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In the long line of students of Diocletian’s Palace, George Niemann (1841-1912) and Ernest Hébrard (1875-1933) merit particular attention, for with their publications they laid the foundation for scholarly research into its architectural forms within the context of the universal development of architecture and urbanism.

Soon after the foundation of the Diocletian Palace Commission in 1903, the Ministry of Education in Vienna gave the architect George Niemann the task of once again registering the Roman ruins in Split. During six years of work, in which he was aided by five assistants (three of them were his sons), he managed to prepare a folio-format monograph with 23 plates and 162 drawings in the text. In 1910, the work was printed at Alfred Holder, Vienna. Niemann died in 1912, with the renown of one of the most important figures in the discipline of archaeology in Austria. From 1873 he had lectured in perspective and the history of architectural styles at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, of which he was president from 1902 to 1905.

He became acquainted with Split the first time as early as 1873 on the way to Samothrace, where archaeological excavations had just been begun under the supervision of Alexander Conze, in which Niemann was joined by Otto Benndorf and Alois Hauser. All of them in their own way also took part in issues of conservation operations.
in Diocletian's Palace, particularly concerning the restoration of the imperial mausoleum and the bell tower. Niemann subsequently took part in Benndorf’s archaeological excavations in Olympia and in Caria and Lycia, in Asia Minor (1881-82) then with Count Karl Lanckoronski in Pamphilia and Pisidia (1884-85). In 1889-90, along with Benndorf he excavated the Tropaeum Trajani (Adamclissi) in Romania. In 1892, with Count Lanckoronski again, he studied the cathedral in Aquileia. From 1893 he was a permanent member of the great Austrian research expedition to Ephesus. Finally, immediately after the excavations in Split he took on the job of publishing the research campaigns of Teodor Wiegand in the Temple of Apollo at Didyma. He was interrupted by death when he had taken upon himself the job of excavating Xanthos.

At the time when Niemann was half way through his job in Split, Diocletian’s Palace started to be studied by the professor of ancient history Jacques Zeiller and architect, archaeologist, and, soon after, town planner Ernst Hébrard, at that time pensionnaire architecte de la Villa Médicis à Rome. Immediately after the publication of a book about the palace in Split (Paris: Massin 1912), Hébrard, together with the Norwegian-American sculptor and philanthropist Hendrik Christian Andersen produced a project for the World Centre of Communication, imagined as a utopian garden city, a peacemaking centre of an ideal state. The vast book Creation of a world centre of communication was published in English, Italian and French, going through six editions between 1913 and 1917. But Hébrard was to be much better known, particularly, for the town plan of the reconstruction of Salonika (after the great fire of 1917), where he also explored Galerius’ mausoleum, and for his plans of the urban reconstruction of Morocco (Casablanca). From 1921 he was the chief town planner of French Indochina (Hanoi, Saigon, Phnom Pen). In 1930 he presented the project for the building of a university in Salonika and from 1931 to his premature death he lived in Paris.

Hébrard’s monograph, published in 1912, with important contributions by Jacques Zeiller, the Byzantine scholar Charles Diehl and the Egyptologist Gustave Jéquier, is complementary to Niemann’s. In the latter the primary aim was to give architectural drawings that were as accurate and detailed as possible. Hébrard’s reconstruction of the Palace’s original appearance has remained very largely authoritative to this day. Great help was given to the Austrian and French researchers in the field by Split conservator and archaeologist Msgr Frane Bulić. The books published led to a number of well-informed reviews and new articles and are an essential basis for any serious consideration of the Palace even today.

