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ABSTRACT

A lacuna is a disruption in a figurative image and impedes comprehension of the unity of the whole. It is something missing, a void, in material form and, in some cases memory.

The urge to eradicate or minimize a disruption to an aesthetic whole has long been a dilemma in conservation, particularly in painting and sculpture, but also in the repair of historical buildings. Any solution must address the issue of authenticity, as repair will be an insertion into an ancient, perhaps layered artefact. The solution requires a theoretically based methodology if the aim of the conservation intervention is to conserve the value and meaning of the building or artefact. The repair of lacunae at the Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town has had a distinct aesthetic impact on the complex and has changed the perception of the complex. The extensive three-decade-long intervention undertaken by Gabriël Fagan Architects is a re-establishment of the Castle complex as a VOC/Dutch fortified citadel as envisioned by the Architects and reveals the issues that must be confronted in order to conserve authenticity.

The study has two main sections: the first, examines the intellectual contexts of the repair of lacunae; and the second section, will examine some of the filling in of lacunae at the Castle in some detail. Chapter Two reviews the theories of repairing lacunae in particular. It also describes the intellectual context in South Africa at the time of the conservation intervention at the Castle. Fagan often uses terminology similar to that of the nineteenth century ‘restorers’ such as Viollet-le-Duc, which demands Fagan’s conservation work to be placed within the nineteenth century European debates between restorers and preservationists (or anti-restorers). Fagan’s work also demands to be evaluated in the context of twentieth century ideas, which require the reading of historical buildings ‘as a document’. In Chapter Three, the Castle lacunae, which included substantial ‘reconstruction’ of long-demolished buildings as well as three smaller lacunae in the vicinity of the main entrance area are analysed in some detail to establish Fagan’s theoretical approach to lacunae and their meaning for the Castle as a cultural artefact.

The intervention at the Castle, undertaken between the early 1970s and 2000, reflected the local consensus, particularly in the Afrikaner community, regarding historical and stylistic restorations. This can be attributed to four factors: South Africa being a provincial outpost far removed from the intellectual metropole; the increasing need after 1948 to invent a white national identity and its influence on conservation; the consequences of the increasing international isolation following the Sharpeville massacre in 1961 which led to an intellectual and theoretical vacuum in local intellectual life including conservation theory and practices; and finally, the relative paucity of published conservation theory in English and of translations of European writings (mainly Italian and German texts) before the mid-1980s.

Keywords: Castle of Good Hope, Gabriël Fagan, Lacunae, Restoration, Stylistic Restoration
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Authenticity
The term, as Choay (1992) suggests in referring to heritage, has ‘nomadic’ meanings. The ICOMOS Riga Charter (2000) is the only Charter that attempts a definition: “Authenticity is a measure of the degree to which the attributes of cultural heritage (including form and design, materials and substance, use and function, tradition and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other factors) credibly and accurately bear witness to their significance, believe that replication of cultural heritage is in general a misrepresentation of evidence of the past, and that each architectural work should reflect the time of its own creation, in the belief that sympathetic new buildings can maintain the environmental context, but that reconstruction of cultural heritage, lost through disaster, whether of natural or human origin, may be acceptable.”

Cape Dutch buildings
‘Cape Dutch’ is sometimes used in place of the longer ‘Dutch building/s at the Cape’. It refers to a building built by the Dutch at the Cape up to 1806 in Cape Town and to about 1840 in the countryside/Cape hinterland.

Castle of Good Hope
The Castle (1666-1679) was the second fort built at the Cape to house the VOC Company (see overleaf) and secure the Cape against European attack and take-over, as well as to safe-guard its interest at the Cape against the indigenous Khoi-San population.

Conservation:
“Conservation of the existing fabric only attempts, as far as is necessary, to stabilize individual areas technically and to eliminate sources of danger that directly threaten the fabric.” (Petzet, 2004, 9)

Gabriël Fagan
Gabriël (Gawie) is a member of a prestigious Afrikaner family. He obtained a B.Arch. degree from the University of Pretoria in 1952 and started Gabriël Fagan Architekte in Cape Town in 1964. His contemporary and restoration projects are highly acclaimed, see Appendix A: Awards, Special Awards and Honorary Doctorates.

Gabriël Fagan Architects:
In this paper “Fagan” includes both Gabriël Fagan and his wife Gwen. They have been working as a team at Gabriël Fagan Architects since 1969 when Gwen, a medical doctor (MB.CH.B. 1948 - UCT) left practice to work as a historical researcher and landscape planner in her husband’s office. She obtained a PhD from the University of Cape Town in 1995 entitled: “An introduction to the man - made landscape at the Cape from the 17th to the 19th centuries”. In 1973, they won the Gold Medal from the National Monuments Council for the research and restoration work in Church Street and the Drostdy in Tulbagh. In 1987, Gwen was awarded the Cape Tercentenary Award for historical research and historical landscape restoration and in 1992 the Gold medal from the Simon van der Stel Foundation for her contribution to the conservation of South Africa’s historic gardens and architecture. She holds an
Honorary Doctorate from the University of Stellenbosch (1993), and Honorary Membership from the South African Institute Architects (1991).

Lacuna
(Latin: Lacūna) lacuna refers to something missing. An abstract noun donating a blank, empty part, missing portion, cutting, cavity, and disappearance. It is also interpreted as an interruption of an activity and process. A synonym of Lacuna is 'interval', a gap in time between two events; it also could mean a detachment of events in time and space. Lacuna as disappearance may donate gaps in our historic memory (Hansar, 2004b).

Restoration
From much literature it appears to be a subjective word. It was difficult to adhere to the Burra definition: “Returning the existing fabric of a place to a known earlier state by removing accretions or by reassembling existing components without the introduction of new material. (ICOMOS Australia, Burra Charter, 1998, Article 1.7) ‘Restoration’ (in brackets) is used where it is known that new materials where used and does not comply with the Burra definition.

Reconstruction
Returning a place to a known earlier state and is distinguished from restoration by the introduction of new material into the fabric (ICOMOS Australia, Burra Charter, 1998, Article 1.8).

Recreation
The speculative creation of a presumed earlier state on the basis of surviving evidence from that place and other sites and on deductions drawn from that evidence, using new materials (English Heritage: Policy Statement on Restoration, Reconstruction, and Speculative Recreation of Archaeological Sites including Ruins, 2001, Definitions; my emphasis)

Replication
The construction of a copy of a structure or building, usually on another site or nearby (English Heritage: Policy Statement on Restoration, Reconstruction, and Speculative Recreation of Archaeological Sites including Ruins, 2001, Definitions).

Values
In this paper, this term does not refer to ethics or morals but to the simple insight that any particular thing or place has a number of different values in the sense of characteristics, for different reasons and for different people; and are susceptible to change (Mason, 2006, 22).

VOC
The Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie or VOC (Dutch East India Company) was a chartered company established in 1602. The government of the Netherlands granted it a 21-year monopoly (as extended) to carry out colonial activities in Asia. It was the first multinational corporation in the world and the first company to issue stock. It was also arguably the world's first mega-corporation possessing quasi-governmental powers, including the ability to wage war, negotiate treaties, coin money, and establish colonies. The VOC was the government of the Cape from 1652 until 1795.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLAGIARISM DECLARATION</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR’S STATEMENT</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND DEFINITIONS</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER ONE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 THE ARGUMENT/CLAIM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER TWO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: CONSERVATION THEORY AND LACUNAE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN RESTORERS AND ANTI-RESTORERS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Restorers: Viollet-le-Duc and the Restoration of Style</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Anti-Restorers: Ruskin, Morris and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Monuments and their wider Influence</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: MODERN CONSERVATION THEORIES AND APPROACHES TOWARD LACUNAE</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 THE CASTLE: VALUES AND MEANING</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 THE CASTLE: SEMIOTIC MEANING</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 CONSERVATION CHARTERS AND INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1 The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments (1931)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2 ICOMOS Venice Charter (1964)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3 ICOMOS Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4 Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (1998)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5 ICOMOS Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction (2000)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.6 Lausanne Charter – ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage – (1990)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.8 The Charters on Authenticity</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.9 The Charters on Reconstruction of Lacunae</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 ARCHAEOLOGY AND RESTORATION OF RUINS</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 FORTRESS LOUISBOURG: AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE CASE STUDY</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 SOUTH AFRICAN CONSERVATION CONTEXT</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE ............................................................................................................................. 52

DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF LACUNAE CASE STUDIES AT THE CASTLE OF GOOD HOPE ................. 52

3.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE CONSERVATION INTERVENTION ................................................................. 52
3.2 THE LACUNAE OF THE CASTLE ........................................................................................................... 63
  3.2.1 Lacunae Case Studies ....................................................................................................................... 63
    3.2.1.1 Corporal’s House outside the Castle walls – Contract 7: 1997-2000 ........................................... 64
    3.2.1.2 Dolphin Pool, the Bakhuys and ‘Colonnade’ Building – Contract 4: 1987-1988 ...................... 71
    3.2.2.1 Main Timber Entrance Gates ............................................................................................... 89
    3.2.2.3 Reclining Statues of Neptune and Mercury on the Internal Entrance Gable: 1998 ............ 96

CHAPTER FOUR ......................................................................................................................................... 99

CONCLUSION ........................................................................................................................................... 99

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES .......................................................................................................................... 102

BIBLIOGRAPHY .......................................................................................................................................... 103

APPENDIX .................................................................................................................................................. 114

APPENDIX A: GABRIEL FAGAN: AWARDS RECEIVED ............................................................................. 114
LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1: LAYOUT PLAN: LOCATION OF LACUNAE AT THE CASTLE OF GOOD HOPE DISCUSSED IN THIS PAPER .............. 52
FIGURE 2: GOVERNORS’ RESIDENCE: FAGAN ARCHITECTS RESTORATION DRAWING, BLOCK G, LOCATED OPPOSITE DOLPHIN POOL ................................................................................................................... 60
FIGURE 3: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: DETAIL PRE-1896 PHOTOGRAPH: 1. IMHOFF BATTERY; 2. CORPORAL’S HOUSE .......... 64
FIGURE 4: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: PHOTOGRAPH FROM THE SOUTH ........................................................................... 66
FIGURE 5: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: FAGAN ARCHITECTS: RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING; WEST ELEVATION AND PLAN ...... 67
FIGURE 6: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: CONTEMPORARY VIEW OF WEST ELEVATION (FROM SIGNAL HILL SIDE) ................ 69
FIGURE 7: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: CONTEMPORARY VIEW ONTO EAST ELEVATION FROM BIUREN BASTION; WITH REFILLED MOAT IN BACK .................................................................................................................. 69
FIGURE 8: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: CONTEMPORARY PHOTOGRAPH OF JOINT BETWEEN NEW (LEFT) AND OLD (RIGHT) ....... 70
FIGURE 9: CORPORAL’S HOUSE: DETAIL OF NEW COPY OF WINDOW/SHUTTER, IRON-MONGERY AND GRANITE Lintel ...... 70
FIGURE 10: POOL COMPLEX: TRACING OF A VERY FAIN SKETCH ON 1795 PLAN (FAGAN) ........................................... 71
FIGURE 11: POOL COMPLEX: TRACING OF SKETCH ........................................................................................................ 71
FIGURE 12: POOL COMPLEX: PROPOSED RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING BASED ON FIG. 10 FOR NMC ...................... 72
FIGURE 13: DOLPHIN FOUNTAIN: TRACING OF M796 CAPE ARCHIVE ........................................................................ 72
FIGURE 14: DOLPHIN FOUNTAIN: FIRST RECONSTRUCTION PROPOSAL BY ARTIST JAN COREWIJN ......................... 72
FIGURE 15: POOL COMPLEX: FAGAN ARCHITECTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL DRAWING, WITH SITE PROGRESS LOG/NOTES BY GWEN FAGAN ........................................................................................................................................ 76
FIGURE 16: POOL COMPLEX: FAGAN ARCHITECTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL DRAWING, WITH SKETCHES OF FOUND ARTEFACTS .... 77
FIGURE 17: POOL COMPLEX: FAGAN ARCHITECTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL DRAWING, COMPOSITE OF TYPES OF FOUNDATIONS EXCAVATED. (LIGHT BLUE REPRESENTS SLATE FOUNDATIONS, LIGHT GREEN BRICK FOUNDATIONS, ETC.) .......... 78
FIGURE 18: POOL COMPLEX: FAGAN ARCHITECTS RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING: CROSS SECTION ......................... 81
FIGURE 19: POOL COMPLEX: FAGAN ARCHITECTS RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING: PLAN ............................................ 82
FIGURE 20: POOL COMPLEX: ARCHITECTS RECONSTRUCTION DRAWING: POOL ELEVATION ............................ 83
FIGURE 21: POOL COMPLEX: FRONT POOL COURTYARD VIEW .................................................................................... 84
FIGURE 22: POOL COMPLEX: FRONT POOL COURTYARD VIEW, WITH REAR VIEW ONTO ORIGINAL GOVERNOR’S RESIDENCE 84
FIGURE 23: POOL COMPLEX: PIER COPING: COPY OF ORIGINAL ARTEFACT FOUND ON SITE; WITH REPLICA LIGHT FITTING REPRODUCED BY JAN COREWIJN (ORIGINAL FROM KAT BALCONY) ................................................................................................. 85
FIGURE 24: POOL COMPLEX: PLASTER DECORATIVE BALUSTRADE, PATTERN COPIED OF ORIGINAL ARTEFACTS FOUND ON SITE ................................................................................................................. 85
FIGURE 25: POOL COMPLEX: INTERIOR: ROOF BEAMS ARE SIMILAR TO ORIGINAL DUTCH BEAMS IN CASTLE; NOTE PLASTER PEDIMENT OVER DOOR OPENING AT REAR ........................................................................ 86
FIGURE 26: POOL COMPLEX: NEW MEETS ‘OLD’, STAINLESS STEEL DOOR FRAMES AROUND BRICK PIERS ......................... 86
FIGURE 27: POOL COMPLEX: FRONT DOOR DETAIL WITH PILASTERS AND PEDIMENT ....................................................... 87
FIGURE 28: POOL COMPLEX: VIEW OVER POOL WITH NEW DOLPHIN FOUNTAIN TO RESTORED GOVERNORS’ RESIDENCE .... 87
FIGURE 29: POOL COMPLEX: ORIGINAL POOL STEPS BELOW WATER LINE WITH NEW DOLPHIN FOUNTAIN BY ARTIST JAN COREWIJN ........................................................................................................................................ 88
FIGURE 30: MAIN ENTRANCE GATES: ‘ALPHEN DRAWING, 1943’: CLOSE SCRUTINY OF THE LEFT GATE SEEMS TO INDICATE DIAGONAL TIMBER BOARDS ................................................................. 89
FIGURE 31: MAIN ENTRANCE GATES: JAFFNA VOC FORT ................................................................. 90
FIGURE 32: CAPE CASTLE: MAIN ENTRANCE GATES: BRICK RECESSES FOR ORIGINAL SECURING MECHANISM; FAGAN ARCHITECTS RECORDS ................................................................. 91
FIGURE 33A+B: MAIN ENTRANCE GATE: OVERALL VIEW OF NEW TIMBER GATE BASED ON JAFFNA FORT; AND DETAIL OF GATES WITH ‘ELEPHANT’ SPIKES, IRON-MONGERY AND ‘SPY’ WINDOW ................................................................. 92
FIGURE 34: LADY ANNE BARNARD’S PANORAMA: INTERNAL VIEW OF ENTRANCE GABLE, CUPOLA AND VERANDAH ............ 93
FIGURE 35: LADY ANNE BARNARD’S PANORAMA: DETAIL OF INTERNAL ENTRANCE GABLE AND CUPOLA ......................... 94
FIGURE 36A+B: WEATHERVANE: PHOTOCOPY OF A ST. PAUL’S WEATHERVANE; BARROW DRAWING, FAGAN ARCHITECTS ARCHIVE .................................................................................................................. 94
FIGURE 37: WEATHERVANE: GENERAL VIEW OF ENTRANCE: NEW GATES AND WEATHERVANE ............................................. 95
FIGURE 38: WEATHERVANE: DETAIL ........................................................................................................... 95
FIGURE 39: INTERNAL ENTRANCE ELEVATION WITH GABLE FIGURES: FAGAN ARCHITECTS ................................................................. 97
FIGURE 40: INTERNAL GABLE: LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY ........................................................................ 98
FIGURE 41: INTERNAL GABLE: NEPTUNE AND MERCURY REPLACEMENTS; WITH REPLICA COAT OF ARMS .................. 98
Contextual Aerial Photograph: Castle of Good Hope, Cape Town: Main components and context, 2010
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

An essential question of conservation is how to deal with lacunae. A lacuna is a missing part and a disturbing interruption of the integrity of a figurative image. This is a particular dilemma as it requires a theoretical basis to determine the conservation approach. Inserting modern replacement parts into original objects has been fiercely debated at least since the discovery of the Laocoön sculpture in 1506 with arms and hands missing. This dilemma continues to be an important theoretical question in contemporary conservation as it fundamentally deals with the meanings and values attached to authenticity. In modern art restoration, Cesare Brandi’s theory of restoration notes that the problem is not so much the missing part, but the incorrectly inserted one. Paul Philippot, who expanded Brandi’s conceptual basis of how to repair lacunae within architecture, notes that the only aim of this repair is to reduce the disturbance caused by the lacuna to the artistic whole. This has to be a critical interpretation and an identifiable insertion into an original object or context without faking the original object.¹

The intervention undertaken by Gabriël Fagan Architects at the Dutch East India Company (VOC) Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town, and in particular the filling of lacunae, are explored in this paper to establish Fagan’s conservation attitudes and principles applied to this project. Very little critical assessment has been undertaken regarding the work of Fagan (Gabriël and his wife and partner, Gwen) in this regard.² The work reveals itself as a historical and stylistic hand-crafted manifestation of Fagan’s meticulous historical research. This approach also reveals what Jukka Jokilehto calls ‘cultural choices’³ and it is this interpretative and creative act that forms the basis of this investigation.

¹ Philippot, P. (1976), 270
² See Glossary ‘Gabriël and Gwen Fagan’ regarding their work methods and co-authorship
³ Jokilehto. (1985), 11
Although the Castle ‘restoration’ can also be regarded as a structural stabilization of the complex, the client (The Public Works Department) requested the recreation of certain parts of the Castle to its original state, in order “to allow the Castle to become into its own again”. The project ultimately took thirty-three years to complete and comprised seven different contracts. It will be argued that for Fagan, the ‘restoration’ was to respect the original intent and design of the VOC Castle as a cultural artefact of the past. This required not only historical evidence, but also creative and interpretive decisions to establish the unity and aesthetic completeness. The multitude of decisions taken over the course of the project reveal various complex methodological and theoretical approaches, including respecting some of the various layers and histories of the Castle, but mainly comprising a historical and stylistic ‘restoration’ as might have been undertaken by Viollet-le-Duc. The methods reveal approaches spanning the breadth of the debates over the past 150 years.

Although in sculpture the replacing of missing elements has been abandoned, in architecture it has continued. In art and architecture, the conservator’s filling of lacunae are seen as an interpretive and creative process which project or transfer certain values, meanings and identity onto the object as well as affecting authenticity. Fagan’s response to lacunae of significant old Cape Dutch buildings including at the Castle, has been the most controversial aspect of his conservation practice. The purpose/aim of this dissertation is to establish the conservation attitudes, values and principles of Gabriël Fagan when reinstating lacunae into a whole and how these practices project the meaning and interpretation of the Castle into contemporary South Africa.

