Question of Authenticity of Steel Sheet Roof Cover on Traditional Housing Units in Urban Environment
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Abstract. Elaborating on the theory of analytical philosophy and conservation doctrine, and a case study of a selected sample, the paper discusses the authenticity of the secondary roof cover of steel sheets on traditional Bosnian houses built for housing or economic purposes. Although such steel sheet replica of a shingle or šimla wooden cover is registered and defined as authentic in rural areas, its authenticity in urban traditional areas, where it can also be found, although not as often, has not been doctrinally examined. Comparative analysis of results of theoretical base and statistical data obtained from the selected sample determines the context where it is possible and recommendable to treat the steel sheet roof cover as authentic when carrying out restoration and reconstruction.

1. Introduction
Use of steel sheeting as a roof cover when reconstructing traditional rural housing and farm economic buildings by local population was noticed in mid last century all over Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly in cattle-breeder’s settlements in the area of Mt. Bjelašnica. Rural population of Bosnian villages, cattle-breeders or, less frequently, farmers, replaced the traditional cover of shingles or šimla (characteristic form of wedge-profile, tongue-and-groove shingles) with available, more durable and affordable material obtained by cutting tin barrels. Such barrels were first used in economic activities – for storing and keeping anything that may be needed in everyday life – cattle feed, water, construction materials, tools, etc. In the process of repurposing, the tin is cut into sheets of larger dimensions and straightened from round to flat form (Figure 1, Left), and then nailed either directly to the rafters, or to the remaining shingles or šimla (Figure 1, Right). Very susceptible to corrosion, over many years of its integration into the architecture of mountainous settlements, such roof cover created for itself a prominent role in picturesque and patinated appearance of traditional buildings. Moreover, the patinated appearance of this material contributed to its spontaneous anticipation by the wider community as a traditional and authentic, and gave it an important place in the associative projection of the image of a traditional village.

1 The economic farm buildings include stables, storehouses, larders, etc. that used be found in the the yard of the house.
Figure 1. Left: Drawing of approximate dimensions of the steel barrels that were being repurposed and turned into sheets used for covering roof. [1] Right: Wooden roof structure with the shingles cover. Detail showing two ways of preparing the shingles and fixing them on the structure frame. [2]

This appearance of secondary authenticity in rural settlement has been observed by scientists and conservationists, who evaluate acceptability of replication of original materials in the context of its historical nature and sustainability factors. [3] Material is interpreted as authentic in its active role and within the framework of authentic sociological context – the situation when the traditional activity of the population has been maintained, and when the context of the initial recycling of the material exists.

However, besides in rural areas, replication of the perishable wooden materials with the metal sheets is observed, atypically and more rarely, also in urban settlements; the provenience of this practice is still unclear, in view of a different sociological profile and occupations of the local population. The approach to restauration and protection of such buildings is not defined, and there has been no doctrinal discussion on the authenticity of use of metal sheet roof cover.

2. Methodology
Authenticity of the described occurrence in urban traditional settlement was examined on a sample selected on the basis of frequency of this occurrence, and in consideration of historic, architectural and ambiance value of the buildings found on the site – the settlement Osoje in Travnik, a town in Central Bosnia (Figure 2). It is an urban residential complex of extreme historical value, with large number of existing traditional residential and economic buildings of various level of authenticity of their value, which is under protection of local administration. The study, which is the doctrinal basis for the current approach to conservation, has not taken into consideration the occurrence of this form of materialisation of roofs; instead, the materials proposed to be used for rehabilitation and reconstruction were shingles or šimla. [4] However, large share of metal sheet roof covers, long tradition and continuity of this occurrence, which had caused its prominent role in the memory of the place, impose the question of justification / non-justification of its use in the programatically implemented conservation and restauration efforts.

---

2 The study was used as the basis for the architectural project of seven possible types of traditional house in the selected zone. In addition to the construction of individual houses, a detailed regulation plan was made in this period, which envisaged the construction according the laws “of traditional urbanism.”
The following information has been collected from the traditional settlement used as a sample: value and value authenticity of the examined sample; frequency of use of the metal sheet roof cover in the whole sample; date when the replication by metal sheet cover appeared; current occupation of the building user; origin of the material; intention/motive for use of the replacement material.

Theoretical basis of authenticity to which the data from the case study were applied enabled some conclusions regarding appropriateness of use of metal sheets in restauration or reconstruction.