For all of these reasons, marking the centenary of Niemann’s death and the publication of Hébrard’s book about Diocletian’s Palace, the Institute of Art History is organising an international symposium at which there will be discussion of not only the contributions of Niemann and Hébrard but also of the conservation and restoration operations and theoretical reflections of their time related to the Palace.
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Daniel Baric, Université François-Rabelais, Tours

Title
Ernest Hébrard’s Monograph on the Palace of Diocletian: Context, Genesis and Consequences of a Collective Work

Abstract
In the years before World War I, a whole series of publications appeared in France which tried to bring to the French audience the aesthetic beauties and spiritual situation of until then unknown Dalmatia, and quite extensively of its major city Split. Such travellers as Edouard Maury in his essay Aux Portes de L’Orient (Paris, 1896), Pierre Marge in his Voyage en Dalmatie, Bosnie-Herzégovine et Monténégro (Paris, 1912) celebrated the archaeological excavations in Split and Salona and thus paved the way to the scientifically more ambitious entreprise of Hébrard. His work could rely on the French academic structure which had produced specialists he could gather in order to publish this major synthesis. The Parisian monograph of 1912 on the Palace of Diocletian was deeply rooted in the French scholarship on Antiquity, which had various consequences in the shaping of the context in which the work was received. For Hébrard himself, as for every collaborator on the book, the time spent on gathering facts and elaborating hypotheses about the Palace seems to have left an enduring imprint on their further work, with various intensities. Ernest Hébrard, Jacques Zeiller, Charles Diehl and Gustave Jéquier went on developing visions and interpretations of the Palace, while they played different roles in various cities in Europe and overseas, proving thus the lasting importance of the work for themselves as well as for a broader audience.

Curriculum vitae
Born in Paris in 1972, Daniel Baric is Associate Professor at the François-Rabelais University in Tours (Institute for German Studies) since 2005. He studied History and German and Slavic philology at Ecole normale supérieure and Sorbonne (Paris), Hungarian in Budapest, Egyptian Studies (Institut Catholique, Paris) and Modern Greek studies. His PhD at the Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes in Paris dealt with the role of German language in Croatia in the 19th century. He is currently working on the history of archaeology in the Habsburg Monarchy.

Bibliography link
http://www.circe.paris-sorbonne.fr/index

Contact
daniel_baric@yahoo.com
Abstract
Since the late 19th century, modern scholarship has devoted considerable attention to the problem of original layout and function of Diocletian’s mausoleum at Split. Beside the very important monographs by Niemann, Hébrard & Zeiller centenary of which is currently being marked, the two French scholars also produced several less known and rarely mentioned works on the same topic, that also merit attention. Ernest Hébrard, for example, published an article concerning important issues that reflect upon the Late Antique imperial sepulchral architecture: »Les travaux du Service archéologique de l’armée d’Orient à l’arc de triomphe de Galère» et à l’église Saint-Georges de Salonique« (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, 1920). Jacques Zeiller, on the other hand, developed his reflections on Diocletian’s tomb and palace in several stages before and after his and Hébrard’s 1912 book, such as »Le palais de Diocletien à Spalato« (Comptes-rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1908) and »Sur l’origine de Spalato« (Mélanges Cagnat, Paris, 1912), finally »Sur la place du palais de Dioclétien à Spalato dans l’histoire de l’art« (Byzantion, 1931). At last, one should mention two other works co-authored by Hébrard and Zeiller, namely »À travers le palais de Dioclétien à Spalato« (Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire, 1911) and a booklet Le palais de Dioclétien a Spalato (Paris, 1911).
Briefly summarizing the contributions by the mentioned archaeologists, historians, historians of art and architecture, especially the ones by Niemann, Hébrard and Zeiller, the author will try to delineate the importance of their work, as well as offer his own interpretation of the original function of inner spaces of Diocletian’s mausoleum.
Curriculum vitae

Ivan Basić (Split, 1982), went to First Classical Grammar School at Split, afterwards graduating in history and history of art at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb (2007). Since then he has been attending Doctoral Programme in Medieval Sciences at the same University, currently working on his Ph.D. thesis, entitled »Poleogenesis of Split at the turn of Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (4th–10th centuries)«. From 2008 until 2011 he worked as a scientific and teaching assistant at the Department for History of Art, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. There he was a member of the Chair for Antique, Late Antique and Early Medieval Art. Since 2011 he works as an assistant at the Department of History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split. As a member of the Chair for Ancient and Medieval History, he teaches history of Croatia in the Middle Ages, stressing its Adriatic component. Research interests: Late Antique and Early Medieval history and art of the Adriatic basin in European context (especially urban history and poleogenesis). I. Basić authored and co-authored two books and a number of scientific papers; he also gave lectures at a dozen symposia, mostly international.