---

4 Original contract from the Department of Public Works, Pretoria, 19 May 1969 (in Afrikaans, translated by author)
5 Maintenance is continuing at present under Fagan as well as some further alterations to the Kat building.
6 Refer to Glossary and Definitions for terms such as reconstruction and recreation.
1.2 The argument/claim

It is argued that the filling of lacunae of Cape Dutch buildings was an important aspect of conservation for Fagan. This was in order to re-establish the meaning of the Castle as a stylistic whole, and restore the cultural historical meaning of the original and the intentions of the building’s creators. For Fagan the Castle of Good Hope had to regain its meaning as a VOC citadel fort. The demolition of the Dolphin Pool complex by the British Colonial Army in the mid-nineteenth century undermined this role as a fortified urban place - the home of the VOC administrative, religious and military presence in southern Africa. Without it, according to Fagan, the Castle would not be able to communicate this meaning.

Similarly, the Corporal’s House located outside the Castle next to the Buuren (north-western) bastion and demolished in the early twentieth century was ‘rebuilt’ on old foundations. This building was a long single-storey building, which accommodated the corporal and his patrol as well as the pump maker. The design of the new building was based on a photograph taken from Signal Hill. The aim of ‘reconstructing’ this otherwise unremarkable building for modern functional reasons (to provide space for gardeners’ restrooms) re-established a link between the external works of the Castle, and their origins as fortifications, with other elements in this system. This was to place the Castle once again in the centre of a broader spatial context, which originally defended the VOC presence in Southern Africa.

Another new building, also on historic foundations, was located to the north of the Secunde’s House along the Kat wall, which divides the central space within the Castle walls. Here, a prefabricated industrial-type building built by the military was demolished to make way for a stylistic recreation. This ‘reconstruction’ accommodates numerous back-office services such as electrical supply, air conditioning, security, etc. For Fagan, this lacuna interrupted and disturbed the completeness of an important internal façade and was designed according to a partial turn-of-the-twentieth century photograph.
Fagan also had architectural and decorative elements ‘recreated’ that he considered important to complete his vision of what the colonial fort could have looked like during the VOC period. This included his interpretation of the main entrance timber gates based primarily on timber doors he saw at the VOC Jaffna castle in Sri Lanka. Similarly, the reclining plaster figures of Neptune and Mercury on the internal entrance gable and the weathervane on top of the copula were required to be reinstated in Fagan’s vision for the Castle.

Fagan preceded the conservation intervention at the Castle with exhaustive local and international research, including visits to a number of VOC forts in Sri Lanka, as well as forts in India, Italy and Holland. Assumed positions of old foundations of demolished buildings were excavated to obtain existing material evidence. The historical evidence of lacunae for the Castle, however, was minimal, with only distant or blurred drawings or partial photographs and partial remnant foundations. There was no substantial or detailed documentation of any of the missing parts. Fagan, after prolonged periods of grappling with how to respond, re-created and re-instated the lacunae as he thought was the most obvious, in his own words, “common sense” solutions using stylistic and design-by-analogy methods where no documentary evidence existed. Details such as plaster mouldings, brick sizes and colours were copied or adapted; iron and timber work was meticulously recorded if existing elsewhere on the Castle, or on other buildings such as the VOC forts in Sri Lanka for the entrance gate, and the Groote Kerk church and the Lutheran Church in Cape Town for the copula weathervane. Original materials and work-methods were used and only highly capable artisans and artists were commissioned to produce items in the same manner. In order to re-establish the original intent of a VOC fortification, Fagan ‘reinserted’ himself into the creative process of the original.

The theoretical approach of Fagan grew out of the conservation culture in South Africa in the mid-to late-twentieth century. Although this was similar to

---

7 Forts visited include: Sri Lanka: Jaffna, Trincomalee, Colombo, Negombo, Galle, Puttalam, Anuradhapura, Manna. India: Red fort in Delhi, Agra, Goa; Gwen Fagan, e-mail, 10/11/2010
8 To illustrate the importance of carefully hand-made work-man ship, Fagan had a whole batch of forged hinges returned because they had mechanised grinding marks on them. Henk Lourens, interview, 29/09/2010
the restorers and Viollet-le-Duc theories of the nineteenth century, there was no obviously traceable connection. An early example of the local historical and stylistic conservation tradition is Kendall’s ‘restoration’ of Groot Constantia in 1925, which was ‘restored’ to, and what Mary Cook admiringly described as its “best period”. Well-known and highly respected architects such as Norman Eaton, Revel Fox, Dirk Visser and Gabriël Fagan undertook stylistic and historical ‘restorations’, which often received awards of excellence by the South African Institute of Architects. The twenty-five year political isolation of South Africa between the 1960s and early 1990s ensured that the exponential progress in conservation theories and methodologies experienced internationally around the 1980s was little known locally. The conservation norm was only questioned in the late 1980s and changes in theoretical positions and methodology only really became apparent in the late 1990s.

It will be argued that the repair of lacunae at the Castle reveals that the theoretical basis of Fagan was to ‘restore’ the ideal of the original building. It was based as far as possible on historical evidence in order to ‘restore’ the style and reintegrating the whole image of the building. If no evidence could be found, Fagan would research analogous evidence from similar types of buildings from the same period so that wholeness of the complex could be established. Fagan’s filling of lacunae reveal a carefully choreographed and hand-crafted stylistic completion of the wholeness of the Castle as an example of a VOC colonial citadel fort.

The re-instated lacunae all contributed to one vision. The theoretical and methodological approach of Fagan was to repair these lacunae so that they contributed to re-establishing the Castle to a preferred period, and thereby assist to reveal the cultural and artistic achievement of the VOC/Dutch in Southern Africa.
CHAPTER TWO
A THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: CONSERVATION THEORY AND LACUNAE

2.1 Introduction

In order to understand the issues and debates around the filling of lacunae, it is necessary to explore the concepts of the nineteenth and early twentieth century conservation rhetoric. As Matero notes the nineteenth century formal debates in architectural conservation were largely polarized through the work of two prominent European theorists: Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc and his theory based on stylistic unity and John Ruskin and his preservation doctrine which valued the effects of time and age to create monuments of human memory. Although their respective work has often been over-simplified, re-evaluation of their work and theories continue to offer insights into the issues of interpretation and intervention of significant historical buildings. This illustrates the tensions inherent in conservation between the rational and scientific on the one side, and the emotional and humanistic on the other, and their differing conception of authenticity.

In the early and mid-twentieth century, the conservation theories and approaches shifted firmly toward the rational and scientific. Philological theories were introduced into architectural conservation, particularly by Italians and the historical building was analysed as a documentary text recording history, time and place. This theory has become the basis of all international conservation charters that provide guidelines to various forms of interventions into cultural historical fabric. The tensions of the nineteenth century, however, are still relevant presently, as the ICOMOS Riga Charter of 2000 reveals. This charter clarifies the virtual ban on reconstructions of the Venice Charter but allows reconstructions of lost parts or a building if there is a nationally supported and political wish to do so.

---

9 Matero. (2007), 50
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2.2 The nineteenth Century: The Controversy between Restorers and Anti-Restorers

For preservationists, an ancient building is an almost religious manifestation, which represents a bygone time and a way of life; if it can no longer be maintained or propped up, the building should be left to collapse as a ruin. Philippot writes that John Ruskin noted that there has been a break in continuity between the time of the historical buildings and today’s age. 11 For Ruskin, it was physically and spiritually impossible to recreate history, the patina of the material and the intentions of the original designers and artisans, without total loss of authenticity. For Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, however, there is a ‘concept of style’ where “style is the illustration of an ideal based on principle”. 12 This underpins his often quoted saying that the “purpose of restoring a building is not to preserve, repair or rebuilt it, but to reinstate it to a condition of completeness which may never have existed at any time” 13 in order to achieve unity in style.

This debate is of importance when discussing Fagan’s theoretical approaches to conservation. The ‘restoration’ of the Castle was undertaken during a time when South Africa was politically isolated from much of the world, including developments in architectural conservation approaches. The conservation context in South Africa until the late 1990s can be described as historical and stylistic and Fagan’s intervention at the Castle followed the accepted local conservation norm.

2.2.1 Restorers: Viollet-le-Duc and the Restoration of Style

The establishing of general principles for the conservation of historical buildings and sites is a 20th-century phenomenon, but “the general principles are derived largely from conflicting European conservation theories of the nineteenth century”. 14 One school of thought, as exemplified by the writings

---
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and work of Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc (1814-1879), held restorations as “necessary re-establishment in a finished state [of that] which may in fact never have existed at any given time”.\(^\text{15}\) For Viollet, architectural forms were a natural result of a series of decisions and requirements such as use and programs, structural requirements and choice of materials and their inherent structural qualities. “Only logic can establish the link between the parts, allocating a place for each, and giving the building not only cohesion but also an appearance of cohesion through the series of operations which are to constitute it”.\(^\text{16}\) Thus, the resulting unity was what fundamentally constituted the art of the building and “could not be violated”.\(^\text{17}\) It was present in plan, section and elevation and in every structural element and detail. Viollet believed Hellenistic art had produced immortal masterpieces as had the French Gothic. These two art forms, however, followed two different laws and were therefore incompatible with one another; Viollet therefore refused to accept additions or modifications in a classical style to medieval buildings.\(^\text{18}\)

In his article *Restorations in Volume 8* of his seminal work ‘*Dictionnaire Raisonné*’, Viollet provided guidelines to the architect: before any work was attempted, a precise and meticulously detailed assessment and report of the building had to be undertaken, including drawings and notes and, as France’s different regions had varying styles and different schools of architecture, the architect had to have exact knowledge of these.\(^\text{19}\) In the article, Viollet suggested it was perilous to adopt an absolute position and that the action to be taken should depend on the particular circumstance. The architect therefore must develop a feel for the building and all its parts as if he were the original architect himself. This would give him the ability to work out alternative methods of restorations. If one method fails, he would have other options to fall back upon.\(^\text{20}\)

For Viollet, respect for the building meant ‘restoring’ its architectural unity. Jean-Baptiste Lassus (1807-1857), Viollet’s superior on the restoration of

\(^{15}\) Viollet-Le-Duc. (1855), quoted in Price (1996), 314
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\(^{20}\) Viollet-Le-Duc. (1855), quoted from Price (1996), 315
the Notre-Dame in Paris and other projects, published a statement in 1845 in the ‘Annales archéologie’. Here he stated that restoration was purely scientific and that the architect should totally ignore his creative instincts, tastes and preferences:

With almost religious respect he should inquire as to the form, the materials and even to the ancient working methods since the exactitude and historic truth are just as important to the building as the materials and the form.\(^{21}\)

Jokilehto notes that this statement indicated a new justification for the recreation of an architectural unity.\(^{22}\) For example, at the beginning of the Notre-Dame restoration, re-carvings were allowed only in exceptional cases. Later, many new elements were added such as to the church of La Madeleine le Vézelay restoration; the elevation of the Synodal Hall of Sens was rebuilt with only some fragments as evidence; and the Romanesque Saint-Sermin of Toulouse was restored in a hypothetical Gothic form.

Viollet also used modern materials such as steel to replace timber as long as the original structural concept was retained. Historical materials such as stone could be removed and replaced and therefore were no longer part of the original built fabric. Authenticity was not seen to be embodied in the material, but in the unity of style of the building.\(^{23}\)

These historicist attitudes spread through France, developed along similar lines in other countries, and remained pre-eminent in much of Europe during the nineteenth- and into the twentieth century. In Germany, Cologne Cathedral was stylistically restored between 1840 and 1880 reliant on only a few surviving fragments of thirteenth century drawings. In Italy, the 1893-1899 restoration of Santa Maria in Cosmedin in Rome by Giovanni Battista Giovenale (1849-1934) included removing the Baroque façade and re-creating the twelfth century form, and in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Friedrich von

\(^{21}\) Lassus. (1845), quoted in Jokilehto. (1999), 139
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Schmidt (1825-1891) began the restoration of St. Stephans Dom in Vienna in 1863, which included two massive new gothic towers.\textsuperscript{24}

From the 1840s, the conservation debate in England evolved into two opposing camps; the restorers and the anti-restorers. As Jokilehto summarises, the restorers, as in France, were concerned with faithful stylistic restoration and if required, reconstruction of the earlier architectural form, while also emphasising the practical and functional aspects.\textsuperscript{25}

The Gothic revival had been firmly established in England by the mid-nineteenth century with a number of influential proponents. Augustus W.N. Pugin’s (1818-1852) work and writings are important as he was concerned with re-establishing the way of life which gave rise to the historical buildings, especially the religious buildings. He railed against Classicism and Protestantism and argued that only by re-establishing and restoring the Catholic spirit could the liturgical re-arrangements and workmanship to English churches be properly done.\textsuperscript{26}

These aims were similar to the Cambridge-Camden Society which promoted ‘Catholic restorations’; the Ecclesiological Society (1845) was connected to the Camdenians. John Pearson (1817-1996), an architect who undertook work for the Camdenians, had the chancel at St Pancras in Exeter demolished and rebuilt it “so cleverly that even experts could mistake it for the original”.\textsuperscript{27}

Another proponent was Sir George Gilbert Scott (1811-1878) who was often compared to Viollet-le-Duc. Scott was a prolific Victorian architect who worked on numerous cathedrals, abbeys and as many as a hundred parish churches.\textsuperscript{28} He was a member of the Camden Society and followed their conservation principles that often led to the removal of historical material and the introduction of new elements. He was aware of the loss of authenticity and tried, often ambivalently, to reconcile the need of contemporary use with
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conservation while respecting the ancient building. For him restoration had to be based on conservation, but he recognized the difficulty and could not prescribe any definite rules as there were too many exceptions. “Conservative restoration” for Scott was based on respect for the original design and not for the original material or the existing historical form. In addition, if good documentation and archaeological evidence was available, it justified rebuilding what had been lost or damaged. Additional information may also be found by analogy in the region.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{2.2.2 Anti-Restorers: Ruskin, Morris and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Monuments and their wider Influence}

The notion of restoration as a means of re-establishing stylistic unity, thereby destroying authentic building was strongly opposed by some writers and thinkers, and gathered momentum from the 1850s onwards. Especially the English writers and theorists such as Ruskin (1819-1900) and Morris (1834-1896) were highly critical. They called stylistic reconstruction “a destruction of historic fabric” and advocated the preservation of a building’s physical history, including its patina, as cultural memory.\textsuperscript{30} They regarded historical buildings as a witness and as documentary evidence, which needed to be conserved intact and authentic, without falsification.\textsuperscript{31} Ruskin published and lectured on the values and significance of art, which was highly influential with regard to conservation. These included ‘The Stones of Venice’ (1851-1853) and ‘The Seven Lamps of Architecture’ (1849). The latter was concerned with architecture and especially the importance of ancient material. He defended the material truth of ancient buildings and that they, not their recreations were the nation’s real heritage and memorialised the past. Restoring a historic building, even if it was a faithful copy and using traditional methods, would mean the destruction of the unique and authentic work as moulded by the original artist and weathered through time and history.\textsuperscript{32}
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Ruskin’s writings had some influence on Scott, and Scott later recommended that the architect change as little as possible of the original and work in a tentative manner. Instead of one large building contract, he should rather undertake the work in small contracts. He still advocated the importance of complete and accurate measured drawings with detailed descriptions of all discoveries, which might be useful for future interventions.\(^\text{33}\)

In 1865, the RIBA formulated guidelines for restorations called ‘Conservation of Ancient Monuments and Remains’ based on recommendations prepared by Scott. It accepted that all historical periods and historical material was required for authenticity, and banned the scraping of old surfaces. Some Camdenian principles, however, were incorporated allowing removal of e.g. obstructions, wall linings and floorings. The Anti-Restorers rejected this and in 1874, Ruskin refused to accept the RIBA gold medal because the stylistic destruction of authentic fabric was continuing.\(^\text{34}\)

Ruskin’s influence spread and the Anti-Restoration group was gaining in importance. In 1877, Morris founded the ‘Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings’ (SPAB) and shortly afterwards produced its Manifesto. The society highlighted two essential considerations: protection was not limited to specific styles, and that historical buildings only represented specific periods as long as their authentic material was in situ. The society’s main aim was to prevent conjectural and stylistic restorations and promote proper conservative treatments and maintenance of historic buildings.\(^\text{35}\) Proponents saw historical buildings, through their accretions over the centuries, gain in historic age and aesthetic value. The destruction of historical elements for archaeological research, religious rituals and repairs or for stylistic unity was denounced as ‘madness’.\(^\text{36}\) Particularly the weathering of the buildings over time embodied authenticity. The patina embodied the “golden stain of time”. The patina of age is not just the dirt on its surface, but is “the permanent alteration of the surface of materials as a result of weathering and ageing processes”.\(^\text{37}\) The society
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was active in saving threatened buildings from restorations or demolitions and providing guidelines for preventative maintenance, and thereby causing the least alteration to the historic building.  

As Jokilehto summarises, the anti-restorers were conscious of “historic time”, insisting that each building belonged to a specific historical and cultural context, and that it was impossible to recreate this with the same significance in another period. The only possible task was the protection and conservation of the genuine material of the original object. The anti-restorers believed that authenticity was in the materials and the patina of the historic buildings.

The society’s influence and the promotion of Ruskin’s and Morris’s ideas spread beyond England and similar societies were founded elsewhere to interfere directly in planned restorations. Morris’s Manifesto was translated into a number of other languages, which had an influence in Europe. In Germany, Georg Gottfried Dehio (1850-1936), an art historian from Strasbourg, wrote extensively on German historical buildings and is regarded as the founder of modern conservation approaches in Germany. Dehio insisted on the principle:

To conserve and only to conserve! to complete only when conservation has become materially impossible; what has fallen can only be rebuilt under quite specific and limited circumstance.

In Italy, Giacomo Boni (1859-1925) an archaeologist and architect who had met Ruskin, took up his principles on conservation particularly in Venice. An important theoretical contribution to conservation developed in Milan, which was similar to restauro filologico, a historical approach in linguistic studies. Tito V. Paravicini (1832-1899), who had read Ruskin and had embraced conservation principles, and compared monuments to texts that reflected history, developed Restauro filologico for architectural conservation. This approach would later help define methodologies of re-integrating lacunae.

---
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Ascensión H. Martínez notes the emergence in Italy of ‘a ‘third way’, an approach that avoided both the style-obsessed excesses of the restorers and the radicalism of those who would prefer to see the disappearance of buildings rather than an intervention.\textsuperscript{42}

At the end of the nineteenth century, Camillo Boito (1836-1914) took up the conservation concepts of Paravicini and became the most visible protagonist of the Italian conservation movement.\textsuperscript{43} He was to provide the link to modern conservation approaches with his “theory of philological restoration”. In 1882, he initiated restoration guidelines for the Direzione generale delle antichità. They were, however, still strongly historicist. Shortly afterwards in 1883, he changed direction and produced the first modern Italian charter, based on philological restoration and summarised into seven principles/criteria for interventions. Ancient monuments were defined as documents which reflected the history in all its parts. It recommended that all new parts were to be clearly distinguishable using different materials, more simplified and contemporary forms, and had to be dated. Furthermore, new additions should not contrast too greatly with the original but must be contemporary in style. Boito continued to refine his theory, classifying conservation into classes such as archaeological, pictorial and architectural conservation. Reconstructions were acceptable in exceptional cases and based only on clear documents.\textsuperscript{44}

Boito’s contribution led to the rejection of stylistic restoration and to the formulation of the ‘building-as-document’ approach which was to emerge as the dominant concept in the twentieth century conservation, enshrined in the Venice Charter, and which today, notwithstanding the Riga Charter, still underlines contemporary conservation approaches as promoted by international conservation authorities.