3. Discussion
3.1. Sample analysis – use of metal sheet roof cover in Osoje ambience unit
Following the presented methodology, a sample of 21 traditional houses were examined (Figure 4). They were built not later than in the Tanzimat period – second half of 19th century, and a smaller part in the first half of 20th century. Level of authenticity varies significantly, ranging from eight well preserved buildings, whose each detail has been technically surveyed, to the buildings that have lost a great deal of their authenticity in the processes of transformation, rehabilitation, addition, change of materials or certain details, with only the basic form or some rare authentic elements remaining visible. Their type, scientifically defined as suburban form, whose origin has been found in the form of Central Bosnian two-storey house – the dimlućara – primarily rural form of the house, answers the question of provenience of this occurrence. [7] Namely, initial and primary occupation of the local population was mixed – they worked in agriculture, cattle raising, but also performed some typical town functions – crafts and trade. At the time of examining the sample, such traditional context was completely lost. [8]
Figure 4. Photographs of buildings included in the study.\[9\]

\[9\] Two buildings completely lacking roof structure are not shown here.
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Figure 4. Photographs of buildings included in the study.\textsuperscript{4} [9]

Here are the statistical data from the analysis:

- *Value and value authenticity of the examined*: in case of the eight buildings, architectural, ambience, historical and aesthetic value has been determined, as well as the value of originality and rarity. These buildings possess high levels of authenticity of the determined value. For 13 buildings, the identified value ranged between ambience, architectural and documentary. Authenticity has been undermined, primarily by inadequate materialization and form of the openings, and by degradation in the form of inappropriate expansions.

- *Frequency of use of metal sheet roof cover in the whole*: steel sheets as the replacement material for the wooden roof cover on the roof structure have been found in 12 buildings.

\textsuperscript{4} Two buildings completely lacking roof structure are not shown here.
Dating the replication with metal sheet: on six buildings, the metal sheets were installed in mid 20th century; the dates of remaining interventions range from the end of the last century to this date.

Current occupation of the users of the building: it was only possible to consider the inhabited buildings, 10 of them. The findings show a completely changed social structure compared to the authentic occupation – agriculture/cattle raising, or trade/crafts.

Origin of the material: in nine buildings, steel sheets were used that had been recycled from steel barrels. In three buildings, a metal sheet cover of a different provenience, form and appearance was used.

Intention / motive to use the replacement material: in six buildings, the metal sheet roof cover was used because of the existing climate conditions, availability of material in the immediate surroundings, and economic considerations. In six buildings, the primary reason was the economic affordability, as well as the lost skill of making the original wooden roof cover.

3.2. Theoretical analysis

3.2.1. Factor of creative intention in evaluation of authenticity

When discussing the appropriateness of use of the secondary material – metal sheets as a roof cover on traditional houses in the Osoja settlement, we will look at the analytical philosophy and theory of authenticity and identity in the processes of restauration/rehabilitation, and consequently at the importance and role of historicity and creative intention that may condition the decision on what would be the right position.

As Jokkilehto [10] emphasizes, to compare “authentic” and “identical” means to compare specific and general. Authentic is about autonomous action, it represents the authority, originality, exceptionality, honesty, truthfulness\(^5\) or righteousness, that what is representative for a class of the same characteristics, for example, an identical replica, copy, reconstruction. The very formulation of identity of truth implies uniqueness and fixness of such a category. However, the evident and unquestionable possibility of reproduction, whether as a painting, music, architectural or literary work, affirms that there may be multiple truths, and if we negate the autography as the condition for truthfulness with the first of the stated kinds of arts, which typically signifies the oneness of truth and clear distinction from replica, all other truths are relative, unidentical to the original\(^6\) and may be related to very different properties of a work of art.

So Nicol Ex [11] distinguishes three forms of authenticity: (1) conceptual authenticity (intention of the author), (2) functional authenticity, (3) ahistorical authenticity (original), and (4) historical authenticity (historic development). When restoring a work of art, essentially, a choice is being made among some of these forms. Each intervention requires a decision that will, in a greater or lesser extent, prioritise one of them. David Lowenthal [12] speaks about three types of authenticity: a) authenticity in terms of the original form and substance; b) authenticity in terms of the context, and c) authenticity in terms of the purpose or intention; this does not imply that we favour one type over the other; instead, we try to strike the best balance among the three types of authenticity. Following the concept by the logician Scaltsas regarding the intention and time distance, which we will come back to later, as the key

---

5 Authenticity is not a value in itself. It represents the measure of the level of truthfulness of those heritage attributes that support the main value of the good, as defined in the Operational Guidelines for implementation of the World Heritage Convention [13].

6 In this case, the originality is related to the Scaltsas' origination [14] (origin), which explains all prerequisites of creation of an artwork. All elements involved in its creation determine whether it is new, identical to some other, or just a copy of another artwork.

Such view of origination follows the trail of Brandt's understanding of an artwork as a whole – oneness. Elements used in its creation make a single creative process by which the author creates a physical reality based on 'pure reality' of their own flow of thought.
factors when assessing identicality, Houbert [15] says that, assuming a certain cautiousness regarding any form of generalisation, assessment of authenticity can be based on the concepts of form, material, purpose/intention, and time-space continuum. Inevitable influence of psychological factor suggests the necessity of separate evaluation of each case.