Bibliography link
http://bib.irb.hr/lista-radova?autor=304961&lang=EN

Contact
ibasic@ffst.hr
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Joško Belamarić, Institute of Art History, Centre Cvito Fisković, Split

Title
Gurlitt / Kowalczyk and Iveković:
Two atlases of Dalmatian monuments published in 1910

Abstract
In one of the classic competitions of the publishing industry, two large photographic albums with fine elections of motifs from Dalmatian history battled for the attention of the Austrian and European reading publics in 1910. First to come out, in Vienna (at Franz Malota’s) and in Berlin (Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft), were two sumptuously designed albums, printed with 132 photographic folio-format plates. They had been taken in the summer and autumn of the previous year by Georg Kowalczyk, Austrian art historian and director of the History Museum in Vienna, and were published with a foreword by the then already celebrated Cornelius Gurlitt, professor of art history and historical structures at the Technische Universität Dresden. At about the same time, the well-known Viennese publisher Anton Schroll started bringing out a collection of photographs entitled Dalmatiens Architektur und Plastik (or Bau- und Kunstdenkmale in Dalmatien) that was edited by Ćiril Metod Iveković, a very active architect, conservator, archaeologist and restorer, who had lived in Zadar since 1896, becoming in 1899 a corresponding member of the Central Commission for the Study
and Maintenance of Historical and Artistic Monuments in Vienna. His plan was to create a unique repertory of monuments in Dalmatia, in a series of 25 volumes to come out at the rate of one or two a year, each with 60 plates, which would in the end amount to 3,000 pictures. These two albums represent the crown of a relatively long and extremely important tradition of albums that were all published by the outstandingly important photographers of the time – Baron Raimund Stillfried von Rathenitz, Alois Beer, Emil Stengel, Nikola Andrović & Giuseppe Goldstein, Tomaso Burato, Franz Laforest, Hubert Vaffier, Josef Wlha.

These photographic albums, issued at the end of the 19th century in Zadar, Split and Vienna show us, in their way, what an endeavour there was to use the medium of photography to define the cultural identity of Dalmatia, a province of the Habsburg Empire that the metropolis of Vienna and the whole of Europe were discovering in a gradual crescendo.

**Curriculum vitae**

Josip Belamaric (Šibenik, 1953), graduated from the Classical Gymnasium in Split and the cross-departmental studies in Art History and Musicology at University of Zagreb. At the University’s Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences he then received his MA and PhD degrees. From 1979, he was an employee of the monument protection services in Split and, in period 1991-2009, the director of the Regional Office for Monument Protection in Split (today’s Conservation Department of the Ministry of Culture). Since 2010, he has been employed at the Institute of Art History, as the head of newly established Cvito Fisković Center in Split. In the same year, he was elected to the title of a Research Advisor. He is also a Professor at the Department of Art History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split. He has published a number of books and a series of articles and studies on the topic of urban history of Dalmatian cities and Medieval and Renaissance art.

**Bibliography link**

**Contact**

jbelamaric@hotmail.com
When George Niemann was asked to produce his survey of the Palace of Diocletian, the theory and practice of architectural preservation were undergoing what can only be described as a paradigm shift. Art historical debates at the turn of the century had ushered in a new conception of Denkmalpflege, a shift from restoration to conservation. Split became a test case in these debates when the Austrian Ministry of Education set up a commission for the preservation of the Palace in 1903. It can hardly be a coincidence that Riegl’s essay on the modern monument cult was published at this time – the same year as his apologia for the preservation of the medieval and modern monuments of Split. Diocletian’s Palace, that is to say, was a crucial station in the crystallization of modern conservation theory.