\textit{Summary}
This debate between the historicist restorers and anti-restorers is important as a basis to understand Fagan’s recreation of lacunae at the Castle. The
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Historicist restorers believed that with careful and meticulous study of historical buildings and their construction methods they could authentically imitate and accurately rebuild parts of buildings. The Anti-Restorers rejected this as they believed that the historical buildings were of a different age and could not be restored by imitation as the building’s worth lies in its ancient material. They believed that architecture is perceived simultaneously as a whole and as its parts. All new elements would inevitably alter the perception of the whole to some extent and, the more they imitate the lost or the authentic remains, the more insidious the impact on the whole. Ruskin recognized that no matter how scholarly or well made, an imitation is still an imitation – it has no authenticity. 45 The different meanings attributed to concepts such as ‘authenticity’ and ‘respect the building’ revealed the antagonism of the two groups. Phrases such as ‘respect the building’ have diametrically opposed meanings – historicists respected the unity of the building style and form and not the original materials, whereas the anti-restorers only respected the authentic materials and its layered and ingrained patina of history and time of the building and not its style.

2.3 The Twentieth Century: Modern Conservation Theories and approaches toward Lacunae

The heated controversy of the nineteenth century led to an increased awareness in the early twentieth century of the philosophical issues of the creative processes, meanings and values of art, and its conservation. Writers and thinkers such as Camillo Boito, Alois Riegl, Erwin Panofsky, Rudolf Wittkower and Giulio C. Argan and others, challenged the historicist approach. 46

The next major impetus for re-conceptualising conservation theories in Europe was the shocking and massive destruction and damage to cultural properties and whole towns or cities during the two world wars. After the First World War and the formation of the League of Nations, one of its commissions convened a conference in Athens in 1931 to formulate universal criteria on the conservation of architectural monuments, including restorations. The resolution

45 Null. (1985), 32
46 Jokilehto. (1999), 213
of the conference, later known as the Athens Charter, generally abandoned stylistic ‘restorations’. 47 One of its article stated that reconstruction of ruins only be allowed by reassembling collapsed existing original material known as anastylosis. 48

Later, after WWII, Germany, France, the Low Countries and Italy again faced the dilemma of how to respond to even more severe losses. This brought forward new restoration approaches, particularly in Italy. Benedetto Croce (1866-1952), Giulio Carlo Argan (1909-1994), Roberto Pane (1897-1987) and Cesare Brandi (1906-1988) and others became influential in formulating principles that have become the foundation for the critical process of modern conservation and restoration, and which have been included in international guidelines and charters. 49 They were influenced by a particular Italian concept of aesthetics based on the theories and writings of Giambattista Vico (1668-1744). According to Auerbach, Vico suggested that every civilisation and period had its own possibilities of aesthetic perfection, that works of art must be understood as products of variable individual conditions and must be judged by their own development. For Vico there was no aesthetic dominant rule and that aesthetic judgements originate from individual taste or experiences. 50 Two centuries later, Croce, a philosopher and writer (made Italian Senator for life in 1910), was particularly influenced by Vico, and published a monograph on his work The Philosophy of Giambattista Vico in 1913.

Croce, in his ‘The Essence of Aesthetic’ (Breviario di estetica) which appeared in the form of four lessons (quattro lezioni), emphasises the quality of the whole object over the qualities of its details and created a method of aesthetic appreciation which was independent of practical, social and economic implications. Croce “made a significant contribution to the conceptual basis of later restoration theory, especially in Italy”. 51

Brandi’s theories on aesthetics have a direct link with these previous works by Croce and Vico. Argan and Brandi were instrumental in establishing a
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unifying and scientific conservation authority in Italy, the *Instituto Centrale del Restauro* of which Brandi was its first director.\(^{52}\) Its aim of restoration was not to only reintegrate losses, but to re-establish the work of art in its authenticity, thereby focussing mainly on its materiality. The aim of restoration was also to re-discover “a work of art in its material consistency” which was seen to contradict the restoration of architecture, i.e. to respect the monument in the form in which it was inherited. This was taken further by Piero Cazzola (1908-1979), who saw that both were founded on accurate historical-critical and material analyses and were conceived as an “expression of a specific cultural maturity”.\(^{53}\)

Directly after the war, especially in Italy the scientific and philological theories were criticised for only emphasising the documentary and historic significances and ignored the creative and aesthetic meanings and values. In Italy, the loss of venerated historical buildings, bridges and town-gates was seen as an aesthetic loss. The Italians Roberto Pane, an architect, and Renato Bonelli, an architectural historian, emphasised the importance of a *creative* requirement on restoration. This however, was not stylistic restoration, and Pane disagreed with reconstructions based on analogy where other buildings in the region are used as models to copy. He required all elements of historical or artistic character, irrespective of period to be conserved. There was also a critical choice to be made as to what to conserve. Restoration should expose hidden aesthetic aspects obscured by insignificant additions. However, just to be historically critical was insufficient and he and Bonelli believed that there is a moment in every restoration that is a *creative* one. This is when the restorer must have the confidence to proceed creatively and not imitate the original architect. In this way, reconstructions of lacunae would not be a technical problem but rather a question of how to give new life to the building, reflecting its historic and *modern* aspects in a balanced composition. Bonelli argued that conservation/restoration was a “critical process and then a creative act, the one as an intrinsic premise of the other”.\(^{54}\) Pane believed that all restorations
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include a creative and critical element, and if done well, could themselves become a work of art.

Janett Null notes that once there is recognition of the artistic value of a historical building, then there is an obligation to that work of art.\textsuperscript{55} This entails giving any intervention the best creative effort so that the new work will be on some equivalent basis as the historical building, and not devalued with mediocrity. She uses Carlo Scarpa’s entrance window at the Castelvecchio in Verona as an example. Here, Scarpa’s window was not only a “formal re-elaboration or even celebration of the existing opening in the wall, but has an architectural brilliance of its own so that new and old are mutually enriching”\textsuperscript{56}. Blundel Jones and Canniffe note in their assessment of the Caselvecchio that Scarpa’s intervention in several phases (1957-1974) attempted to “revive the continuity of history without resort[ing] to historical pastiche, by pursuit of craftsmanship which mixed traditional materials and forms with contemporary ones”.\textsuperscript{57} According to Blundel Jones and Canniffe, the over-emphasis of critics and commentators on Scarpa’s idiosyncratic detailing missed a far more important aspect: Scarpa was working in a politically tumultuous context as well as within the conflict between tradition and modernity characterizing the history of twentieth century Italian architecture. The ambiguity of Scarpa’s architectural language subverted the notion that tradition and modernity were opposed, and “present[ed] instead a series of meditative demonstrations on the potential unity of the functional, the aesthetic and the contextual”.\textsuperscript{58} Blundel Jones and Canniffe continue that Scarpa’s “intension was to create a memorable experience from the conjunction of past and present without resort[ing] to historicism, while respecting the integrity of the objects, buildings and spaces with which he dealt”.\textsuperscript{59}

Brandi, after working at the Soprintendenza of Monuments and Galleries, became director of the Instituto Generale de Restauro from 1939 to 1959. Here, the conservators had to resolve many issues, including the
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reintegration of lacunae. The ‘dogmas’ of Croce, amongst others, were seen as too restrictive and Brandi (with Argan) began discussing the philosophical questions of restoration of art and architecture,\textsuperscript{60} referring in particular to the German philosophy and historiography of Husserl, Fiedler, Wölfflin, Benjamin and Heidegger and Riegl.\textsuperscript{61} Brandi was influenced by these various theories and writings on aesthetics. He wrote a series of dialogues in the Platonic manner, which included a volume entitled \textit{Teoria del restauro}, published in 1963. The \textit{Teoria} was a philosophical basis for restoring objects, which were defined in their artistic-aesthetic as well as in their historical aspects. In contrast to the trend of integrating human creativity into the general socio-economic context, Brandi isolated the specificity of a work of art, going back to Vico and relying on Croce, claiming it was the result of a unique and creative process.\textsuperscript{62} This ‘singular process of creation’ begins with the “artist’s will and works its way through different stages to liberation in a figure that has gradually taken shape in the artist’s senses and acquires physical form”.\textsuperscript{63}

Janet Null quotes Brandi to justify her argument that the reason we cannot restore a work of art to any former state, beyond the conservation of the fabric, is that any intervention must be of its own time to be either historically or artistically legitimate.\textsuperscript{64} As Null notes, the ‘recognition’ and achieving consciousness and knowledge of the building is the event, which restores the historical building to us. It is in this deliberate dialogue between artefact and viewer that restoration departs from conservation. The legitimate purpose of restoration is interpretation, not recreation. This may be achieved through different means i.e. “if the historic building is regarded and treated as though it were an art work; re-qualifying the building by re-establishing its functional relevance and meaning; filling lacunae for stability or protection and to support dismembered parts and adding into the building to serve new purposes or expanded needs”, etc.\textsuperscript{65} Null herewith adopts Brandi’s art-based restoration theory in architectural conservation.

\textsuperscript{60} C. Brandi mainly wrote and referred to restoration of art, and the theories and terms cannot be directly transferred to architecture.
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Brandi was describing works of art, particularly painting, but he does describe the transformation of architecture into art as follows: “When human spirituality feels urged beyond practical requirements, architecture becomes ‘dematerialised’ and ‘decanted’ in its form”.66 A building therefore does not only consist of material, but every element that it consists of as well, as its spatial-structural system expresses its architectural concept. So, “even though the material matter of the building deteriorates with time, the human consciousness will continue to perceive its artistic content”.67 As a result, its perception also requires a critical process to reclaim its significance in human consciousness, a process similar to Heidegger’s philosophy.68 Brandi’s philosophy on restoration requires the object to be a work of art that exists in the world as a presence in human consciousness. When an object is restored, it must be based on the “singular recognition of the work as a work of art”69 Brandi identified two possibilities for restoration: firstly, to bring an industrial or common product back to efficiency, this is what most ordinary, and especially vernacular buildings are; the other is the restoration of special products, i.e. works of art. A work of art can only be restored based on an aesthetic approach to the work itself. This was not a question of taste but the ‘specificity’ of art and that art would determine the restoration and not vice versa.70

Brandi proposed a duality to analyse a work of art: on one hand it is in itself (in its material form or structure) and on the other hand, how it manifests itself at the moment it is received in a consciousness of a viewer. A historic building exists physically in its material form but at the same time, it is transmitting an architectural concept with all its associations to a spectator. So while the materials age with time, its artistic concept or cultural meaning and significance is perceived by human consciousness and this, Brandi says, can only happen in the present.
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Brandi formulated two axioms and a definition of restoration, which form the conceptual bases for restoration of objects, defined as works of art, as well as the aim of restoration. These are:

**Axiom I:** “Only the material form of the work is restored”. 71

The precondition of this principle is that restoration must have as an aim that the physical form of a work of art should last as long as possible. Brandi analyses the materiality of a work of art as “…the material in relation to the aesthetic aspect of a work of art could be understood to having two functions: one related to providing the ‘structure’ (struttura), the other concerning the ‘aspect’ or appearance (aspetto) of the project.” 72 For Brandi, priority in restoration is given to the material, which is aesthetically the most important. According to Hansar, an Estonian conservation architect and urban planner, Brandi suggests that when there are new additions, the materials of the structure should be the same.

**Axiom II:** “Restoration must aim to re-establish the potential unity of the work of art, as long as this is possible without producing an artistic or historical forgery and without erasing every trace of the passage of time left on the work of art”. 73

For Brandi, the inseparability of its material and design is part of the potential integrity of the work as a work of art as a whole. “It is not just a geometric complex of its parts, but all its elements together make up the whole in correspondence with the artist’s or architect’s concept”. 74 As a consequence, “a work of art …will continue to exist as a potential whole in each of its fragments”. 75

**Definition of Restoration:** “Restoration is the methodological moment in which the work of art is appreciated in its material form and in its historical and aesthetic duality, with a view to transmitting it to the future.” 76

---
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For Brandi, Hansar states, the moment a work of art is appreciated as such there is a relationship between the work of art to time and space. A work of art has been historicised at two different moments: at its creation and when it is appreciated. Therefore, the “only justified moment of restoration is the present historical time, which contains both the past and the present. Every time a restoration is undertaken, it is undertaken in the present and the recognition of the art work by the individual must be in the present. Restoration is a historic event and the restorer must therefore make this clear so that in the future the work can become a visible part of its history. Choosing any other moment, such as a stylistic or period restoration, would lead to arbitrary results and declare the object as a concluded process.

Brandi formulated principles for restoration:

…any integration must always be easily recognisable, but without interfering with the unity that one is trying to re-establish. Thus, at a distance from which the work of art will be viewed, the integration should not be visible.

Brandi further stated that “a lacuna in regard to a work of art is an interruption of the figurative pattern” and “…the most serious aspect in regard to a work of art is not what is missing but what is inserted inappropriately. The lacuna, in fact, will have a shape and colour that are not relevant to the figurative aspect of the represented image; it is inserted into the work of art as a foreign body”.

Brandi’s restoration principle is based on Gestalt psychology, “where a lacuna independently starts to depict figures and destroys the integrity of an image”. Using a Gestalt psychological approach, the perception of the repaired lacuna as being in the foreground and dominating, while the original figuration recedes to the background, must be avoided, i.e. the missing part must be part of the background and the original must be seen before it.

---
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Brandi proposes for lacunae in paintings the “solution of the neutral tint”.\textsuperscript{82} Here the lacunae are suppressed by using a tonal tint, which is as neutral as possible. He proposes various techniques in the restoration of paintings. For smaller surfaces, watercolours can be used. For slightly larger lacuna that are not too critical, the \textit{Tratteggio} technique is used: small dots or vertical stripes of fitting colour and tonality are inserted. This technique is not visible from a distance but it clearly reveals the filling on closer inspection. For large losses and where the potential integrity of a work has been lost, the lacuna should be preserved. However, the \textit{acqua sporca} (literally, dirty water) technique can be used to neutralise the lacuna. Here, the destroyed surfaces are treated with a neutral tint, so that the original remnants of the painting can become clearer. Brandi further states, reconstructions larger than the original, should be avoided as they might transform the whole into a forgery.\textsuperscript{83}

Jokilehto notes that there are different ways of doing this, and that the problems of lacunae in paintings are different to those of architecture, although the principles are the same.\textsuperscript{84} Hansar, in her conference paper on lacunae in urban contexts, suggests \textit{tratteggio} might entail new reconstructed elements which, from a distance exemplifies ‘copies’ of historical buildings or their elements.\textsuperscript{85} Philippot notes that the artist must discover how to do this; the aim is to achieve a consistency of the reintegration system. In architecture, he suggests that changes of material or surface treatment (akin to but different from the original) can have satisfactory results.\textsuperscript{86}

Brandi’s clear criteria for repairing lacunae in painting, was expanded by for historical buildings and ruins by Paul Philippot.\textsuperscript{87} He believed buildings that have retained their social functions can accommodate larger reconstructions of missing parts than archaeological ruins, although these should not be larger than the original structures. He believed the only aim of restorations should be, through critical interpretation, to “reduce or eliminate the disturbance caused by the lacunae, and in such a way, that the intervention can be unmistakeably
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identified as such.” Philippot notes a special problem in archaeology – a ruin is normally considered the object to be preserved, not as a fragment of the object, since ruins themselves are cultural objects with their own emotional values and appeals to the imagination. This would be destroyed by an attempt to restore the ruin to its original state. The only reconstruction of ruins is possible with anastylosis. 

Brandi refers to new additions as a new phase in its history, in that such interventions facilitate architectural development and the introduction of new uses and functions. Stylistic reconstructions, however, interrupt the creative process and abolish time between the creation of the object and the moment of the work. Brandi saw copies, replicas and reproductions as useful for documentation and when having to prepare casts. Even though the method of making a cast and a fake is similar, a fake results from the intention to falsify. Producing an object in the style of a past period and offering it to the market as an original of that period is a falsification and a forgery.

2.4 The Castle: Values and Meaning

Alois Riegl (1858-1905) argued convincingly that ‘monuments’ are considered as such because modern societies assign meaning and significance to them. Analysing mainly monuments and their different values, Riegl’s theory made observations clarifying the different meanings and categories associated with artistic, age and historical values. According to Choay, his theory “reveals the simultaneous and contradictory demands of the various values accumulated by the historic monuments over the centuries.” These conflicts according to Riegl are not irresolvable and “are amenable to compromise, negotiable on a case-by-case basis, depending upon the condition of a given monument and the social and cultural context in which it is placed.”
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The Castle’s function, meaning and value have changed over its three-and-a-half century existence. Its function has changed from a VOC citadel fort, housing the VOC officials and their families, militia, slaves and prisoners to an exclusively military function after the British took control of the Cape and the Colonial Governors moved to the Tuynhuys in the Gardens. The Castle’s meaning changed again after the National Party victory in 1948 and it gradually grew in stature as a symbol of Nationalist importance. As Leslie Witz\textsuperscript{94} (and Ciraj Rasool)\textsuperscript{95} argue, the tenuous nationalist victory required the power base of the state to be broadened. This meant “promoting [the] accommodation [of] a wider white nationalism, whose right to rule stemmed from its self-proclaimed role as a bearer of civilisation, a role which started with colonial occupation in 1652”.\textsuperscript{96} Further they state that the

“foregrounding of Jan van Riebeeck in the 1952 festival was central to the broader political scheme. Van Riebeeck was the symbol, not of the Afrikaner nation, but of white rule as a whole; and Cape Town was promoted as the founding [mother city] of the white nation”.\textsuperscript{97}

The Castle played an important part this re-conceptualisation. In the Festival, many art exhibitions, musical concerts, dramatic performances, youth displays and sporting competitions took place in Cape Town, many of them centring on the Castle which was proclaimed to be “South Africa’s oldest and most memorable building”.\textsuperscript{98} The highlight of the spectacle was a re-enactment of the arrival of ‘Jan van Riebeeck’ in ‘Drommedaris’ at Roggebaai on 6 April 1952, culminated in ‘Jan’ and ‘Maria’ being driven in ox-wagons from their landing to the Castle, and them waving to the crowds from the Kat balcony before retiring for refreshments inside the Castle.

Witz argues that a major impetus in attempting to establish a past-present alignment in the public historical sphere comes through the State.\textsuperscript{99} Decisions around material and other forms of support for heritage-type projects are grounded in the state constituting itself as the mechanism through which
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the spatial and temporal limits of a singular national unit are established. He continues saying that the state assigns a set of associations between selected moments to fix a national narrative, which moves in a specific direction toward an already determined future. This function of the state has been referred to as ‘curating the nation’, where the nation, with its monuments, statues, memorials, museums, and so on, is equated with an open-air museum where the state, as curator, decides what to display and how. ¹⁰⁰

2.5 The Castle: Semiotic Meaning

The first theories on semiotics, by the American mathematician and philosopher, Charles S. Peirce (1839-1914), provide insights into the world we dwell in. ¹⁰¹ Semiotics, under a Peircean view, may be understood as an attempt to see all knowledge and experience as a structured system of signs in dynamic interaction with one another. His writings on icons and symbols help to understand the Castle’s projection of meanings as well as the meanings projected onto the Castle by changing determinants of governance and hegemony. The Castle was used to project the meanings of its current rulers. After 1948, the State manipulated aspects and objects associated with history for its agenda of white rule. In the apartheid era, the Castle became a symbol of national identity and the State appropriated what where perceived Dutch icons to further Afrikaner Nationalism at the helm of white rule.

