *Przemiany w ocenie twórczości w teorii sztuki XIX w.*, tłum. F. Franckowiak, [w:] *Pojęcia, problemy, metody współczesnej nauki o sztuce*, red. J. Białostocki, Warszawa 1976, s. 77.

<sup>72</sup> C. BOITO, *Zagadnienia praktyczne sztuk pięknych*, tłum. H. Szymańska, [w:] *Zabytek i historia*, s. 202 (jak w przyp. 28).

<sup>73</sup> Problem „transparentności” postaw, działań i metod postępowania w okresie komunizmu, a w szczególności we wczesnym okresie powojennym i w czasach stalinowskich, to zagadnienie na osobną rozprawę, którą – być może – kiedyś uda mi się napisać. Ogólnie o pozytywnych konotacjach „przejrzystości” w nowoczesnej kulturze europejskiej: M. BIEŃCZYK, *Przezroczystość*, Kraków 2007, s. 65–78.

## SUMMARY

Wojciech Bałus

(The Jagiellonian University, Art History Institute)

‘A NEW EMBROIDERY ON A FRAIL TISSUE OF THE PAST’: KAROL ESTREICHER AND THE COLLEGIUM MAIUS OF THE JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY IN CRACOW

Collegium Maius is the Jagiellonian University’s oldest structure, built in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. From 1839 to 1870 it underwent a comprehensive restoration in neo-Gothic forms. After the Second World War another restoration was undertaken by Karol Estreicher. Not only did he remove all neo-Gothic details but also introduced a number of elements that had never existed in the building. Estreicher called his ‘restoration method’ – which was blatantly at odds with the principles developed by Max Dvořák and adopted by the League of Nations in the Charter of Athens in 1931 – the ‘resurrecting of the past’. It may be considered as a form of the ‘invention of tradition’, as described by Eric Hobsbawm. The oxymoronic character of this denomination fits very well Estreicher’s way of thinking about the renovation of Collegium Maius. The building was meant to represent the quintessence of ‘tradition’, but such that would be created as a result of a wide-ranging *intrusion* into its historic tissue. This intrusion, that is, the ‘resurrection’, was possible because the ‘tradition’ still had to be *invented*, that is, be established anew on the basis of elements from the past. What counted was not the authenticity of the building’s old walls or the reverence of its antiquity, but – as Estreicher had put it – to demonstrate the university’s past. Hobsbawm stated that the ‘invention’ of tradition often occurs ‘when a rapid transformation of society weakens or destroys the social patterns for which “old” traditions had been designed’. The seizing of power by communists in post-war Poland marked a watershed in the country’s social and political history. The restoration of the building would have been, consequently, an invention of tradition that was contrary to the official doctrine. In opposition to the regime’s obliteration of the former vision of Polish culture, it was supposed to show the richness of the Jagiellonian University’s history. The picturesque aspect of the structure, the use of details borrowed from Cracow’s historic architecture and, finally, the skilful fusion of Gothic and Baroque elements – so that the new whole would evoke a feeling of homeliness – were means to this end.

At the very time when Estreicher was transforming the Cracow Collegium, Gaston Bachelard wrote about home as a place that was man’s private universe and the realm of his dreams. Conversely, according to Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, at that time a ‘longing for tranquillity in a tight confined space’, called by the scholar a fragile ‘vessel’, was widespread. According to Bachelard, a true house – with rooms of different shapes, arranged on various levels so that one has to

climb up or descend in order to reach them, with creaking floors and light that only partly illuminates the gloom interiors; a house that grows like a tree, with its 'roots' in the cellar and a 'canopy' of leaves in the attic, that at the same time is a centre to which one returns in memories, desires and in real life – is one of the most important archetypes of human culture. And although Collegium Maius is a university building, and not an actual dwelling place, Estreicher's idea was undoubtedly to understand it as a kind of archetypal home. The picturesque forms of the building, its homely appearance in a mixture of the Gothic and the Baroque, irregular floor plan with rooms located on various levels, sometimes higher, sometimes lower, interiors illuminated with dim light coming in through openings of various sizes and shapes, with different kinds of flooring (parquet, stone or boards), and finally the furnishings – evoking both the serious aura of lectures and the solemnity of the university's festivities as well as the simple joys of life experienced by the community of the building's inhabitants – were to impart a feeling of something very intimate, but at the same time stirring up memories and dreams, and all that in 'anti-historical times'.

Should the restoration of Collegium Maius be considered a success? – On the one hand, yes, because the edifice still makes an impression of being 'authentic', not marred by signs of the conservator's intervention. The pastiches, forgeries and fakes were so tastefully designed and executed with such a measure of craftsmanship that they do not disturb the viewer with their newness or inconsistency with historic styles – features that are so often present in the post-war 'tragedy of the conservator's forgery' (as it was called by Jan Zachwatowicz). This effect was achieved by skilfully making the new elements look as if they were *naturally* old, as if they were aging, irregular, and had the homely features of being utterly unsymmetrical and irregular, exhibiting characteristics of a craftsman's work, free from traces of mechanical and industrial production. In the mid-twentieth century the thus understood 'naturalness' was generally accepted as an unmistakable token of material authenticity and antiquity of a work of art.

On the other hand, however, a reconstruction of the building in its 'ideal' state, undoubtedly diverging from historical reality, was based on forgery, counterfeiting, supplementing and replacing. Since the times of Camillo Boito the fundamental principle of conservation has been the *transparency* of the applied measures and their effects. It was considered an ethical obligation to clearly identify what was added in the course of the restoration. Estreicher, however, did exactly the opposite. Not only did he consciously obliterate differences between authentic fragments of the building and its new additions, forging its natural antiquity, but furthermore justified his actions using the ridiculous argument that, 'it is *not* the task of the conservator to *facilitate the identification* of what is old and what is new in a historic building; it is the very task of the recorder'. Thus, his attitude was utterly non-transparent, which cannot be assessed favourably.