This presentation will outline the various approaches to the preservation of Diocletian’s Palace during the Austrian custodianship of Split, from 1850 to 1918. It considers four figures in particular: Rudolf Eitelberger, Alois Hauser, Alois Riegl and Max Dvořák. A comparison of their writings evidences a clear divide. Whilst Eitelberger and Hauser promoted the practice of isolating the Roman structures by demolishing post-classical accretions (isolamento), Riegl and Dvořák subsequently argued for conserving the picturesque fabric of Split in its received state (Stadtbildpflege). But in neither case was preservation a purely aesthetic concern; imperial politics always played a more or less prominent role. This is most striking in a controversy that flared up when the municipality of Split was told it would not be allowed to demolish the Episcopium, a relatively insignificant seventeenth-century building that partly obscured Diocletian’s Mausoleum. Niemann’s architectural designs, incidentally, staved off demolition for a time, but the Episcopium was ultimately burned down in an arson attack shortly after the creation of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. Quite why a Yugoslav should want to confound progressive conservation policy by destroying his own heritage remains unclear. This presentation proposes anti-Habsburg sentiment as a possible motivation, but would welcome more plausible explanations.

Jonathan Blower is an architectural historian and translator based in London. Having studied fine art, architectural history and German at Edinburgh and Cambridge he has recently completed his doctoral thesis on Max Dvořák and the administration of cultural heritage in the late Habsburg Empire. He has published and spoken on this and related subjects at the University of Edinburgh, the Czech Academy of Sciences and, more recently, at CIHA 2012 in Nuremberg. In addition, Jonathan has translated numerous twentieth-century German texts on the history and philosophy of art and architecture for the e-journal Art in Translation.
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Franko Ćorić, Art History Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb

Title
Dalmatian examples of the search for a methodology of the «moderne Denkmalpflege»

Abstract
The affirmation of Alois Riegl's concept of age value and personnel changes in the Central Commission taking place between 1902 and 1911, meant a radical turn in the understanding of the role of conservation and restoration within the scope of the protection of monuments. Alois Riegl set down a fundamental direction in his work but did not proffer a methodology to go with it. Julius Deininger, a head of the technical department of the Central Commission, discoursed in 1911 at a Salzburg conference of conservators and correspondents of the Central Commission on practical application of new principles in monument protection. He pointed out that a new program of protection of cultural heritage would not simply endorse the unchangeability of form, but also insist on preserving ambience values: veneer, dilapidation, open fugues, plants, and the like. He insisted that copying and replacement of elements already in existence on the object/ artefact be abandoned because these would cause it to lose its status of a monument. He upheld a motto: „Don't restore, conserve!“; which was ascribed to Dvořák in his *Katechismus* from 1916. Both texts should thus be seen as attempts to bring together all prior practical experience.

Both the instruction of the technical conservator and *Katechismus* exhibit a strong influence of the *Tage der Denkmalpflege* manifestation, including also practical experience gained in the Austrian service for the protection of monuments. By analyzing concurrently conservation issues in connection with the Buvina portal of the Split Cathedral in 1908, then Dvořák's proposal for the conservation works on a new ceiling of the Zadar Cathedral, and finally Karl Holey's project for the consolidation of the Vestibule from 1911, we may contend that the experience gathered in Dalmatia provided an extremely valuable impetus for defining a new methodology and for reshaping personnel policy in the course of building up the Commission itself.

Curriculum vitae
Born in 1976, undergraduate studies of Art History and German language and literature at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb 1994-2001; graduate study of Art History with specialisation in conservation of cultural heritage, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb 2002-2004; postgraduate study (doctoral level) 2005-2010; in 2010 defended a dissertation on organisation, regulations and activities of the Viennese Imperial and Royal Central Commission in Istria and Dalmatia 1850; from 2004 on teaching assistant at the Department of Art History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. Scientific interests: history and theory of protection and conservation of cultural heritage, links to German speaking countries, contemporary conservation issues.
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Christine Ertel, Vienna

Title
Archaeological Documentation in the Diocletian’s Palace in Split by George Niemann