The iconic architectural footprint of a five-pointed star was used by the State as a symbol of power and dominance and the symbol was used for Nationalistic depictions such as the national road numbers and more significantly, was used on flags and emblems of different divisions of the Nationalist South African Defence Force. Even independent organisation such as the Automobile Association of SA used the five-pointed star, not to mention more mundane exploitations such as dairy producers and instant coffee suppliers.

¹⁰⁰ Witz. (2003), 118
The use of the Castle as a symbol for the state continued into the late apartheid era. In the 1984, the then prime minister P.W. Botha, who presided over the inauguration of the restoration of the Castle, laid the foundation stone of a new museum on axis with the 1926 World War I Delville Wood memorial in Longueval-Somme, France, designed by Herbert Baker (architect) and Alfred Turner (sculptor). The design of the museum was based on a five-pointed star and resembled the Castle of Good Hope, albeit in a much smaller scale.

The importance of the Castle ‘restoration’ as a cultural icon of Nationalistic importance to the white public, is revealed by the large number of newspaper articles and press releases in the main-stream Cape Town press. Newspaper articles from 1979 to 2010 were viewed and they overwhelmingly regarded the ‘restoration’ positively - some articles were glowing in their approval. Of the approximately 130 articles and commentaries, only two letters stood out for querying the ‘restoration’ but on cost. The State’s appropriation, and the extensive ‘restoration’ of the Castle as a symbol of its legitimacy was never questioned.  

2.6 Conservation Charters and International Conventions

The international conservation charters in the second half of the twentieth century reflect the international shift in conservation approaches and principles toward authenticity of material and eventually to values-based conservation. The Nara Charter introduced a relativity of values, which is being expanded in to values-based conservation. The use of the terms in the Venice Charter of 1964 illustrated two important aspects: its emphasis on the authenticity of and respect for the original building fabric, and its reflection of Eurocentric attitudes. Subsequent charters, although based on the Venice Charter and its core scientific principle of ‘building as document’ approach, attempted to broaden the Eurocentric terms of this Charter to accommodate different cultural contexts. This was achieved by ultimately shifting the emphasis from universal values to relative values. The relative power of universal values as
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opposed to relative and contextual values is the main debate within
conservation and heritage management at present.

2.6.1 The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments
(1931)

The Athens Charter was the first truly international charter and prescribed
universal architectural restoration guidelines. The charter permanently
discontinued stylistic restorations and cemented the scientific approach as first
theorised by Camillo Boito. Alessandra Melucco Vaccaro notes that this
scientific approach made “a clear break between the past and present … and
eliminat[es] the possibility of reinserting oneself into the creative process to
open it up once more in competition with the great artists of the past”.104

2.6.2 ICOMOS Venice Charter (1964)

The International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments
and Sites, known as the Venice Charter, was seen as a revision of the Athens
Charter but was based substantially on the Carta del Restauro Italiana (Italian
Restoration Charter) formulated by Gustavo Giovannoni in 1931 which itself
was based on the Athens Charter. It continued the rejections of stylistic
restorations, supported minimum intervention and compatibility between old
and new materials as well as respect for the historical layering and patina. Any
new additions to historical buildings were to reject conjecture, and be
reversible. Article 12 states that ‘Replacements of missing parts must integrate
harmoniously with the whole, but at the same time must be distinguishable
from the original so that restoration does not falsify the artistic or historic
evidence. Article 15, regarding excavations states “All reconstruction work
should however be ruled ‘a priori’. Only anastylosis …can be permitted. The
material used for integration should always be recognizable and its use should
be the least that will ensure the conservation of a monument and reinstatement
of its form.”105
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According to Paolo Marconi and Claudio D’Amato, the Charter’s points were inspired by an article by Pietro Gazzola and Roberto Pane, “Proposals for an international restoration charter” written in 1964. Its eleven points were adopted with minor changes into the Charter. For Marconi and D’Amato, the main difference between the Athens and Venice charters was the ‘radical’ shift from restoration to conservation.

Over the years, the Venice Charter was criticised as not being universally suited for conservation situations outside of Europe. Marconi and D’Amato criticised the charter as being ‘profoundly flawed’. They argue that the cultural environment it was formulated in was post-war Italy and they interpreted the Charter as enforcing Italy’s attempt to “control the market of the authentic original and forged copy”. Whatever the reasons, other countries indeed found the provisions of the Venice Charter ill-suited for their restoration approaches.

2.6.3 ICOMOS Nara Document on Authenticity (1994)

The Nara Document (formulated in Nara, Japan) is seen as marking the move away from universal ‘absolute’ standards and “toward acceptance of conservation judgments as necessarily relative and contextual”.

Pamela Jerome, quoting B. von Droste and U. Bertilson, states that in “the post-modern era of preservation, the anthropological view of cultural heritage has gradually superseded that of the monumental.”

---
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Japan has a particular cultural context not considered by the Venice Charter. Here, most historic buildings are timber constructions. These require periodical dismantling, repairing and reassembling, especially historical timber shires where it is part of the religious culture.\textsuperscript{112} Japan, according to Knut-Einar Larsen, had developed an amalgam combining two conservation approaches, incorporating "the age-old tradition of craftsmanship and technical knowledge, and the use of scientific research methods."\textsuperscript{113} Jokilehto continues that the Japanese approach is "characterised by a challenge of perfection" and is "reflected in the conscious choice … aim[ed] at the aesthetically most perfect form of a historic building."\textsuperscript{114} The Venice Charter used the word ‘authentic’ in its preamble, but did not define it. It was applicable specifically to areas where buildings are constructed as permanent – ‘brick and mortar’. Nara was concerned with culturally specific authenticity and it clarified technical questions, which had frustrated the use of the Venice Charter. This allowed buildings to be re-newable, e.g. where timbers could be replaced.

Stovel lists a number of “delusions” dispelled by the Nara Document in order to facilitate applications for World Heritage listing. These corrected the idea that authenticity was a value in its own right, and postulated that it was rather a “value category of culture”. Stovel argues that “authenticity choices are reflective of the values of the people who do the choosing but do not themselves constitute heritage values”.\textsuperscript{115} Other delusions dispelled by Nara are the notion that authenticity is an absolute qualifier and that it has to be present in all its categories (design, material, setting and workmanship). The analysis of authenticity was perceived instead as being concerned with relative measurements where each of its components need to be examined independently for their ability to embodying authenticity.

Stovel notes that two major issues were, however, not dealt with: one was how to ensure that conservation assessments were not undermined by arbitrary or ad-hoc decisions within "the all-forgiving mantle of cultural context";
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the other neglect of the Document was that it also did not define authenticity.\textsuperscript{116} The Nara Document therefore emphasised the specific cultural context of a heritage resource when evaluating its authenticity.

### 2.6.4 Australia ICOMOS Burra Charter (1998)

Australia ICOMOS found it necessary to draft its own place-specific guidelines, the Burra Charter, which were modified a number of times over a twenty-year period between 1979 and 1998. Although it is based on the Venice Charter, the Burra Charter “introduces the concept of place instead of monument and site; it emphasises the less tangible aspects of cultural significance, associations and meanings that places have for people, and the need to involve people in the decision-making process.”\textsuperscript{117} The Burra Charter emphasised a values-based conservation approach and management system. While the Venice Charter places sole importance on the intrinsic values of a site in its physical and material characteristics, the Burra Charter recognises also the extrinsic values bestowed on sites by people and communities.\textsuperscript{118}

Reconstructions are deemed appropriate only where a place is incomplete due to damage or alteration, and only if there is sufficient evidence to reproduce an earlier state of the fabric. It is considered that in rare cases, reconstruction might be appropriate as part of a use or practice that retains the cultural significance of the place. Reconstructions should be identifiable on close inspection or through additional interpretation (Article 20).

### 2.6.5 ICOMOS Riga Charter on Authenticity and Historical Reconstruction (2000)

The Riga Charter was the result of an ICOMOS sponsored regional East European meeting which focused on authenticity and the reconstructions of culturally significant but destroyed buildings in republics of the former Soviet Union. In the 1990s in newly independent states, a search “for symbols of
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statehood often seemed to result in the recreation of former monuments with little or no regard for historical pertinence, accuracy or context".\textsuperscript{119} The Riga Charter’s articles follow Nara closely and included a definition of authenticity (used at the Nara conference but not included in its Document), where:

Authenticity is a measure of the degree to which the attributes of cultural (including form and design, materials and substance, use and function, traditions and techniques, location and setting, and spirit and feeling, and other factors) credibly and accurately bear witness to their significance.\textsuperscript{120}

The Riga Charter accepted the established norm against reconstruction of the cultural heritage, except in:

- circumstances where reconstruction is necessary for the survival of the place; where a ‘place’ is incomplete through damage or alteration; where it recovers the cultural significance of a place; or in response to tragic loss through disasters whether of natural or human origin, and providing always that reconstruction can be carried out without conjecture or compromising existing in-situ remains, and that any reconstruction is legible, reversible, and the least necessary for the conservation and presentation of the site, and that the need for reconstruction has been established through full and open consultations among national and local authorities and the community concerned.\textsuperscript{121}

The Riga Charter therefore specifically deals with damage and loss due to war or political actions and requires a broad-based national consensus by authorities and communities to recreate this loss.

\begin{center}
\textbf{2.6.6 Lausanne Charter – ICOMOS Charter for the Protection and Management of Archaeological Heritage – (1990)}
\end{center}

This charter, inspired by the Venice Charter, lays down general principles relating to aspects of archaeological heritage management. These are basic universal principles, based on scientific premises, which need to be
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supplemented by regional and national guidelines and principles to reflect specific issues. Article 7 it states that reconstruction:

should, however, be carried out with great caution, so as to avoid disturbing any surviving archaeological evidence, and they should take account of evidence from all sources in order to achieve authenticity. Where possible and appropriate, reconstructions should not be built immediately on the archaeological remains, and should be identifiable as such.122


The UNESCO sponsored Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention (WHC) provides criteria for listing sites as World Heritage Site. These conventions and guidelines have been signed by the largest number of United Nations members, including South Africa in 2004. The obligations of the UNESCO conventions are legally binding on member state parties, whereas the charters’ role is to encourage professionals to adhere to commonly agreed upon principles.123

The Operational Guidelines include an evaluation for conservation (Chapter 3) which sets out the criteria for designating cultural properties, as well as defining treatments for the maintenance of authenticity (Chapter 8).124 They note that the most important aim of the conservation of World Heritage Sites is to maintain their authenticity:

The aim of conservation is to safeguard the quality and values of the resource, protect its material substance and ensure its integrity for future generations.125

In order for designated properties to be included on the World Heritage list, they must meet the ‘test of authenticity’ as set out by the guidelines. These are authenticity in design, materials, workmanship and setting, as well as use, function, traditions, language, spirit, and feeling.126 The Guidelines stress the
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importance of maintaining evidence of the monuments existence over time, and its authenticity through the ‘ravages’ of time, which include alterations and the effect of weathering, i.e. its patina. The Guidelines continues to list the values which contribute to the heritage resource’s significance. These are cultural values, relative artistic or technical value (based on research), rarity value (based on statistics), socio-economic values, functional value and educational, social and political values. It notes that these may have both positive and negative impacts on the resource and that detailed evaluation of each depends on the object and its possible listing as a World Heritage site.

The WHC also established the ‘outstanding universal value’ (OUV) concept to classify places of universal importance. As the significance of a property may not be recognized by all people, everywhere, opinions may vary and ‘universal’ was therefore seen to mean as referring to a property which is highly representative of the culture of which it forms part. OUV is defined by six criteria and sites have to possess one of these to be eligible to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

These are:

- unique artistic or aesthetic achievement
- outstanding importance in terms of influence on subsequent developments
- rarity
- significant example of a type or structure
- vulnerability of traditional form
- exceptional historic significance

2.6.8 The Charters on Authenticity

Reconstruction will affect the object’s authenticity. As the discussion so far reveals, the definition of authenticity and how it is perceived and valued by conservators, varies greatly. Not only does the definition vary fundamentally between restorers and preservationists, the meaning fluctuates within the scientific conservationists as its values are perceived to be relative and are not required to be present in all attributes. As Lowenthal argues in a Nara
Conference paper, “authenticity is never absolute in practice, always relative”. The dichotomous positions are easier to articulate: for stylistic and aesthetic restorers, authenticity lies in the original concept and intent of its creators to create a completeness of form and detail; whereas for philological conservators, the authenticity of a place is based on the historic stratification of all its layers of growth and the patina of time. The knowledge-based concept of authenticity fluctuates and, although codified in international charters, its definition was only incorporated into the Riga Charter in 2000.

The Venice Charter was broadly recognized as being too Eurocentric and, as Michael Petzet argues, that it “appears not to be compatible with some traditions of non-European cultures especially if it is applied aesthetically”.

Currently, the debate concerning authenticity is centred on the extent of relativity as well as its universal attributes. Jennifer Ko’s article on reconstruction in Oceania advocates a regional and relative understanding of authenticity. This position is countered by Jokilehto’s opinion that the notion of truth and authenticity does have universal relativity. In her article, Ko notes that the Nara consensus emphasised that authenticity cannot be judged using fixed criteria and that all heritage properties need to be judged within their own contexts. However, it was later confirmed that a site’s material authenticity is the highest and determining factor for the international conservation authorities. In the Oceania region, many culturally important structures above ground are either timber or grass requiring cyclical renewal – thus material authenticity as required by the charters is impossible to achieve. The Japanese Shinto Ise Shrine was eventually inscribed as a World Heritage Site but as an intangible property for which there is no formal list.

In his article on relativity of values and identity, Jokilehto argues that there are degrees of absolute values that apply universally. He agrees that each culture has its own characteristics and identity and cultural heritage must be verified within these contexts. This, however, does not mean that all values
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are equal. The question is rather how to identify valid issues according to specific qualities. ICOMOS has attempted to identify issues of universal validity for evaluations of potential World Heritage sites.\textsuperscript{131} These recognise the creative diversity and the debate is how to identify genuine/authentic examples of such creativity. Regarding cultural diversity, different cultures have generated divers, yet comparable responses. Choosing the most representative must also meet minimum quality criteria and must exhibit integrity. A critical judgment is required of properties “based on research and documentary evidence to be able to decide the quality, integrity and the values of the cultural response represented”.\textsuperscript{132}

\textsuperscript{131} ICOMOS. (2004)
\textsuperscript{132} Jokiletho. (2006), 15
2.6.9 The Charters on Reconstruction of Lacunae

The reintegration of lacunae is a specific issue in restoration and was first identified in the field of art restoration where the methodology and their technical solutions are connected in a particular way.\textsuperscript{133} Probably the most influential modern theory regarding filling lacunae is Cesare Brandi’s \textit{Teoria del restauro}, which has dominated the restoration schools in Europe since it was published in 1963.\textsuperscript{134} However, Brandi’s \textit{Teoria}, concerned primarily with works of art restoration and in particular paintings, has proven to be inadequate to deal with three-dimensional objects such as architecture and sculpture, as noted by Vaccaro.\textsuperscript{135}

Brandi’s terms and definitions cannot be transferred to architectural restoration as he is concerned with works of art. Stephen Townsend, however, suggests a transfer of the definitions and terms can be achieved, but only if and when the architectural object, say, of cultural significance is described and valued as if it were a work of art.\textsuperscript{136}

Brandi’s \textit{Teoria} is important for architectural restoration as his ideas influenced the Venice Charter a year after its publication.\textsuperscript{137} Brandi’s definition of restoration, (below), is very similar to wordings in the Venice Charter:

Restoration must be directed at the re-establishment of the potential unity of the work of art, as long as this is possible without committing an artistic falsification or a historic falsification and without eliminating any trace of the work of art’s passage through time.\textsuperscript{138}

As Martínez suggests, Brandi defined restoration as more of a critical act than a technical one.\textsuperscript{139} Brandi argued that, without undermining the importance of the historical and documentary value of a work of art, restoration was based on aesthetic values and the aim of restoration was to re-establish the potential
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unity. Brandi’s’ theory recognises that filling a lacuna must take into account the visual processes and mechanisms of the human eye. The goal of filling the lacuna is to re-establish the unity of the image. Brandi observed that a lacuna disrupts the figurative pattern of the work of art, affecting not only the immediate area, but disturbs the entire field of vision. This causes the lacuna to move into the foreground as the image recedes into the background. Brandi proposes the inversion of this perception with a correctly filled lacuna where the image regains the foreground position and the lacuna recedes into the background.

For Brandi, the objective of restoration was not the renovation of historical buildings but their conservation as cultural objects. Therefore the restoration should adapt the modern reintegration work to the historic parts. He proposed three fundamental principles:

- Any integration should be easily recognisable at close distance but, at the same time, it should not offend the unity that is being restored

- The part of material that directly results in the images is irreplaceable as far as it forms the aspect and not the structure

- Any reconstruction should be made in such a manner that it will not be an obstacle for future interventions, (i.e. the idea of reversibility); indeed these should be facilitated.

The idea of reversibility (now seen as potentially problematic as it negates the particular time and place of a repair) was formulated as interventions were seen as being based more on hypotheses and interpretation. When replacing lacunae it is impossible to know exactly what the original state was, even with documentation. As new evidence is found, it should be possible to reverse or re-treat the intervention. There is also the awareness that restorations are always witnesses of the particular period of their undertaking and they reflect
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the contemporary conservation approach as well as tastes and aesthetics. This is a contradiction of the historical layering approach: previous restorations become part of the history of the object and therefore become integral with the object. An example is the restoration of the ruins at Knossos in the 1920s, and in particular, its colour scheme, which was ‘toned down’ in the 1950s but recently reinstated, as it was seen as an important part of the meaning and message of the site over time.

Nicholas Stanley Price also identifies the reconstruction of ruins as being one of the most controversial issues in conservation. He says the urge to complete again a historical building that contains lacunae is very strong. He believes we sometimes find it intolerable to see a creative work diminished in its intelligibility. The idea that incomplete objects may have a greater value runs counter to this compulsion. This, however, is the central idea of the conservation charters since 1931 as all charters strongly discourage reconstruction of incomplete buildings. Why this norm was almost entirely absent from any South African conservation project in the 20th century would be an interesting research project.

Price observes the appeal of reconstruction and asks when excavated or incomplete buildings could possibly be reconstructed to a similar state to how they might once have appeared? The questions he asks are: what are the accepted principles for reconstructions? How have reconstructions been justified? What have been the arguments against reconstruction? And what principles can be proposed to help guide issues in reconstruction?

Price notes that all conservation charters or conventions reject reconstructions except under strict and limited conditions. The exception, as mentioned earlier, is the Riga Charter, which allows reconstruction if there is a national will, and consensus.
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Price, however, suggests that reconstructions could be justified for a number of reasons. These include national pride, where the building played an important role in the country’s history and therefore deserves to be rebuilt as a symbol of a glorious past; re-use, where the reconstructed building can serve a historic function, or a new one; education and research, where the process or rebuilding can be useful for research and the result could be an important didactic tool for visitors; tourism promotion, where reconstructed buildings can attract visitors and generate funds; and site preservation, where a reconstruction could safeguard a site from developmental pressures.

The cautions Price cites are the loss of the evocative value of ruins; the difficulty, even impossibility of maintaining authenticity; the ethical issue of conveying erroneous information; the disruption of landscape values; distorted site interpretation; the cost; and the distortion and falsification of evidence.