Abstract
At the Institute for Ancient History at the University of Vienna is prepared a project to make a catalogue of all works of George Niemann on the base of the collection of his drawings and sketch-books stored by the Academy of Fine Arts and the Albertina Museum. The numerous works of the extremely busy and motivated architect should be collected to protect the inheritance of this great personality of Austrian culture. Among his archaeological documentations and reconstructions, the Diocletian's Palace in Split takes an eminent position. In regard of his publication on the palace of 1910, we can observe that it is a wonderful book with enchanting drawings, but only little text. It intended to give a beautiful survey without systematic discussion of all features and problems. The same can be said of the book of Niemann’s colleague Ernst Hebrard. The French "architects pensionnaires" at Rome were looking for splendid archaeological sites to prove their capacity for more or less fanciful reconstructions. Their drawings sometimes fill gaps of the official archaeological documentation. As modern archaeologists, however, we are interested in complete realistic and systematic information concerning the monuments. Therefore, we think it very useful to look for drawings of Niemann which were not yet published. They could provide a new source of the investigation of Diocletian’s Palace in Split.

Curriculum vitae
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Stanko Kokole, Department of the History of Art, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Title
„Wer ist dieser Molé?“ A Slovenian Student of Max Dvořák and Josef Strzygowski in Dalmatia between 1911 and 1914

Abstract
Vojeslav (or Wojsław) Molè (1886–1973) – a pupil of Josef Strzygowski, who received his Ph.D. from the University of Vienna in 1912 – is comparatively little known outside his native Slovenia and his much beloved adoptive homeland, Poland; yet in these two countries he is still fondly remembered among the truly outstanding art historians of his generation. At the then fledgling University of Ljubljana (founded in 1919) Molè had taught Classical archaeology and Byzantine art history between 1920 and 1925 (and was temporarily reappointed between 1940 and 1945 following his lucky escape from the brutalities of both Soviet and Nazi occupiers in 1939). For the most part, his distinguished professional career was, however, closely tied up with one of the most venerable academic institutions of Central Europe – the Jagiellonian University at Kraków, where he has been a highly honored professor between 1925 and 1939 (and – albeit mistrusted by the new regime – again between 1945 and 1960). He spent the last years of his life at Eugene (Oregon, USA) absorbed in writing a voluminous autobiography that was published in 1970 under the title Iz knjige spominov (literally “From the Book of Memories”). My paper will accordingly focus on Molè’s own account of some of the most telling episodes from his decisive formative years in Kraków (1908–1909), Rome (1909–1910), and Vienna (1910–1912) – and especially also on their immediate aftermath – with particular regard to Dalmatia. For, already in 1911, he was engaged by his other Viennese teacher, Max Dvořák, to carry out extensive archival research in loco for Dagobert Frey’s seminal study of the Cathedral of Šibenik. Moreover, in the fall of 1913 (again thanks to Dvořák) “Herr Dr. Molè” (who had shortly before joined the junior staff of the recently reorganized K.K. Zentral-Kommission für Denkmalpflege) was assigned as a provisorischer Praktikant to the Landeskonservatorat in Split, headed by Don Frane Bulić, where this young Slovenian intellectual with art-historical, archaeological and literary interests quickly earned his learned superior’s trust and affectionate support. A re-examination of Vojeslav Molè’s personal memoirs of his brief sojourn in Split – which was, needless to say, abruptly cut short by the outbreak of World War I in the summer of 1914 – promises additional insights into the specific political, social and cultural circumstances that jointly reinvigorated international scholarly interest in the architectural and artistic heritage of Dalmatia during the last decades of the Habsburg Monarchy.
Curriculum vitae
Stanko Kokole (born in 1962), who currently teaches at the University of Ljubljana (Faculty of Arts, Department of the History of Art), completed his Ph.D. in Art History at the Johns Hopkins University in 1998, and was subsequently a post-doctoral fellow at the Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies – Villa I Tatti, Florence, Italy (1999-2000), and at the Humboldt University in Berlin, Germany (2000-2001), as well as a Senior Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. (2007-2008). In 2004 he was also the first recipient of the Jacob Burckhardt-Prize awarded by the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz.
Dr. Kokole published and lectured extensively in Slovenian, Croatian, English, German and Italian on various aspects of Renaissance art and the history of Classical tradition in and beyond the Adriatic Rim.