Price proposes principles for site reconstructions in order to bridge the gulf between the charters and conservation practice. He argues that a reconstructed building, if based primarily on excavated evidence, must be considered a new building. Reconstruction of buildings should be considered only if the values of a site will be better appreciated than if the buildings are left in a ruined state, leaving the ruin as a source of inspiration or a memorial. The surviving evidence for the former building must be fully documented in such a way that this record is always available in the future and that it fulfils a scientific and ethical obligation to record for posterity. The surviving evidence of the former building, or for different historical phases of it, must not be destroyed or made inaccessible by the act of reconstruction, in order to fulfil a scientific obligation to allow [built] hypotheses to be verified or rejected. The evidence used (its strengths and its limitations) for the reconstructed form must be interpreted clearly to all visitors. This fulfils the ethical obligation not to mislead or misinform the public. Lastly, he suggests that buildings that have been incorrectly reconstructed in the past could, on a case-by-case basis be
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preserved as they are, with the erroneous reconstructions part of the history of ideas.\textsuperscript{148}

Martínez suggests minimum intervention with consolidation of the remains and respect for the historical authenticity of the monument. He is less in favour of architects claiming the right to manipulate and interpret an edifice using current styles and languages to replace missing parts that contrast in scale, material and colour. The relationship between the past and the present, and between historical and contemporary architecture is one of limitations. He questions to what extent contemporary architecture can intervene without the monument losing its cultural value and becoming a different thing. He advocates discreet intervention, where the formal typology and materials of the historical architecture are respected, and the new is used to strengthen the values of the restored edifice.\textsuperscript{149} Martinez quotes Andrè De Naeyer, a Belgian conservation architect and lecturer:

Conservation should not put obstacles in the way of architecture, and good architecture must respect and promote the memory of our predecessors. Good architecture must safeguard and guarantee permanence; it must rescue ancient material, structures and historical spaces.\textsuperscript{150}

According to Martinez, in addition to reversibility and visual distinction, compatibility is another criterion to be addressed. Besides using compatible materials which do not damage the historical object, “compatible use or function is seen as an important aspect as it can help conserve the object, or destroy it.”\textsuperscript{151}

\section*{2.7 Archaeology and Restoration of Ruins}

Although Article 15 of the Venice Charter does not rule out reconstructions, it does so for reconstruction of excavated ruins. The Castle restoration included three substantial reconstructions built on top of historic excavated foundations:
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\textsuperscript{149} Martínez. (2008), 257
\textsuperscript{150} Martínez. (2008), 258
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the Dolphin Pool and the *Bakhuys* (1987) building, the Corporal’s House (1997-2000) and a new services building adjoining the *Secunde’s House* (1988). Jameson, in his introduction to his book *The Reconstructed Past*, argues that Archaeologists have been aware of the value of archaeological research in establishing authenticity as a prerequisite to reconstructions and restorations, but that architects and historians have been slow to recognize this.\(^{152}\)

The repair of lacunae is by definition, a physical alteration of the artefact and its history. Opponents claim that it cannot but undermine the authenticity of the site and alter the experience and perceptions thereof. It can unnecessarily mislead the public (and experts) if reconstructions have not been absolutely verified by archaeological and documentary research and the observer is not explicitly informed. As contemporary cultural perceptions and norms influence reconstructions and as the complete details about a site can never be entirely recovered and explained, a true reflection of the past can never be achieved.\(^{153}\) Reconstructions on historic excavated foundations also destroy evidence and prevent future research on the site, in effect freezing any tenuous knowledge to the period of reconstruction.

Opponents to the reconstruction of lacunae are often in conflict with the advocates of such reconstructions who employ a less critical approach to verification, and emphasise the educational and interpretative values.\(^{154}\) Proponents believe that a researched and planned reconstruction that does minimal damage to the archaeological remains is justified as public interpretation tools. “They provide a three-dimensional encounter with history to which people can relate and comprehend within their own experience … and provide a spatial reality and intimacy to material culture that cannot be accomplished by story-telling or two-dimensional and small-scaled exhibits.”\(^{155}\)

Catherine Woolfitt warns that problems can arise from adhering dogmatically to a single aspect or principle of conservation philosophy and

\(^{152}\) Jameson. (2004), 1
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losing sight of the wider picture of the ruined site.\textsuperscript{156} This includes its history, its present condition and its future. She argues that proposals for any form of protection or intervention are based on respect for the essential values and integrity of the site and its structures and must aim to ensure that these are not compromised. Usually, however, permanent buildings on ruins will inevitably have some adverse impact. She adds that once architectural remains on archaeological sites have been exposed and valuable data and portable artefact have been extracted, it is important to know how to safeguard the exposed material. If no resources are available, excavated and recorded remains should be back-filled, or if the remains are of great importance, purpose built shelters need to be erected over these. The potential protective measures include re-burial, open shelters or reconstruction.\textsuperscript{157}

Woolfitt argues that reconstructions be judged within their local, regional and national context as appropriateness is relative to the particular conditions and needs of individual sites and their contexts. She provides underlying principles for reconstruction under such conditions. Generally, the older the ruins, the greater the potential problems and complexities that will arise. Attempting what she calls an ‘authentic’ reconstruction will become more and more fraught with problems as historical documentation and memories taper off progressively from the present until only physical remains are available as evidence.\textsuperscript{158}

Woolfitt suggests there are legitimate reasons for reconstructing ruins; however, the test must include a rigorous assessment of the motivation and justification of the use made of the site or buildings. The debate is nuanced as the various conservation charters have different conservation philosophies, ethics and values which they emphasise.\textsuperscript{159}
2.8 Fortress Louisbourg: An International Comparative Case Study

Woolfitt provides the example of the partial reconstruction of the eighteenth century French Fortress Louisbourg at Cape Breton in Nova Scotia (1960-1990),\textsuperscript{160} which is analysed in detail in Fry’s article \textit{Designing the Past at Fortress Louisbourg}.\textsuperscript{161} This example is a large-scale reconstruction and does not qualify as the reconstruction of lacunae in Brandi’s theory. It was a comprehensive re-building above the excavated ruined foundations of eighteenth century French fortifications and associated settlement. It was, as Fry says, an unabashedly political venture, planned by the highest levels of the federal government for the 1967 centenary celebration of the establishment of Canada: the decision was to rebuild on top of the remains the fortress’ configuration of 1744, the year before it was besieged and fell into the hands of invading New Englanders.

The reconstructions were based on extensive research and a third of the fortress was recreated; the rest was left ruined to preserve this aspect of its history. Fry notes that a design committee was established, whose decision making relied upon a hierarchy of evidence: archaeological remains were ranked as the highest level of evidence, followed by documentary sources of varying degrees of reliability. When there was no evidence of these kinds, typical analogous sources were considered, extrapolated from the site or even other forts in the French colonies. Fry continues that preservation of original fabric was never an overriding priority in the restoration at Louisbourg, as modern structural and safety requirements made this impossible. Equally, very few original stone components were inserted into the new buildings, the rest survive as archaeological artefacts and as museum pieces.\textsuperscript{162}

Woolfitt notes that the reconstruction, would be criticised and assessed as a ‘recreation’ by the Burra Charter, and would therefore be rejected in Britain and Australia. When the terms of the Nara Document, which emphasise
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the cultural context in assessment of authenticity are applied, “the conclusion might be more favourable, allowing for factors specific to the Canadian context such as the comparative scarcity of eighteenth century architecture above ground and the importance of the site as the strongest fort on the Atlantic coast of North America at the time”.¹⁶³ It was argued that there is little left of that specific period in Canada, that the fort was the strongest of North America, that the reconstructed site has significantly helped the region economically through tourism and that it has provided an educational tool to portray the history of the early French colonists.¹⁶⁴ The reconstruction is highly popular in Canada, where it is seen as a form of preservation.

Although Fry notes that the “form is there but not the substance” and that Louisbourg’s ‘moment in time’ is “less a journey back to the 1740s than it is to the 1960s,” he concedes that the place nevertheless succeeds on a number of levels.¹⁶⁵ Primarily it has been a major tourist attraction and has transformed the appearance and economy of the modern town of Louisbourg. It is also a vast educational tool, which reaches a wide public in an understandable and enjoyable way. The main lesson though would be to move away from the ‘moment in time’ concept in order to “increase the depth and richness of the program in a way that more comprehensively reveals the complexity of Louisbourg’s history in its national context”.¹⁶⁶

2.9 South African Conservation Context

Very little, if any, critical analysis has been published on architectural conservation approaches in South Africa over the last century, although academic work, which covered aspects of local twentieth century conservation, has been produced such as Townsend’s unpublished PhD thesis.¹⁶⁷ There have been numerous conservation interventions of historic buildings, particularly in the Western Cape of early VOC period buildings, farm manor houses and complexes and churches. The ‘restorations’ of early Cape

¹⁶³ Woolfitt. (2007), 150
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¹⁶⁷ Townsend. (2003), 129-131
buildings until the late 1980s were almost invariably all stylistic re-creations and attempted to returned the building to “a particular style or to return it to a previous significant or ‘best’ configuration”. Often the justification was based on previously documented states or based on interpretative assumptions and analogy. The great European restoration/preservation debate of the nineteenth and early twentieth century seems to have had little or no influence in South Africa. The European and later international transition to a scientific-based conservation approach has left little evidence in South African conservation work until the late 1990s.

The local acceptance of stylistic and aesthetic considerations in the interventions of early VOC / Cape Dutch buildings was established in the beginning of the twentieth century with examples such as the then celebrated rebuilding of the gutted Groot Constantia by F.K. Kendall in 1925. Renowned and highly regarded modern architects such as Revel Fox and Norman Eaton undertook ‘restorations’ using documentary evidence, traditional workmanship and analogy to achieve a stylistic wholeness. Eaton’s restoration of Reinet House in Graaff-Reinet in 1950 ‘returned’ the building to a 1865 photograph, and aimed to achieve authenticity through stylistic accuracy and not historical stratification. The remodelling of the Old Town House on Green Market Square in Cape Town into an art museum undertaken by James Solomon in 1927 combined stylistic ‘restoration’ (of the exterior) with an entirely new and re-invented traditional 17th century Dutch guildhall interior.

After the Venice Charter of 1964, conservation interventions in South Africa continued to be historical and stylistic recreations, as propagated by Viollet-le-Duc, and practiced by local architects such as Dirk Visser, Revel Fox and Gabriel Fagan. Fagan become known as a conservation architect after the celebrated stylistic reconstruction of the President’s office Tuynhuys, and the reconstruction of Church Street in Tulbagh after an earthquake. The only
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exception to this trend was John Rennie who trained in York at the School of Advanced Architectural studies in the mid 1970s.

A conservation symposium in Cape Town in 1960 favoured historically correct ‘restorations’, which included recreation by analogy if insufficient information was available.\textsuperscript{172} Mary Cook, in her paper titled ‘The Authenticity of Restoration’ writes that “no work is worth doing unless it is authentic, or correct or right”\textsuperscript{173}. Her best example of a defining restoration was F.K. Kendall’s reconstruction of Groot Constantia, “whose aim was not to restore Groot Constantia to its original form, but to its best”\textsuperscript{174}. For her, correctness of style and detail was as important as the retention and recapturing of atmosphere or character. She emphasised the importance of various items such as maintaining strong elevational features and symmetry, correct door heights and window and pane sizes, correct timbers and ironmongery, etc.\textsuperscript{175}

Norman Eaton, in the paper presented at the 1960 symposium, states that the “aim and purpose of preservation is the belief that in any country, especially a young one like SA, there should be as much visible and authentic reference as possible to the best creative efforts of the past.”\textsuperscript{176} Eaton believes that “the aesthetic pinnacle reached by the Cape Dutch work, in and of its time and country, will never be exceeded.” This “truly great indigenous architecture therefore requires meticulous and correct restoration and preservation.”\textsuperscript{177} This was echoed by the architect Oliver Dods who worked for the Fagans on the Castle restorations. He said that the ‘Italian method’ of restoration (i.e. inserting modern looking parts into historic fabric) is inappropriate in South Africa, as our architectural legacy is much more limited and rare and that we need to preserve the aesthetic wholeness.\textsuperscript{178}

This approach was re-iterated at the 1982 Potchefstroom Conference which issued guidelines for restorations of structures and sites in South Africa.
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The preferred method of ‘restoring’ buildings was to limit it to only one stage, its best period in its history, i.e. removing all historical layers except the identified preferred option. This conference also recommended design by analogy.\textsuperscript{179}

A conservation conference held in 1988 in Cape Town was the first gathering of local conservation experts who challenged the prevailing conservation environment. Some papers called into question the hegemonic conservation model, while others referred to the documentary nature of objects as opposed to stylistic considerations.\textsuperscript{180}

The reasons for the prevalence of stylistic restorations and the almost complete lack of a theoretical conservation discourse in twentieth century South Africa have not been researched; until the late 1980s there is no critical literature on the topic. Fagan points out that the Venice Charter only appeared in 1964 and Nara and Burra in the 1990s.\textsuperscript{181} Another aspect is that there was little conservation polemic translated into English (internationally or locally) until the 1980s. Townsend recalls his disquiet as a young architect over the debates in South Africa in the 1960s and 1970s, which were “conspicuously void of theory, principle and ethics”.\textsuperscript{182} This however, does not explain the lack of knowledge or interaction with the nineteenth and early twentieth century debates and the Athens and Venice Charters.

The political and cultural context, especially from the 1940s has to be considered as having had played a significant role. Nationalism, the White identity creation, the removal of Black people from any kind of franchise, WWII, the role of modernism, etc. and their effects on conservation are all important aspects which need further research. Conservation appears to have been seen as an overwhelmingly white preoccupation and focussed primarily on VOC and early Dutch colonial buildings and landscapes in the Cape.\textsuperscript{183} Conservation
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\textsuperscript{183} A Victorian double storey building located next to the 18th C Rust-en-Vreugd was demolished in 1961 as it was perceived to negatively affect the newly restored early Cape Dutch Cape house.
organisations were established from the 1950s such as the Simon van der Stel Foundation, Historic Homes of South Africa Ltd. and the Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa, as well as older institutions such as the Dutch Reformed Church were also active in promoting conservation.

From the 1960s, the Nationalist government began ‘restoring’ many buildings, even towns, through national and provincial departments or authorities. Examples include Rust-en Vreugd (1961), Grosvenor House, Stellenbosch (1960s), Old Supreme Court (1960s), Tynhuys (1967) Tulbagh (1969) as well as the Castle (1969-2001).

This conservation activity coincided with the increasing international isolation of South Africa due to the Nationalist government’s racist policies, and its rejection by international organisations. This has been noted by Witz in his writings on the white Afrikaner state’s need to forge a particular national identity consistent with its political agenda.\(^\text{184}\) South Africa did not renew its membership of the British Commonwealth in 1961 and was excluded from United Nations activities from the early 1970s until 1994 and was not a State Party to any international cultural heritage conventions of UNESCO.\(^\text{185}\) By the 1970s, the country had become an inward-looking nation with a government that was paranoid and suspicious of any external contact. As a consequence, South Africa was isolated from international interaction and progresses technically, academically and socially even though a few interested individuals maintained links.

This introverted national context with almost no external contact, coupled with an effective government strategy of misinformation and propaganda based on the notion of a threatened European existence in Africa strengthened the perceived need of preserving the physical representation of this selected Afrikaner history. The VOC landing at the Cape and the establishment of a European presence in Southern Africa, was advanced as being historically the most important period in South Africa’s history.\(^\text{186}\) This
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elevated the built remnants of that time to ‘monumental’ status. This was similar to the national identify revivals of building styles in many European countries at the end of the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{187}

The legislation, which regulated conservation in South Africa, was the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act (1934) until 1969 when it was replaced by the National Monuments Act (No.28 of 1969). The 1969 Act established the National Monuments Council, which was responsible for the conservation and management of a set of cultural resources that span a period of approximately 2-million years.\textsuperscript{188} However, the range of buildings and sites proclaimed as national monuments by the Commission in the thirty-odd years of its existence almost exclusively reflected the colonial and apartheid history of South Africa. Deacon and Hofmeyr note\textsuperscript{189} that well over 95% of all declarations were buildings constructed by people of European decent since the establishment of the VOC station at the Cape.\textsuperscript{190}

The South African conservation context reveals aspects of the dominant cultural and social structures of its society.\textsuperscript{191} Equally indicative was the peer support of the restorations undertaken. Both the South African Institute of Architects and the Cape Institute of Architects\textsuperscript{192} awarded certificates of excellence to historical and stylistic restorations well into the 1990s. Gabriel Fagan was the recipient of a SAIA Award of Excellence for the Castle restoration in 2002.\textsuperscript{193} The adjudication panel noted that “the names of the Fagans can now be recorded against those of the original design engineer Dombeyer and the likes of Thibault as having significantly contributed to the architectural legacy of our country.”\textsuperscript{194}

\textsuperscript{187} This is seemingly an unrelated development, as no literature could be found showing any contact with South African architects and stylistic restorers in Europe or England. Although Herbert Baker and F. Kendall had contact with English architects and undertook restorations, I cannot at present detect a stylistic restoration intent.\textsuperscript{188} Deacon and Pistorius. (1996), 6\textsuperscript{189} This was reliant on Frescura’s 1990 paper challenging the NMC status quo; Frescura. (1991), 12-22\textsuperscript{190} Deacon and Hofmeyr. (1996), 16\textsuperscript{191} Barthel. (1989), 88\textsuperscript{192} Formally Cape Provincial Institute of Architects; now Cape Institute for Architecture.\textsuperscript{193} Refer to Appendix A\textsuperscript{194} Piet de Beer, ed. \textit{Editorial - Architecture South Africa}, August/September 2002, 03
It was in this context that Fagan undertook the restoration of the Castle, where authenticity was not perceived to be in the stratification of a multi-layered history, but rather had to be revealed by recreating the original intent of its first VOC creators.
CHAPTER THREE
DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF LACUNAE CASE STUDIES AT THE CASTLE OF GOOD HOPE

Figure 1: Layout Plan: Location of case studies at the Castle of Good Hope discussed in this paper

3.1 Introduction to the Conservation Intervention

The brief from the client, the Ministry of Public Works Department, to Fagan Architects was to restore the Castle to its previous appearance, remove ‘unsightly’ additions and do necessary repairs. However, although the Castle undoubtedly required serious structural and waterproofing repairs, the overriding intention was to restore the Castle to “its original unblemished” appearance.\(^{195}\) (See Figure 1) This required a theoretical and methodological

\(^{195}\) Original contract from Department of Public Works 19/05/1969 (translated from Afrikaans by author)
basis from the architect in order to undertake the task. Echoing similar words by Viollet-le-Duc, Fagan has written about the values of old buildings:

Through the continuous thread of our communal culture, we can identify ourselves with previous generations and, by better understanding them, re-affirm our own values. For a building to transmit these values, however, it must be completely genuine and credible.\textsuperscript{196}

He continues:

The building must be regarded as a valuable document, which must not be falsified, … additions and changes should be clearly visible and not ‘antiqued’. In this way the sequence of events is legible and the layering clearly visible. The restorer should be informed by thorough historical research and detailed archaeological examination of all parts of the building. As personal whims should play no role, broad principles are required.\textsuperscript{197}

Fagan often refers to the removal of a large toilet block in the second courtyard and the saw-tooth building to the east of the Castle and emphasises the positive effects these removals had for the Castle. Fagan’s interventions also removed most of the English period windows and doors (which “cut into and disrupt the symmetry of a 17\textsuperscript{th} century Dutch façade”\textsuperscript{198}), the English period hipped roof on Block A and D and many other British army accretions, some of which were nearly two hundred years old.

For Fagan, the infilling of lacunae at the Castle were defining for a number of reasons; most important was to return the Castle to its ‘original Dutch’ appearance, “with its narrow passages between the buildings, to its condition at the time that it was a citadel.”\textsuperscript{199} His stated justifications for reconstructions were as follows:

- The missing parts such as the building adjoining the Secundes House, front gates and the pool courtyard complex were required to complete the \textit{ideal form} of the complex. Although the moat was not a lacuna, it too
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was recreated to embody the concept or intension of an ideal VOC fortification.

- There were aspects that were seen to be so rare, particularly the demolished pool and surrounding building, that a reconstruction was justified. “The pool would be the only example in South Africa of a very common feature of the seventeenth century formal European gardens”.

Extensive historical research was undertaken at the Castle. This was a search to discover historical evidence of the various buildings and their assumed condition during the VOC period and their subsequent development. Each original detail was carefully recorded in order to be able to make exact replacements. Other buildings were studied to solve design problems by analogy; the entrance timber gates in the Jaffna fort in Sri Lanka were copied in detail and used as a template for the Castle’s main gate. Regarding authenticity, an earlier quote from Fagan is relevant:

>[f]or a building to transmit these values, however, it must be completely genuine and credible.

To achieve ‘genuineness’, Fagan believed buildings needed to be ‘restored’ in such a manner so that they convey a credible message through an “appearance of cohesion” and “unity in style”. The removal of many British period elements, which were seen as undermining the true value of the Castle, was an attempt to ‘restore’ the unity of the creative act of the VOC. The meaning and values of authenticity for Fagan, as they were for the restorers of the nineteenth century, are embedded in the imagined idea of the historical building and not in the historical fabric.

Fagan, echoing the words of preservationists such as Ruskin and the Venice Charter, emphasised that “the essential insight is that any historical
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building is a document, of greater or lesser value".\textsuperscript{202} He continues that any minor repair or maintenance, which might reveal new aspects of the artefact, will inevitably involve destroying part of that document. The theoretical position of reading that document, however, is different to that of Ruskin’s. Fagan is reading the ‘document’ to ultimately discover the ‘original’ text (as far as this is determinable) of the building in order to fill lacunae with the imagined loss and to ‘restore’ a lost unity, than to preserve the existing state of the text/building as found with all its blemishes and in doing so, for him, “disrespect” the original.

Although there was an attempt to represent different periods at the Castle such as preserving Block E’s dominant British period, the intervention did not approach the Castle as a ‘document’ as understood by say, Boito. In Fagan’s notes on the project he writes:

However, attrition through careless or ill-considered alterations through the years caused a gradual degradation of the building so that it has become necessary to examine the building thoroughly and to restore it with care and sympathy.\textsuperscript{203}

In a 1990 newspaper article, Gwen Fagan states that they did not want to restore the Castle to a certain period. “One would rather want to cover its whole history by restoring some portions to the Dutch era, others to the Dutch era with an overlay of British and others to the pure British era”; and by re-flooding of the moat “will be the final touch to bring the appearance of the outside entrance closer to the original”.\textsuperscript{204} However, it is clear that this is not the view that dominated their work. Fagan’s approach to the Castle intervention was one of historical and stylistic ‘restoration’ similar to the theoretical approaches of the nineteenth century as exemplified by the work of Viollet-le-Duc and Gilbert Scot.

The Castle of Good Hope ‘restoration’ was undertaken by Fagan from 1969 to 2000.\textsuperscript{205} The project began at about the same time that Fagan was involved in two of the most publically visible conservation projects of the time,
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that is, the then State President’s office Tuynhuys (1967) and Church Street in Tulbagh after a devastating earthquake in 1969. At Tuynhuys, Fagan discovered the original ‘Cape Rococo’ roof balustrade underneath the roof covering, confirming the Josephus Jones, an artist and traveller, depiction of circa 1790. Fagan called this “the most important find in this field this century” and later compared this to the excavation of Simon van der Stel’s circa 1706 ‘Dolphin Pool’ foundations at the Castle.\textsuperscript{206}

At Tulbagh, Fagan repaired about twenty damaged houses to their pre-English influenced appearance. This was mainly based on 1811 drawings by Josephus Jones and a photograph of 1865. Most, if not all alterations and additions after these dates were removed. Fagan states that Church Street before the earthquake was a slum – the houses were a warren of unsanitary and unliveable additions without natural light or ventilation. To resolve unknown aspects, ‘design by analogy’ was considered appropriate where there was insufficient information from old photographs and the finer decorative work on, for example a gable, could not be seen.

To leave such a gable bare would obviously not convey the spirit of the original. Although this is dangerous ground, we prefer in such instances to compare and assimilate all available examples in the district, and then to create anew in the same spirit.\textsuperscript{207}

Fagan also stated that to preserve elements of the English influence was financially impossible; i.e. to replace, for example cast-iron Victorian verandahs after the earthquake would have been far too expensive with the limited budget allocated.\textsuperscript{208}

These historical and stylistic ‘restorations’ were highly praised at the time, especially Tulbagh which directly led to the initiation of similar urban ‘restoration’ projects in other early Cape towns, such as Graaff-Reinet,\textsuperscript{209} financed by wealthy Afrikaners such as Anton Rupert.
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\textsuperscript{208} Gabriël Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
\textsuperscript{209} Gabriël Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
The Castle conservation work progressed as funds were made available by the client, the Department of Public Works, slowly at first but continuously and more generously later in the process. The project in the end consisted in total of seven distinct contracts. Although all contracts had elements of structural and waterproofing repair components, the conservation intention was to systematically ‘restore’ the complex to re-establish the main concept of a Dutch VOC citadel fortress. Although the initial brief of the client required some restoration work to be undertaken, by the end of three decades Fagan had ‘restored’ the Castle in its entirety including filling the moat with water. The Castle’s internal and external aesthetic and spatial configuration and how it relates to its surrounding urban context and beyond had altered the complex to a state which had never existed in this form. The SAIA Award of Excellence adjudication panel summarised Fagan’s work as follows:

This building, through the creative work of the architects is now one that did not exist before. The licence that the architects have granted themselves is based, however, on an impressive body of meticulous research, the documentation of which alone makes a vast contribution to the field of heritage not only nationally, but more importantly, internationally.

---

210 Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010. Elize Botha, wife of the then State President P.W. Botha, took a special and personal interest in the castle restoration. After a lull in progress due to lack of funds the project was restarted in earnest following a phone call between Gwen Fagan and Elize Botha. Elize Botha phoned Gwen to congratulate Gabriël Fagan on his Cape to Punta-del-Este yacht race win. On enquiry how the Castle intervention were progressing, and being told of its suspension, a week later the PWD minister was in Cape Town arranging its resumption. Elize Botha visited the site on numerous occasions, on her own or with her children, and once with P.W. Botha. Particularly her daughter Rozanne would pop in often on her own.

There are other examples of wives of Presidents becoming involved in prestigious restoration projects. One example is Jacqueline B. Kennedy, wife of USA President J.F. Kennedy and her popular and publicised restoration (on the national CBS TV program, with an all-time record of 56-million viewers) of the interior of the White House in 1962, (its first), which she at first called ‘that dreary Maison Blanche’. In another outburst she said: "Redecorate?! I hate the word! – It must be restored – and that has nothing to do with decoration! That is a question of scholarship!" She did, however, establish the White House Historical Association to fund the continual restoration without being a burden on the treasury. Jacqueline did progress to other important conservation projects and personally was involved in saving a row of eighteenth century buildings from demolition on Lafayette Square and advocated the restoration of Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington D.C.

211 Henk Lourens, author interview, 29/09/2010. Lourens was a trainee architect at Fagan Architects and on being called up for national defence duty; he was ‘stationed’ at the Castle, becoming effective ex officio clerk of works 1982-84.

212 Gabriël Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010

213 SA Architect. (2001), 24
The interviews with employees, artists and the Fagans themselves reveal an exhaustive methodology, which was applied throughout the various intervention contracts. This methodology was based on documentary research, detailed analysis of the existing buildings with 'as-found' notes and drawings as well as archaeology. Gwen Fagan did most of the historical research in the local archives and libraries as well as the British Records Office in London and the Rijksarchief in The Hague. They undertook overseas visits to do site inspections of other VOC forts, in particular in Sri Lanka as there are many existing forts. These, they say, provided them with valuable information especially with elements which they perceived were lost, such as the large timber entrance gates. They argue that these forts and their components were built by the same company and in some cases by the same people and therefore exhibited similar solutions and detailing. At the Jaffna fort in Sri Lanka, as with many Sri Lankan VOC forts which had moats, they saw that many had retained these and which influenced their idea to recreate the originally intended Cape Town moat.

Although sections of the original moat walls were excavated on the western and south-western side, the literature and archaeological evidence confirm that the Castle moat never was a “key defensive element, [but] was more a gesture to the formal science of fortification”. The recreation of a section of the moat and its filling with water is “Fagan’s attempt to respect the intention of the early Dutch occupiers and to restore the Castle to the first five or six decades of its existence”. The instructions for the design of the Castle moat from the VOC headquarters, however, were ultimately unrealisable due to local conditions which very different to Holland, Batavia or Sri Lanka. The Cape Mediterranean climate with its unreliable rain, and rocky or poor soil conditions around the Castle created a moat of no military significance. In summer, archaeological investigations show, the water depth was only 0,9 meters high, and in winter, water torrents would briefly threaten the Castle.

---

214 The contexts are of course very different and Sri Lanka is not similar to the Cape. It could be argued that Indonesia would have been more appropriate as the VOC headquarters were located there.
216 Hall. (1990), 31
217 Prof. Martin Hall, archaeologist on sections of the Castle, telephone conservation, 25/10/2010
walls. Hall argues that by the early eighteenth century, the moat was militarily obsolete not only due to its design and functional shortcomings, but also due to advances in weaponry. The moat eventually became a refuse dump and was finally filled in during the 1860s and landscaped.\(^{218}\)

The recreated moat, with its constant level of water and landscaped embankment between the moat and Castle wall has been ‘restored’ to an imagined ideal form, one of Viollet-le-Duc’s main theoretical concepts where a building is completed to a state “which might never have existed at any given time.”\(^{219}\) It reflects what should have been built and not what recorded documentation reveals.

Documentary evidence was gathered by Fagan in order to attempt to establish the extent of the ‘original’ Castle in its first decades and to track its subsequent changes. The plan of each building lining the Castle Walls (for convenience called “Blocks”) was traced over time from historical maps from different periods which revealed the changes. Block C, for instance, had three distinct stages from the early and late Dutch period and the occupation of the Castle by the British army.\(^{220}\) Pre-restoration photographs show that over the years, the military had added numerous ad-hoc, non-descript utilitarian additions. Most windows had been replaced or their positions moved, disrupting the symmetry of the earlier Dutch façades. Gwen Fagan says the British changed the buildings without any regard for the existing aesthetics and had unsympathetically altered much of the Castle.\(^{221}\)

Regarding detailing Gwen Fagan says, echoing Viollet’s superior Jean-Baptiste Lassus that little needed to be designed as all details were already there …and that the architects must restrain their creativity.\(^{222}\) Lassus stated that “… the architect must acquire scientific knowledge as well as step aside completely, forget his tastes, preferences and instincts” and the architect should “inquire as to the form, the materials and even to the ancient working

\(^{218}\) Hall. (1990), 32
\(^{219}\) Jokilehto. (1999), 155
\(^{220}\) Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, Public Lecture: Friends of Welgemeend & Boerneef Art Collection, Cape Town, 31 August 2010
\(^{221}\) Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
\(^{222}\) Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
methods since the exactitude and historic truths are just as important”.223 Gabriel Fagan, however, is aware of the creative process and has noted in lecture notes that the “present Castle is unavoidably a new creation by its restorer”.224

Many elements in the Castle, such as windows, doors, roofs, etc. were replaced. Viollet has written that if the restorations require elements to be replaced, the new work should respect the original forms “but that does not necessarily mean conserving the original material”.225 Viollet further argues, that the architect must have “mastered every detail of that building, just as if he himself had directed the original building”226

![Figure 2: Governors’ Residence: Fagan Architects drawing, Block G, located opposite Dolphin Pool](image)

Although most building interventions undertaken at the Castle ‘recreated’ the VOC period, there were exceptions, revealing an awareness of other periods at the Castle. In Block B, the building connecting the Leerdam and Oranje bastions, which was assessed to be the first building within the Castle walls and built out of blue stone, Fagan retained the elegant large British sash windows in the Kapteins House, as well as retaining their exposed brick quoining surround detail.

Another example of a layered restoration is Block E, the building between Buuren and Catzenellenbogen bastions. Fagan’s conservation approach to this building was to preserve its VOC and British legacy and is the only building that retained the British period hipped steel roof, a replacement of

223 Jokilehto. (1999), 139
224 Gabriël Fagan, Notes for a lecture on the Castle Restoration in Bloemfontein, undated from Fagan Architects office archive
225 E.E. Viollet-le-Duc. (1854-68), quoted from Jokilehto. (1999), 152
226 E.E. Viollet-le-Duc. (1854-68), quoted from Jokilehto. (1999), 153
the previous VOC flat roof. It is readily apparent as the most authentic building in the Castle and there appear to be the least number of significant changes. Here, the military and family-less history of the British period of the Castle as a place of men and armies for two centuries is evident. It reveals old bricked-upped window positions, un-plastered brick walls indicating possible previous additions and removals, and other remnants. The building faces the pristinely (and beautifully) laid out entrance courtyard with the Anton Anreith-decorated Kat balcony and the columned west verandah.

The conservation approach here retained the various periods of its history: original VOC timber floor beams, (albeit re-engineered),\(^{227}\) the irregular interior of the British period, retention of corridors and small corrugated-walled individual offices to which the British officers seemed to have been partial (unlike the VOC who appear to have functioned in generous open-plan offices, revealed by historic drawings\(^{228}\)) as well as the strong British internal colour scheme in primary blues and browns with black accents. This building, now housing the military museum and offices, also has one of the very few notably contemporary elements in the Castle in the form of a large glazed aluminium entrance door. Although this is not of the same architectural excellence as Carlo Scarpa’s entrance at the Castelvecchio, it is an indication that the building has undergone alterations. In the author’s view, the conservation approach of this building and the retention of its layered history has the potential to elevate the meaning of the Castle as a place of changing histories.

One of the main consequences (and stated aim) of the intervention was a drastic change in the visual and aesthetic appearance of the Castle. The Castle during the VOC period was not just a military outpost. Most of the administrators of the VOC Company lived there with their families and their slaves until 1795. So did the blacksmith, baker and pastor, clerks, soldiers\(^{229}\) and the judge and prisoners. The Castle resembled a fortified town, (or a

\(^{227}\) Almost all of the massive Dutch floor beams in the Castle had rotted where they were embedded in the walls. These were surgical removed in order for their ends to be fitted with stainless steel shoulder brackets. They were then re-inserted into their original positions without the brackets being visible.

\(^{228}\) Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010

\(^{229}\) However, early in the 18th century, barracks were built south of the Castle to house most of the military.
“citadel” as Fagan refers to it). The British Governor, however, moved to the more agreeable Tuynhuys (later Government House, and now De Tuynhuys) shortly after the second British occupation of the Cape in 1806. After that time, the Castle was exclusively military.

Photographs taken before the restoration reveal the effects of two centuries of functional military usage. The Fagans’ research revealed that there was an architectural intent in the original Dutch design which they wanted to recreate: façades were arranged symmetrically, and certain elements were selectively elaborated such as entrances, staircases and balconies. The building between Catzenellenbogen and Nassau bastions (Block D) particularly suffered under later functional, and what Gwen Fagan calls “haphazard alterations”. The original symmetrical Dutch façade centred on the Sally Port and the two staircases on either end “were a mess”. During the nineteenth century, a metal hipped roof partly replaced the flat roof. Most of the original smaller, horizontal and shuttered Dutch casements windows, built flush with the exterior walls, had been removed and either replaced with vertical British sash windows or bricked up. New window positions were knocked through where they were required by the military; ground floor doors were either bricked up and new ones put in seemingly arbitrary (but perhaps historically functional) places.

The aesthetic and stylistic result of the restored elevations reveals Fagan’s intent: the original symmetrically designed façade was re-instated and painted a warm ochre (wall scrapings revealed this was one of the first colours); British sash windows were removed and replaced with accurately copied Dutch casements and positioned windows with their integrated shutters; the iron-mongery was meticulously copied from other exiting examples and re-forged; all timber and metal work was painted as the VOC had believed to have done. (See Figure 2) The effort required to accomplish this can be appreciated. Each item, down the shutter wall-stays was researched on site or sometimes in archives; existing items had to be measured on site, recorded and then incorporated into drawings and schedules. This work can be

231 Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010

62
multiplied by the innumerable details that require resolution on site and in the office.  

This process was repeated with all buildings, each with its own peculiarity and special aspects. The Governor’s Residence in the Kat building also underwent internal as well as façadal recreation. This building was restored around 1936, the year the Castle was declared a National Monument for museum use, which among other aspects also created the new ‘Lady Anne Barnard’ ball room for entertainment. During this earlier intervention new windows were built in. These were removed by Fagan as they were “incorrectly” proportioned and positioned.

3.2 The Lacunae of the Castle

The individual lacunae and their reinstatements, which the study addresses, will be described and analysed case by case in order to discuss Fagan’s theoretical approach to these in term of the theories and viewpoints raised in Chapter Two. The Castle complex is of high significance and this can, nationally and internationally, be justified on historical, cultural, and associational and scientific values. It is a unified whole and can be described, in Brandi’s terms, as a work of art, or at least, as an artefact of cultural significance akin to that of a work of art.

The lacunae reviewed at the Castle will consist of two substantial buildings as well as the most prominent decorative elements of the main entrance, which were recreated in order to reinstate a unity in style.

3.2.1 Lacunae Case Studies

The case studies assessed include Fagans’ ‘rebuilding’ of the Corporal’s House and the Dolphin Pool complex, creating new the timber main entrance

---

232 The Castle contract documentation and drawings are kept at Fagan’s office. This invaluable collection must be catalogued and archived in a more suitable and managed location.

233 The Kat building was extensively ‘restored’ around 1936, creating the so-called Lady-Anne-Barnard ballroom. This ‘restoration’ radically altered the façade by inserting English sash windows.

234 Information board at the Castle
gates, a new weathervane on top of the entrance copula and placing two statues on the internal entrance gable. The lacunae to be assessed are:

**Building Lacunae**
- Corporal’s House outside the Castle walls – Contract 7: 1997-2000

**Decorative Elements Lacunae**
- Timber entrance gates
- Weathervane on the entrance copula
- Reclining statues of Neptune and Mercury on internal entrance gable

3.2.1.1 Corporal’s House outside the Castle walls – Contract 7: 1997-2000

Figure 3: Corporal’s House: Detail pre-1896 photograph: 1. Imhoff Battery; 2. Corporal’s House. (Enlarged copy of photo from Cape Archive, M623, undated)
The Corporal’s House was built as a gardener’s store and office for the SA Herb Society outside the west-facing Castle walls. According to Fagan’s research, it was originally built in the early nineteenth century and demolished early in the twentieth century. It was built into the stone and earth-filled embankment between the moat and the Buuren bastion of the Castle and was used as a corporal’s dwelling and it provided accommodation for his patrol. This flat-roofed single-storey house, although not part of the nearby and independent Imhoff Battery, was embraced by its western outer wall. This battery was built in c1744 to safeguard the Castle from maritime attack from the then adjacent Table Bay. The entire Imhoff Battery was demolished in c1896 to make way for railway lines serving the old Cape Town Central station.