Bibliography link
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Claudia Lang-Auinger, Institute of Cultural History of Antiquity, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna

Title
Niemann’s Task as arbitrator in the Trojan controversy

Abstract
In this symposium my speech does not relate directly to Diocletian’s palace. What I would like to show is the way which enabled George Niemann to manage such a complex task like the graphic representation of the Diocletian’s palace as well as the preservation of such a historical monument. In the same way he was fulfilling the highest artistically and scientific standards.
An unpublished correspondence between Heinrich Schliemann and George Niemann demonstrates the high appreciation of this famous man. These are letters from Schliemann, Dörpfeld and other colleagues dealing with the well known problem: Schliemann’s results and interpretation of the Trojan excavation. In this public conflict George Niemann found convincing arguments, which were based on several years of experience in different archaeological fields.
Curriculum vitae
Claudia Lang-Auinger is a scholar in Classical Archaeology. Participation in various national and international excavations; member (1980–2009) of the excavation staff at Ephesos. Since 1986 research associate of the Austrian Academy of Sciences. Lecturer in Classical Art at the University of Vienna.

Contact
Claudia.Lang@oeaw.ac.at

Goran Nikšić, Service for the Old City Core, Split

Title
Research and conservation of Diocletian’s Palace in the first half of 20th century

Abstract
The aim of the paper is to show how the idealized image of Diocletian’s Palace, described as a “typical, textbook” example of an ideal building type – a fortified imperial villa set in an idyllic landscape, a Late Antique achievement from which Byzantine and medieval architecture have developed – has facilitated a series of purifications, destructive archaeological excavations and «heavy» reconstructions, favouring the antique building, opening up views that never existed, and sometimes destroying large portions of the city’s historic fabric. During the last two centuries the historic centre of Split has been a laboratory for practicing theoretical conservation principles. Of particular interest is the first half of the 20th century, when the up-to-date conservation doctrines and the presence of the most prominent Austrian and Italian scholars influenced the practice of local conservation specialists and the public opinion on the most important projects.
Curriculum vitae

Goran Nikšić (Split, 1957), architect (1980 Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade). MA in architectural conservation (1992 Centre for Conservation Studies, University of York). PhD (2012 Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb). As conservation architect with the Ministry of Culture, Conservation Department in Split produced architectural surveys and supervised restoration projects for a series of historic buildings, including cathedrals of Korčula, Hvar, Split, Trogir and Šibenik; responsible for the Historic Core of Split and Diocletian’s Palace. Since 2006, as Head of the Service for the Old City Core has managed a number of planning, restoration, rehabilitation and maintenance projects for the Municipality of Split. Since 1997 has lectured architectural conservation at the Restoration Department of the Academy of Fine Arts, University of Split. Engaged by ICOMOS as expert for assessment of candidates for the World Heritage List. Published articles on his important conservation projects and on local architectural history, with special interest in the analysis of architecture and in the research of design methods used for Dalmatian buildings through history. Also researches the history of conservation in Split in 19th and 20th centuries.

List of publications (selection):

- *Dioklecijanova palača – od projekta do izvedbe* (Diocletian’s Palace – from Design to Construction), in: Proceedings of the conference Dioklecijan, tetrarihija i Dioklecijanova palača o 1700. obljetnici postojanja (Diocletian, Tetrachy and Diocletian’s Palace on the 1700th...
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Title
L’étude du Palais de Dioclétien à Split par Ernest Hébrard et Jacques Zeiller

Abstract


Curriculum vitae

Publications sur l’histoire de l’archéologie:
Réalisations anciennes et dégagements modernes de monuments antiques: Arles, Nîmes, Orange et Trèves, Tours, Cæsarodunum, suppl. n° 31, 1978;

Contact
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Sandro Scarrocchia, Accademia di Brera, Milano