The corporal’s house was built to Fagan’s design reliant on his interpretation of the photographs and historical plans, some of which showed the internal layout. This required the removal of part of the stone/earth embankment. In an interview, Fagan explained that the reason for reconstructing the building was the client’s use; the client required garden maintenance facilities as well an office of a public society. This building is a visual reminder of the demolished Imhoff Battery, which stood directly to the north of this building. This battery was an important part of the extensive VOC Table Bay defence system, which included numerous fortifications and batteries, from Moullie Point around the bay to the Castle and then sweeping around Table Bay toward Melkbosstrand. These included the contemporary remnants of the Amsterdam Battery and the rediscovery and rebuilding of the Chavonne (or ‘Waterkasteel’) Battery, now in the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront area and also recreated by Fagan c2000. This lacuna is an infilling of two aspects: one is a rebuilding of a relatively minor but aesthetically important building for occasional use; the other is the recreation symbolic of a lost connection of meaning for the Castle, in order to reveal the original intent of its VOC creators as a military stronghold.

---

235 Seemann. (1993)
236 Gabriël Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
Figure 4: Corporal’s House: Photograph from the south (Source: photocopy in Fagan Architects Archive, no source or date)

The historical documentary evidence for reconstructing the Corporal’s House was limited. The main sources of evidence were a pair of photographs, one of which was taken from the distant Signal Hill before the demolition of the Imhoff Battery (see Figure 3), showing the western elevation. The other photograph, showing tall sailing ships in the bay, was taken from the south overlooking the flat roof of the building (see Figure 4). There were small-scale historical maps which depicted mainly the location of the building and that the building existed before the British take-over of the Cape. A British plan circa 1906, found in the Cape Archive showed its internal layout at that time. Martine Robinson, the architect in Fagan’s office who prepared the architectural reconstruction drawings for this building, said the Signal Hill photograph, although taken from a distance, helped them to determine the exact building envelope, roof type and heights. Also, the exact positions of the west-facing window and door openings could be determined, as well as their types (on the right were English Casement windows and on the left, smaller Dutch windows with shutters) and divisions. She said that there were no archaeological excavations undertaken, although there might have been some trenches dug after the stone wall embankment was removed to establish any material remains.237

Although it appears to be clear from Figure 3 that the building was plastered and not built of slate stone, the building’s exterior walls were built with ‘blue stone’ slate, the same as most of the Castle’s walls and other

237 Martine Robinson, informal telephone discussion, 02/11/2010
external works. (See Figure 5) The notoriously difficult to dress slate often resulted in a random pattern with fairly large grouting areas. This same random pattern was used by Fagan and there is no discernable difference to the old stones in the embankment wall with which it connects next to the house. From the Signal Hill photograph, it is difficult to determine if the original building was indeed an exposed stone building or plastered, which is more than likely for an unimportant building of this nature. The photograph from the south depicts a plumb and un-jagged corner edge of the building and the roof line has a half-round finish which could be a plaster moulding. According to Robinson, Fagan would carefully look at all evidence and decide which was the most likely to be historically correct. She said they had photographs which showed the building to have been stone.238

Figure 5: Corporal’s House: Fagan Architects: West Elevation, Plan, dated 06-10-1998

238 Ditto
Although the building construction method and detailing matches traditional methods as seen on other stone parts of the Castle, there is a visible difference between the newer and lighter coloured stones and the original ones where they meet in the embankment wall. According to the geologist, Doug Cole, the slate will take a long time to weather; seeing that the Castle wall rocks are almost 400 years old to appear the way they do. The new grouting is also much lighter, but Cole believes that this will weather more rapidly.\textsuperscript{239} (see Figures 6 & 8) The castle stones were originally bound with lime or clay mortar, the former being derived from burning seashells. Although the new grouting also has a seashell mix, it is distinctly lighter in colour.

Regarding the building’s detailing, there is little articulation such as plinths; however, the roof ‘parapet’ has a slight protruding stone edge, and the inclusion of granite window and door lintels. The window and doors sizing and type (English or VOC) were informed by the photographs. The detail design of the window, doors and gates were copied from similar types, which had been found elsewhere on the Castle and recorded by the architects. Similarly, the iron-mongery was copied from the most appropriate found examples.\textsuperscript{240} The granite lintel over the openings was a creative and practical solution by Fagan of spanning and supporting heavy stone work. Granite lintels are rare in the Castle as usually shallow soldier-course brick arches were used to span openings and divert forces within the brick structures. Robinson said that there are examples of such lintels and this solution was used here. Except for the granite lintels and the uncertainty that the building was stone, the building appears very similar to the old photograph. (see Figure 9) This lacuna was reconstructed as accurately as was considered possible with the found historical evidence.

With this lacuna, Fagan believes he has inserted an aide memoire to the original purpose and meaning of the Castle as the most important element of the fortification system to protect the VOC presence in Southern Africa. It is a hypothetical reconstruction required to accommodate a new purpose.

\textsuperscript{239} Doug Cole, email correspondence, 03/11/2010
\textsuperscript{240} Martine Robinson, informal telephone discussion, 02/11/2010
Figure 6: Corporal’s House: Contemporary view of west elevation (from Signal Hill side); (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 7: Corporal’s House: Contemporary view onto east elevation from Buuren Bastion; with refilled moat in back; (Photo: Author, 2010)
Figure 8: Corporal’s House: Contemporary photograph of joint between new (left) and old (right); (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 9: Corporal’s House: Detail of new copy of window/shutter, iron-mongery and granite lintel; (Photo: Author, 2010)
3.2.1.2 Dolphin Pool, the *Bakhuys* and ‘Colonnade’ Building – Contract 4: 1987-1988

The recreation of this remarkable ensemble undoubtedly changed the aesthetics and meaning of the Castle. It reintroduced the concept of the Castle as a fortified citadel. It is also, however, the most discussed and controversial aspect of the entire conservation intervention, mainly due to its size and the large number of inventions required to realize it.

![Figure 10: Pool Complex: Tracing by Fagan Architects of a ‘very faint sketch on 1795 plan’ (No source mentioned. See Fagan, 1986)](image)

![Figure 11: Pool Complex: Tracing by Fagan Architects of Lady Anne Barnard sketch (See Fagan, 1986)](image)
Figure 12: Pool Complex: Proposed drawing based on Fig. 10 for NMC by Fagan Architects (See Fagan, 1986)

Figure 13: Dolphin Fountain: Tracing of M796 Cape Archive by Fagan Architects (See Fagan, 1986)

Figure 14: Dolphin Fountain: First reconstruction proposal by artist Jan Corewijn (undated)
The documentary evidence was limited and the design was based mostly on, and partly built upon, the excavated original foundations of the pool and surrounding buildings. That the structures existed is not in question. Regarding the pool, Gwen Fagan has often recounted Lady Anne Barnard’s letter describing the existence of a pool with a dolphin water-spouting fountain. Fagan did a number of tracings of historical plans, which reveal the changes in the layout of the complex over time. They also traced a faint pencil sketch found on a 1795 plan showing a partial main pool elevation (See Figure 10). This was referenced to M796 at the Cape Archive. This drawing is used as evidence for this elevation as well as the dolphin fountain. A viewing of M796 show this to only depict a fountain with a dolphin sculpture (See Figure 13) which Pearse reproduced in his book. In Pearse’s book, the drawing is acknowledged as a copy of a Fassler drawing and notes that this is a copy of a drawing by D.H. Schutte, which in turn is a copy of an original by Hermann Schutte and dated 1801. The elevation evidence was therefore not corroborated.

This small section of the elevation and a plan of 1795 were expanded by Fagan into a complete provisional pool-side elevation for the building of the complex, showing a two-arched double-storied building. (See Figure 12) The two-arch drawings, however, are quite different to the five-bay column pad foundations excavated along the east side of the pool. Fagan also traced a perspective of the pool courtyard, attributed to Lady Anne Barnard, although trees obscure most of the buildings. (See Figure 11)

Various historical plans show that the pool itself is no longer depicted after 1862. There is, however, an undated photograph in the Elliott collection in the Cape Archives showing a portion of the extreme north-east corner of the building’s roof. As Elliott only arrived in Cape Town in 1900 and a map of 1880 shows that the complex no longer exists, the photograph is unlikely an Elliott but reveals that the building existed until just before 1880. There was  

---

241 Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, Public Lecture: Friends of Welgemeend & Boerneef Art Collection, Cape Town, 31 August 2010
242 Fagan, Gabriël (November 1982), 9-11
243 Pearse. (1963), 37
244 Fagan, Gabriël. (December 1986), 1
thus very little documentary evidence of what the building looked like for the approximately 170 years it existed after records show Willem Adriaan van der Stel supposedly built it in c1706 and its demolition (presumed) sometime in the 1870s.²⁴⁵

Fagan was convinced of the crucial importance of the recreation of this building for the meaning of the Castle, so much so, that at an emergency meeting of the National Monuments Council (NMC), he was able to win over the members to his vision.²⁴⁶ An aspect that could not be determined and which still requires research was why Fagan had to appear before the Council and what led to this emergency meeting.²⁴⁷

In his motivation to the NMC for the re-creation, he presented them with three options: back-filling after recording the excavation, re-construct the pool only (“which would make scant architectural sense without its balustrade and colonnade”) or a re-creation of the whole complex.²⁴⁸ Fagan did not suggest any other conservation approach.

In addition to the importance of this ensemble as testimony to the original citadel fort, the reconstruction was also justified on functional use requirements. Fagan wanted to use this building as the entertainment venue for the military. Kitchens, lounges, bars and restrooms were inadequately provided for in various parts of the Castle. At the time, the military was using the Kat buildings; Fagan wanted to relocate them away from sensitive buildings in order to safeguard these from present day soldiers.²⁴⁹

Although stylistic conservation approaches at the time were still the norm in South Africa and were supported by the architectural community, at the Castle it was the presence of archaeologists and their entirely different approach to conservation which highlighted the problems of this type of stylistic conservation. The tensions on site between the architects and the

²⁴⁵ See E 3544 in Elliott collection, Cape Archives
²⁴⁶ Fagan. (2001), 20
²⁴⁷ In the author interview with the Fagans, Gabriël said that the archaeologists reported the architects to the NMC, but did not state on what grounds.
²⁴⁸ Fagan. (1986), 3
²⁴⁹ Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
archaeologists can be traced to this fundamental difference in approach. As Martin Hall argues, Fagan wanted the Castle to only convey a specific period and this required the removal of layers which were not of that period. This, Hall states, is unacceptable in archaeology. The theoretical idea of re-establishing the Castle to an imagined original shape and form is foreign to archaeology as all stages of the complex's evolution contribute to its authenticity.\footnote{250}

The Fagans, on the other hand, were of the opinion that the archaeologist did not use the right methods in excavating the site and were destroying architectural artefacts.\footnote{251} The architects felt they needed an architect on the dig to help indentify material remains as they appeared. Henk Lourens, although on national service duty, was stationed at the dig daily to oversee any discoveries.\footnote{252}

The tensions grew to such an extent that Gwen Fagan (who is not an archaeologist) eventually took over the excavation from Gabebba Abrahams, the State appointed archaeologist working for the then Cultural History Museum. As a consequence of the breakdown in the professional interdisciplinary relationship, there are no written archaeological reports about the pool complex excavations and the ruins have not been professionally recorded, analysed or interpreted by anyone, let alone an archaeologist.\footnote{253} There is no documentary record or evidence of the only remaining parts of this complex. The ruins, now covered by the new building, have had their capacity to act as a document destroyed. And, as the rebuilt complex is not reversible, there is no possibility of future research investigation, as recommended by all the charters.

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item[250] Prof. Martin Hall, archaeologist on sections of the Castle, telephone conservation, 25/10/2010
\item[251] Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
\item[252] Henk Lourens, author interview, 29/09/2010
\item[253] Gabebba Abrahams, telephone discussion, 21/09/2010
\end{itemize}}
Figure 15: Pool Complex: Fagan Architects archaeological drawing, with site progress log/notes by Gwen Fagan (Fagan Archive, dated July 1982)
Figure 16: Pool Complex: Fagan Architects archaeological drawing, with sketches of found artefacts (Fagan Archive, dated various July and September 1982)
Figure 17: Pool Complex: Fagan Architects archaeological drawing, composite of types of foundations excavated. (light blue represents slate foundations, light green brick foundations, etc.) (Fagan Archive, dated 1 November 1982)

The most reliable evidence for the complex was the remains. Although there is no archaeological record from the excavation, Gwen Fagan kept a log of the artefacts found in the pool. These logs include sketches of an entire pier coping as well as a section of the plastered balustrade wall, (See Figures 15 & 16) and the types of foundations were recorded. (See Figure 17)

Most foundations were extant except for a few gaps were trenches had been dug through them, possibly for drainage. However, the perimeter foundation on the north-east facing façade was almost entirely missing. (See
Figure 17) The building’s perimeter extent and the envelope existing today are built directly on top of these remaining and partly missing foundations. The exterior walls therefore, except for the north-east façade, correspond accurately with the excavated historical foundations. A comparison of these drawings of the excavated foundations, however, reveals that the present interior layout is an amalgamation of the excavated foundations. Choices were made as to which of these internal foundations to use and which to ignore. (See Figures 17 & 19) This was based on Fagan’s functional requirements in order to provide suitably sized spaces for kitchens, function rooms and restrooms. The recreated building therefore has a spatial layout which reflects a conglomerated layout of different periods of its history. No preference for a particular period is noticeable; some blue slate foundations, which indicate VOC building methods, were not incorporated into the new spatial manifestation. (See Figure 17)

The foundations for the architecturally most noticeable element, the five red-brick arches which open directly onto the pool, had a combination of various materials. These foundations were mostly red and blue bricks but also included three remnants of blue slate pad foundations on the northern end. The sketch found on a 1795 plan with two arches (See Figure 11) had to be reconciled with the five pad foundations found suggesting five openings. (See Figures 18 & 19) There is no doubt that the British adapted the VOC layout to suite their new functions, changing the building from a bakery and storage facility to stabling - at some point in history the number of openings increased. Faced with this, Fagan decided to use the dramatic architectural potential of these five pad foundations and invented, in the author’s opinion, a very satisfying but ultimately misleading space in the Castle. (See Figures 28 & 29)

During the excavations, the original round foundations of the fountain were found intact. The design of the new fountain with a basin and a spouting dolphin was entrusted to Jan Corewijn, an architect by training but now a renowned artist who specialises in copying historic building artefacts such as relief-work, sculptures, wall friezes and other ornamentation. Corewijn was given a free hand by the Fagans to design the fountain. There were only a few historical fixes that were known. These were that the water spouted from the dolphin and that a document showed the VOC emblem on its plinth with little
cherub heads also spouting water. The first design from Corewijn was deemed to be “too fancy” by Gwen Fagan, after which the dolphin sculpture was lowered directly onto the top basin.\(^{254}\) (See Figure 14)

What is controversial is that the archaeological record of the ruin has been destroyed. None of the Lausanne Charter’s archaeological guidelines have been met. These include conservation, identification, and presentation of archaeology. Article 7 of this Charter discourages building directly on top of the remnants.\(^{255}\) The new building does not reflect or demonstrate the evidence uncovered and then recovered. There is no visual or physical reading of the site “as a document”; there is no area which exposes the other histories present (unlike the glass-covered excavation in the Granary Store which exposes some of the stratification of the Castle’s past); there is no visual representation, perhaps in the floor covering, which corresponds with the found but ‘unused’ foundations below; and there is no presentation to the public of what lies below them and that, what they are looking at, is a creative interpretation of some of the fragments of a ruin. Although there is an information board which mentions that the complex is a ‘reconstruction’ (although not explicitly), the accuracy of the presented building cannot be verified. There is also no prominent date on the building, and as components of its architecture and detailing are a copy of the genuine ancient Kat and Block C buildings nearby, visitors are misinformed, even misled, about its true status as a modern interpretation.

The importance of a permanent embodiment of such layers becomes further apparent and complicated when the archaeological artefacts are removed from the archaeological site. These few authentic items (pier coping and balustrade fragments) were the only material evidence of the demolished building. Boito, in his eight-point *Carta* of 1893, had already included the requirements for dating ‘reconstructions’, and exhibiting all removed artefacts close by for inspection. In the Castle, the situation has become even more acute: the conservation exhibition,\(^{256}\) which included these various found

\(^{254}\) Jan Corewijn, author interview, 09/10/2010
\(^{255}\) ICOMOS, Lausanne Charter, (1990)
\(^{256}\) Included in this conservation museum were also the original teak coat-of-arms from the internal entrance gable, blue stone engraved VOC emblems from the front gable as well as the
artefacts, were removed from where they were housed in the Granary in 2004 for the Democracy-10 exhibition, but have, seven years later, not been reinstated. Apparently, they are being housed in some store room which is not open to the public.\textsuperscript{257}

Although the then NMC gave their permission for the new building, what is of interest is that there were no conditions attached. The architectural manifestation of the wholly new ensemble appears from the exiting record to have been of no concern to the Council. It must therefore be assumed that the NMC found the proposal to be perfectly acceptable and appropriate.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure18.png}
\caption{Pool Complex: Fagan Architects drawing: cross section}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{257} Natie Greef, curator of the Military Museum at the Castle, informal discussion, 30/10/2010
Figure 19: Pool Complex: Fagan Architects drawing: plan

The lacuna of the pool complex and the need to repair this missing part of the Castle has been justified by Fagan as representing the idea of the Castle as a citadel. The reconstruction of a building with a pool, which approximates the layout, and massing of the found remains does, in the author’s opinion, enhance the layering and meaning of the Castle. Fagan’s historical rebuilding of the complex, although re-establishing the idea of a citadel has, however, undermined its ability to project itself as part of a continuum of the creative process and in fact “abolishes time of coming into being”. The architectural language of the building is stylistic: the doors and windows are all meticulous copies of original windows found elsewhere in the Castle, elaborate plaster mouldings and carefully reproduced red klompie accents and the same painted surface create the illusion, as it stands next to the same looking original, that the building is genuine seventeenth century. (See Figures 21, 22, 23 &24) The interior too, is stylistically consistent with the exterior. The same exposed detailed floor joists with carved wall brackets are used and elegant plaster
pediments adorn internal door openings (similar ones are over the two entrance doors on either side of the brick arches).

Brandi’s three principles for repairing lacunae which are: easily recognizable reintegration at close distance but not offending to the unity; that the material manifestation is required but does not overpower the whole; and that the restoration should not be an obstacle but facilitate any future interventions, are not satisfied here.

There is one element which suggests newness: these are the delicate stainless steel window and door frames carefully inserted into the internal edge of the five arched brick columns. The architectural concept was, with frameless appearing sheets of plate glass from the pool area, to integrate the pool with the function room, and vice versa; a very modern idea. Fagan wanted to indicate that these could have been open stables and therefore a ‘new’ idea inserted into an ‘old’ building. The introduction of this obviously ‘new’ element into the ‘reconstruction’ causes confusion to the viewer by making some parts new and attempting to emphasise that the rest is old. (See Figures 25 & 26)

From these observations, it can be deduced that for Fagan authenticity of this complex is embedded in the idea which he hopes it transmits which is to respect an assumed original intention of the creators. For this to be legible and credible, it needs to be conveyed in material form which, based on research and analogy, must be stylistically correct.

Figure 20: Pool Complex: Architects drawing: pool elevation
Figure 21: Pool Complex: Front pool courtyard view (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 22: Pool Complex: Front pool courtyard view, with rear view onto original Governor’s Residence; (Photo: Author, 2010)
Figure 23: Pool Complex: Pier coping: Copy of original artefact found on site; with replica light fitting reproduced by Jan Corewijn (original from Kat Balcony); (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 24: Pool Complex: Plaster decorative balustrade, pattern copied of original artefacts found on site; (Photo: Author, 2010)
Figure 25: Pool Complex: Interior: Roof Beams are similar to original Dutch beams in Castle; note plaster pediment over door opening at rear; (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 26: Pool Complex: New meets ‘old’, stainless steel door frames around brick piers; (Photo: Author, 2010)
Figure 27: Pool Complex: Front door detail with pilasters and pediment; (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 28: Pool Complex: View over pool with new Dolphin Fountain toward Governors’ Residence; (Photo: Author, 2010)
Figure 29: Pool Complex: Original pool steps below water line with new Dolphin Fountain by artist Jan Corewijn; (Photo: Author, 2010)
3.2.2 Decorative Elements Lacunae

3.2.2.1 Main Timber Entrance Gates

Before the intervention, the main entrance was secured with a metal gate, allowing a view through toward the Kat balcony. Careful analysis by Fagan of the brickwork around the main entrance revealed a recess along the internal edge around the opening as well as recesses made into the side wall to accommodate a gate cross rail. Also still existing were remnants of pintles at the sides. This evidence suggested to Fagan that the Castle might have had a different entrance gate. The evidence around the opening indicated heavy doors, which lead Fagan to conclude that these were timber. (See Figure 32) However, what these timber gates could have looked like was unknown; no documentary evidence was found which showed the Castle gates.

Figure 30: Main Entrance Gates: ‘Alphen Drawing, 1943’: After close scrutiny, Fagan believed that the left gate seemed to indicate diagonal timber boards; (Artist: Unknown, small photograph copy in Fagan Archive, date on drawing 1943)
A visit by the Fagans to various Sri Lankan VOC forts confirmed that these had all timber entrance gates, and in some cases such as Jaffna, they still existed. The Jaffna gates, although in a poor state, and still exhibiting the faded ubiquitous VOC green paint, were constructed from thick, vertically constructed timber boards with three hinges per leaf. One leaf had a separate small access gate as well as a little viewing opening. A visually dominating feature on these gates was the diagonally arranged square-pointed wrought-iron spikes. These were necessary in VOC Ceylon to prevent attackers using elephants to force open the gates. These gates were recorded and photographed by the Fagans and became the blueprint for the Castle gates. (See Figure 31) Fagan admitted that there was little chance of an elephant-charge at the Cape Castle, even in the seventeenth century, but still preferred to incorporate this element into the design.258

Figure 31: Main Entrance Gates: Jaffna VOC fort; (Photographs: Fagan Archive, undated)

258 Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, author interview, 23/09/2010
However, at a dinner at Alphen, a Cape Dutch homestead some 15 kilometres from the Castle, a last minute discovery of a water-colour painting, (See Figure 30) forced Fagan to revise the new gate drawings as they were about to be issued to the joiner. The drawing apparently depicted the entrance of the castle – and at close scrutiny, Fagan interpreted the timber arrangement of the individual planks of the gate to be diagonal and not vertical as the Jaffna gates.\textsuperscript{259}

The iron-mongery, mostly wrought-iron, including the hinges, lock- and latch-mechanisms, cross-bar holders as well as a protective grate over the ‘spy’ window and the pointed spikes, were all carefully researched by Fagan. He looked at seventeenth-century period examples of these items from the Castle itself, other local remaining VOC examples as well as Dutch (the Fagans travelled to Holland and inspected buildings of the seventeenth century). Fagan’s theoretical approach in filling this lacuna was analogy – using an example from another fort in another part of the world as a basis for a new invention. (See Figures 33a+b)

\textsuperscript{259} Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, Public Lecture: Friends of Welgemeend & Boerneef Art Collection, Cape Town, 31 August 2010
The gate is the threshold into the Castle. For Fagan, it is the gateway into the ‘restored’ vision, re-establishing the Castle as a cultural artefact. In this vision, the gate has an important role to play in the entrance scenario. This includes the gabled VOC pediment (parts of which are replicas during the intervention), the bell tower and a new weathervane, as well as the new internal slatted timber gate, all of which now suggest a stylistic wholeness which might never have existed before.

Figure 33a+b: Main Entrance Gate: Overall view of new timber gate based on Jaffna fort and a painting; and detail of gates with ‘elephant’ spikes, iron-mongery and ‘spy’ window; (Photo: Author, 2010)

3.2.2.2 The Weathervane on the Entrance Cupola

The research undertaken by the Fagans, especially the scrutiny of old drawings revealed a number of lacunae on the Castle. Lady Anne Barnard’s prolific writing and, in this instance, her watercolour panorama paintings from the Castle roof tops provided much information of the Castle in the years 1797 to 1802. This was after the VOC period and during the first British occupation of the Cape (See Figure 34). This panorama showed the internal façades of the first courtyard, the main entrance gable and the cupola. For the Fagans it revealed two lacunae: a long spike with a ball on top of the domed brick cupola
above the main entrance, and what appears to be two reclining figures adorning the top part of the elaborate internal entrance gable.

Figure 34: Lady Anne Barnard’s panorama: Internal view of entrance gable, cupola and verandah (photo reprint of original, undated)

This painting was used as evidence of a weathervane on top of the cupola but the drawing, even when enlarged, does not provide much proof. A faint horizontal line half-way up the spike above the ball is visible when the drawing is much enlarged, but this could also be a defect. (See Figure 35) There is no evidence of a weathervane. A drawing of the Castle attributed in Fagan’s files as a Barrow, however, does suggest a weathervane. (See Figure 36b) These conflicting drawings do not provide conclusive evidence of the existence of a weathervane or what it looked like. Fagan used British period information in assuming what the Castle looked like during the VOC period. Fagan, assuming that the weathervane was from the VOC period, looked at other existing Dutch weathervanes in Cape Town for information, including the Groote Kerk and the Lutheran Church. A photocopy of a weathervane from St. Paul’s Cathedral in London was found in Fagan’s office files suggesting that he looked at unrelated periods to solve what was essentially a modern design problem. (See Figure 36a)

---

260 Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, Public Lecture: Friends of Welgemeend & Boerneef Art Collection, Cape Town, 31 August 2010
Although Fagan has remarked that weathervanes “all looked the same ‘in that period’”\textsuperscript{261} Oliver Dods, who worked in Fagans office as a young architect, said that it occupied Fagan’s mind from the first day he arrived, and when he left eight and a half years later, it was still not designed.\textsuperscript{262} This reveals Fagan’s dedication to designing a small but for him important detail, as this was required to achieve his historical vision for the Castle. (See Figures 37 & 38)

\textsuperscript{261} Gabriël and Gwen Fagan, Public Lecture, 31 August 2010
\textsuperscript{262} Oliver Dods, author interview, 01/10/2010
Figure 37: Weathervane: General view of entrance: new gates and weathervane; (Photo: Author, 2010)

Figure 38: Weathervane: Detail, note similarity to St. Paul’s (Photo: Author, 2010)
3.2.2.3 Reclining Statues of Neptune and Mercury on the Internal Entrance Gable: 1998

Lady Anne Barnard’s panorama indicated two reclining figures on the internal entrance gable at the beginning of the nineteenth-century. The painting again gives more of an impression rather than any details of the two figures. (See Figures 34 & 35) This unusually high and double-scrolled gable probably dates from around the 1780s when, according to Hans Fransen, other additions and alterations were undertaken at the Castle, including the construction of the Dolphin Pool.263 No information is available of the possible artist of these two figures while opposite this gable, Anton Anreith was almost certainly responsible for the Kat balcony parapet relief-work. The relief-work, c1785-91, depicts Neptune and Mercury as infants which also adorn the Fagan intervention at the Tuynhyus garden pediment.

No other information is available on these figures and no date is known when they disappeared. Fagan did find metal rods embedded into the gable walls on either side, which to him was evidence that these were used to secure the sculptures. (See Figure 40 & 41) Why Fagan decided to fill this perceived lacuna with the figures of the Graeco-Roman mythical gods is not clear. Both these gods are usually depicted with their recognisable mythical iconography: Mercury is depicted holding a caduceus, a winged staff entwined with two snakes, and Neptune is usually shown holding a trident and sometimes sits on a horse. On Lady Barnard’s drawing of the gable’s two figures, neither a caduceus nor a trident is visible.

After a tender process, Fagan’s preferred artist, Jan Corewijn who carried out much of the artistic replication on the Castle such as the copies of the coat-of-arms on the same internal gable, the two entrance lions and who created the Dolphin fountain, was not commissioned by the client to sculpt the Mercury and Neptune figures. Instead Maureen Langley received the contract to produce the three-meter high statues.

263 Fransen. (2004), 30
These sculptural recreations, based on some evidence but with no detail to work on, are new and fantastical art works, and are stylistically compatible to Fagan’s vision of the Castle. As with the Fagan created infant gods on the Tuynhuys parapet, here the lacunae have been filled with stylistically correct sculptures so that they may contribute aesthetically to complete a presumed unity. Using British evidence, these figures, with the newly created weathervane and the elaborate gable and coat-of-arms, reveal Fagan’s intention to portray the cultural and artistic refinement of the VOC period. (See Figure 39)

Fagan wanted to overcome the aesthetic and perceived cultural destruction of the Castle during the British period. To achieve his version of the Castel with a glorious past as a VOC citadel, he altered the historical layering of the Castle by stylistically matching the lacunae so closely (and potentially erroneously) to the original fabric that it has impacted on the value of the Castle as a historical document.

---

Figure 39: Internal entrance elevation with gable figures: Fagan Architects. Part of larger drawing with Title Block missing, undated, but with instruction to joiner dated 02.11.1989
Figure 40: Internal Gable: late nineteenth century photograph (photo reprint Fagan Archive, Cape Archive ref. M814)

Figure 41: Internal Gable: Neptune and Mercury sculptures; with replica coat of arms; (Photo: Author, 2010)
CHAPTER FOUR
CONCLUSION

The conservation intervention by Fagan of the Castle of Good Hope is a tour-de-force of historic and stylistic ‘restoration’ and has attempted to present the Castle in an ideal form which has never existed before. Viollet-le-Duc, in order to rise above the mixed and messy history of a building, strove to achieve the ideal of the building by interpreting the original intention of its creators. To achieve this ideal requires “an aesthetic-moral belief in the unity, wholeness and integrity” of historical buildings.\(^\text{264}\) This Romantic concept, however, requires the conservator to negotiate between history and truth, between aesthetics and authenticity.

The conservation methodology used by Fagan at the Castle and his approach to the lacunae can be located in the debate in the nineteenth century between restorers, such as Viollet-le-Duc and preservationists, such as John Ruskin. The theories and approaches by restorers’ differed point for point with preservationists. The Castle intervention shows that Fagan had continued the theories of Viollet and other nineteenth century ‘restoration’ interventionist approaches a century later without acknowledging the several intervening paradigm shifts in conservation theory and practice.

This nineteenth century approach had the aim of restoration as the re-establishment of the intent or conception of the original. ‘Restoration’, as Viollet stated, is “first for the sake of history and above all for the sake of art”.\(^\text{265}\) Authenticity was seen to be embodied in the idea of the building and not in its materiality, as the preservationists strongly believed. The antithesis for the preservers was to not allow new insertions or reconstructions, not only because they affected authentic fabric but also the impossibility of the contemporary craftsman to “re-immersc” themselves in the spirit of the times when the building was built.\(^\text{266}\)

\(^{264}\) Eggert. (2009), 54

\(^{265}\) Viollet-le-Duc, Architectural Theory, ed. Hearn, 281, quoted from Eggert (2009), 55

\(^{266}\) Choay, (1992, English 2001, 103)
The polemics of Ruskin and Morris argue that the ‘reconstruction’ of lacunae is incompatible with the maintenance of authenticity. Boito modified this strong opposition and at the end of the nineteenth century codified criteria in the first charter promoting the idea of the building as a document: reconstructions were only to be attempted under certain conditions. Since Brandi and the critical restoration theories, which became dominant in the mid-twentieth century, as well as all international charters and guidelines, reconstructions were discouraged, except in very particular circumstances. The overriding concerns, which remain with us today, are, one, the impossibility of all information being available for an exact reconstruction; two, evidence will be lost; and three, that new buildings will not be able to embody the authentic. Although the Riga Charter could be used to justify stylistic reconstructions, the Charter is a rationalisation of political will in times of national reinvention which was not the case at the Castle.

The basis of these concerns is derived from knowledge-based conservation theories, as well as being founded on conceptual theories of aesthetics and philology. For Brandi, the problem was not the infill as such, but the risk of an inappropriate intervention, which may dominate the artistic image of the original. Stylistic restorations and repair of lacunae were rejected as these inserted disruptions and falsification or errors into originals in time and place, and affect the integrity and authenticity of the original. Brandi’s theory, as applied to a culturally significant perceived work of built art, provides methods for repairing lacunae in order to conserve the original whereby the infill recedes into the background. Although Fagan recognises these concepts of layering and reading buildings as documents of their time, he understands these similarly as the nineteenth century restorers’ theoretical concepts of authentic ‘restoration’. The specific conditions for ‘reconstructions’ as outlined by the charters are therefore not met with Fagan’s approach.

Criticism of Fagan’s intervention at the Castle must to some extent be seen in the context of its time and place in the 1970s and 1990s. From the 1950s, the South African State was preoccupied with reinventing itself as a unified white nation. Nationalistic stylistic ‘restoration’, as was seen in Europe toward the end of the nineteenth century, became a means of national identity
formation driven by the political will to manifest the invention. The Castle intervention was conceived and largely undertaken during the height of the apartheid era. After the Sharpeville massacre in 1960 and the declaration of South Africa as a republic based on racist ideology and legislation, South Africa was isolated internationally. This isolation affected every sphere of its existence, including exposure to advances to conservation theories and practices, and stylistic ‘restorations’ continued until the 1990s as a direct consequence. Although many of the developing conservation theories and writings from the 1950s particularly from Italy, Germany and France, were not available in English before the 1980s, the Fagans did travel overseas and they would have been aware of international trends in conservation.

As with the rebuilding of the collapsed San Marco Campanile in Venice in 1912, Brandi might have agreed with the recreation of the Dolphin Pool lacuna in order to complete the unity of the whole, but not as an invented copy of the original. The authenticity of the Castle has been questioned, and as a consequence, doubts have been cast to its eligibility as a potential World Heritage Site. Although some of the repaired lacunae are substantial in size and have destroyed authentic material, they do not overpower or detract from the authenticity of the whole, or endanger its significance. The doubt also ignores the time and place of the ‘restoration’ during ‘Grand’ and late Apartheid. The ‘restoration’ should presently be read as being part of the history of the complex, documenting the change in conservation approaches in South Africa.

The result of the Castle intervention is a product of a highly conscientious and inventive restorer. The project has brought to the fore previous forgotten histories and meanings and the infilling of the lacunae at the Castle has been pivotal in exposing and manifesting this past. The invented repair of the Castle lacunae must in the last instance be read as a product of its place and time, two aspects which will always determine conservation approaches.
LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Gabriel & Gwen Fagan: Architects and Historian
(Personal interview - Cape Town) 23 September 2010

Gabeba Abrahams State Archaeologist
(Telephonic interview) 20 September 2010

Henk Lourens: Final year Student at GFA*
(Personal interview – Cape Town) 29 September 2010

Oliver Dods: Junior Architect at GFA*
(Personal interview – Hout Bay) 01 October 2010

Jan Corewijn: Artist
(Personal interview – Hout Bay) 09 October 2010

Prof Martin Hall: Archaeologist (UCT)
(Telephonic interview) 25 October 2010

Martine Robinson: Architect at GFA*
(Telephone discussion) 28 October 2010

Natie Greef: Curator of the Castle Military Museum
(Informal discussion) 30 October 2010

(*) GFA – Gabriël Fagan Architects


Architecture South Africa. *A Restoration of International Importance*, August/September, 2002


Orientated Controls in the City Centre of Cape Town, unpl. PhD, UCT, 2003


Brink, Yvonne. They came to stay: Discovering meaning in the 18th Century Cape country dwelling. Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2008


Deacon, Janet and George Hofmeyr, Forms of Protection Provided by the National Monuments Act, in Monuments and Site, ICOMOS, 1996

Deacon, Janet and Penny Pistorius, Introduction & Historical Background to Conservation of Monuments and Sites in SA, Monuments and Sites, ICOMOS, 1996


Fagan, Gawie and Gwen. *Church Street in the Land of Waveren*. Cape Town: Printpak (Cape), 1975

Fagan, Gwendoline E. *An introduction to the man-made landscape at the Cape from the 17th to the 19th centuries, Vol.1, Part 1; Vol.2*, unpublished PhD, University of Cape Town, 1994


Hall, Martin, David Halkett, Pieta Huigen van Beek, Jane Klose, “A stone wall out of earth that thundering cannon cannot destroy”? *Bastion and Moat at the Castle, Cape Town*, Social Dynamics, 16: 1. (1990), 22-37


Hernández Martínez, A. *Conservation and Restoration in Built Heritage: A Western European Perspective*, in *The Ashgate Research Companion to*


ICOMOS, Monuments and Sites in South Africa, Rome, 1996


Mrubata, M.P. *The Production of History at the Castle of Good Hope in the 20th Century*, unpublished MA thesis University of the Western Cape, 2001


Sabinet, online data base: numerous newspaper and other press articles


Western, J. *Undoing the Colonial City? (Cape Town and Tianjin)*, in Geographical Review, Vol. 75, No. 3 (Jul. 1985), 335-357


APPENDIX

Appendix A: Gabriel Fagan: Awards Received

Special Awards
1991 Fulton Award: Klein Constantia: New Maturation Cellar, Constantia Valley, Cape Town
1993 Fulton Award: Environmental Sculpture, Cape Point Entrance Gate
2000 Laureatus Award Alumni Board University of Pretoria
2008 Hon.Fellow of the American Institute of Architects
2010 City of Cape Town Civic Honours

Awards of Merit from the South African Institute of Architects
1968 La Dauphine
1971 Government House
1973 Tulbagh restoration
1983 Swanepoel House St Francis Bay
1985 Worcester Open-Air Museum
1987 Klein Constantia Wine Cellar
1989 Mossel Bay Museum Complex: Conservation Award
1993 Swanepoel House Hermanus
1997 S A Breweries Visitors’ Centre, Newlands: Award of Merit
1998 S A Breweries Visitor’s Centre, Newlands: Award of Excellence
2001 Weekend House Betty’s Bay
2001 The Castle of Good Hope: Conservation Award
2002 The Castle of Good Hope: Award of Excellence
2003 Chavonnes Battery: Commendation
2005 Holiday House Paradise Beach, Langebaan: Cape Institute of Architecture, Award of Commendation
2005 UCT Institute of Infectious Disease and Molecular Medicine in association with MLH: Cape Institute for Architecture, Award of Commendation
2006 New Link Building for the Institute of Infectious Disease and Molecular Medicine – Award of Merit
Energy Effective Design
1990 ESKOM Energy Effective Design Award for Klein Constantia New Wine Cellar

Other Awards for Conservation Work
1979 Cape Times Centenary Award
1982 Tony Williams-Short Award
1984 Cape Tercentenary Foundation Award
2007 The CAPTRUST Award for Environmental Achievement

Gold Medal Awards
1973 Gold medal with G E Fagan from the National Monuments Council
1975 Gold medal from the South African Academy of Literature and Science
1982 Gold medal from the Simon van der Stel Foundation
1988 Gold medal of Honour from the South African Institute of Architects
1989 The Order for Meritorious Service: Gold (State President's Award)
2000 Cape Tercentenary Foundation: Molteno Medal
2003 Chancellor's Award, University of Pretoria

Honorary Doctorate Awards
1991 D ARCH (HC) University of the Orange Free State
1993 D Phil (HC) University of Stellenbosch

Sports
1982 Winner of Trans Atlantic Cape to Punta del Este yacht race
1982 The South African Sport Merit Award: Navigation
2003 Winner Transatlantic Yacht Race to Bahia in his class, 3rd overall