Title
Centralità di Spalato nella teoria e storia della conservazione dei monumenti

Abstract
A Spalato si teatralizza, su di un palcoscenico storico che vede attori molti protagonisti di rilevanza internazionale della storia dell’arte, della tutela e del restauro del Novecento, il grande conflitto tra il valore dell’antichità con tutta la sua carica mitologica e simbolica, da un lato, e, dall’altro, il valore dell’antico, cioè il valore della stratificazione e dell’unità ambientale (disomogenea), con le sue implicazioni antropologiche e sociali moderne, aperte su di un orizzonte culturale allora agli albori, che solo dopo tre guerre, due mondiali e una interetnica non meno tragica e infausta delle prime due, poteva essere limpidamente riconosciuto. Consapevoli del ruolo strategico che Spalato rivestiva all’interno della neonata disciplina della conservazione, per primi in assoluto (e con sessanta anni di anticipo sulla Carta di Gubbio), i maestri viennesi Riegl e Dvořák considerarono la città dalmata come un unico monumento, come uno stratificato e, proprio in ragione di ciò, prezioso complesso architettonico e ambientale patrimonio dell’umanità.

Curriculum vitae
Sandro Scarrocchia, (Casperia 1952), architect (graduated in 1977 from the Faculty of Architecture, University of Florence) and art historian (masters degree in 1983 in medieval and modern art from the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Bologna; PhD in 1995 from the Faculty of Philosophy at the Friedrich Wilhelm University, Bonn).
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Abstract
The problem of treatment of historical monuments in Europe reached its peak at the beginning of the 20th century. After several decades of fervent discussions and polemics on the proper method of treatment, initiated by Ruskin’s critique of stylistic restoration in his Lamp of Memory, there appeared in fin-de-siècle Central Europe and Italy a new approach to conservation promoting keywords such as Pflege, Erhaltung, conservazione, and manutenzione. As is well known, it had its protagonists in the eminent art history scholars and architects such as Boito, Thausing, Riegl, Dehio, Dvořák, Giovannoni and Gurlitt. At the beginning of the 20th century Cornelius Gurlitt was one of the leading promoters of the modern cult of monuments in Germany, participating at the conferences Tage der Denkmalpflege since their beginning in Dresden in 1900. His discussions and critiques of Viollet-le-Duc’s principles are well documented, while the minutes of the German conferences establish him as one of the pioneers of the motto Konservieren, statt restaurieren! Thanks to his visit to Zagreb in 1908,
where he held a lecture on the founding of the cities, Gurlitt has been referenced in Croatian historiography of art and conservation. This paper will explore Gurlitt’s connections with Split and his perception of Diocletian’s Palace in the context of the discussions on sventramenti and isolamenti, on one hand, and conservation of Stimmung and picturesqueness of the heterogeneous monumental complex, on the other.
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Exhibiting Dalmatia on the Eve of the Great War: The Vienna Adria-Ausstellung in 1913

Abstract

The paper is going to analyze the so called “Adria-Ausstellung”, which was opened on May 3rd 1913, and being one of the biggest exhibitions that ever took place in pre-war Vienna. Planned by the “Österreichischer Flottenverein” – an organization close to the Austrian Government – and located in the Vienna Prater, this exhibition was a monstrous endeavor to represent Dalmatia en miniature. From the Prater Rotunda southwards an enormous 300 m long hole was dug out and filled with water – the Adriatic Sea. At the coast some of the most famous Dalmatian buildings were reconstructed, among others Zadar’s City gate (Kopnena vrata) and the Rector’s palace in Dubrovnik. My paper will try to explore the historical background of this somehow bizarre theme park. Far from being just a representation of Dalmatian art and architecture, the “Adria-Ausstellung” obviously had several goals. First, it was intended to enhance the tourism by showing the beauty of Dalmatia. And second, the exhibition was a welcome means to demonstrate the military force of the Austro-Hungarian armada.
This political aspect especially has become important in summer 1913, when the Scutari-crisis and the Second Balkan-war destabilized the whole Habsburg Monarchy.
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