What is seen in all three theories as a special form of authenticity, and what is missing in Eco and his Copy⁷, is the intention. Such intention, as we will demonstrate later in this discussion, may express significant differentiations when creating the original work and its replication. Also, we will underline that one of the key parameters in such differentiation is the historical/ahistorical character of value.

3.2.2. Importance of historicity
Noting the historicity as an element of truthfulness of a creation is most present in architecture, i.e. historic heritage. Considerations by Michela Parent, in the Report on Comparative Study of Nominations and Criteria for World Cultural Heritage [16], that the truthfulness may be founded on history instead on the Art has received new attention in the doctrinal positions on conservation of heritage. As early as in 1977, the Operational Guidelines introduced the notion of historical layering, but it was, however, very soon - immediately after Warsaw, disqualified in the attempt to avoid the problem of uniformity of approach.

Benjamin Walter states that the authenticity is related to here and now of the original subject. One condition for it is the idea of historicity, and certain weight and aura that stems from tradition. “Since the historic testimony is based on physical durability, it is threatened by reproduction, where physical duration does not have a role. And what is truly threatened by affected historical testimony is the authority of the object, the weight that stems from tradition” [17]. Brandi [18] also points at the actual historic act of restauration that respects the existing historicity: “Furthermore, in order to understand the complex historic nature of a work of art, the act of restauration cannot be developed secretly or in a manner that is not in accordance with the time. It must be allowed to express as a true historic event – because it is a product of human action – and become a part of the process whereby the artwork is carried forward into future.” According to Goodman, a falsified work of art is an object that falsely testifies of the history of production of the original. Starting the reasoning by making a clear distinction between allographic and autographic art, he says that the difference between the one and the other form is the presence/absence of historicity. “Where exists a theoretically permeable test that determines that an object possesses all constituting characteristics of the subject work, without determination of how and by whom it had been produced, there is no requirement of historicity of production, and therefore there is no falsification of the work. Such test is provided by appropriate system of meaning with articulated set of properties and relative position foreseen for them. [...] Allographic art achieves its emancipation not by proclamation, declaration, but by meaning.” [19]

Replication of the original material, shingles and šimla, suggests an interruption of existence of a property that participates in construction of value of a traditional creation. The question is whether such gap essentially reflects on the here and now of the replicated?

When explaining the relationship between reconstruction/restauration and discontinuity, Brandi [20] says that such an intervention “[…] merges the old with the new, so that they cannot be distinguished, and thus terminates or reduces to a minimum the time interval between the two creative moments.” Houber [22], invoking Scalsas, discusses the negation of the gap in continuity, which is possible if the act of reconstruction is quick enough to annul the effects of destruction.

---

⁷ According to him, a copy fully conveys the message of an original, since truthfulness is linked to the form of an artwork [21]. Substantial disappearance does not condition also the disappearance of authenticity.
In his essay: Identity, Origin and Spatiotemporal Continuity, Scaltsas considers the importance of temporospatial continuity for identity of a material object, examining, first of all, whether the origin/originality/origination were an essential characteristic of its identity, and then also the importance of historicity for presentation of such identity. Is the destruction terminal, or does it depend not only on the status of the deconstructed product, but also on the skill of the environment to restore such initial element? Scaltsas believes that such relativism means that in every society we have certain destructive situations that are a) stereotypically terminal, b) some border cases, and c) some stereotypically non-terminal. Altered social circumstances will result with redistribution of destructive situations into one of the three groups. Destruction is not a phase in duration, but ceasing to be, while the renewed object, i.e. its part – means a new existence or otherwise one stage in the existence of the same object.\textsuperscript{8} The medium or the connecting link that preserves the identity while ceasing to be is very different, and can only conditionally be subjected to categorization. The origination is not essential for identity of the object, which continues its existence.

Scaltsas finds that the key in deciding whether the structure is the same or not, is not conditioned by whether the second structure is an original concept or not, but whether it intends to be the same, while the identity remains preserved in some property of the building.\textsuperscript{9} “Therefore, the fact that two structures have non-identical origin does not mean that they cannot be numerically identical (i.e. be phases of the same structure); however, the intention in the background of the renewal can make a difference when determining whether the new structure is numerically identical to the old one or not” [23].

A significant instance of the Scaltsas’ discussion on essentiality of origination is the very concept of historicity. In the absence of historicity, origination of the second creation of a structure is essential for its identity, making it different from the first one – non-identical. Only in the case of a historical structure, origination of the reconstructed structure is not essential.\textsuperscript{10}

\textsuperscript{8} Scaltsas uses the formulations 'ceases to be' to describe termination of being, and 'come to be' to mean creation, and this at the same time explains the first – initial creation, and the second – renewed creation of an object.

\textsuperscript{9} Origination is examined on a hypothetical example of a broken antic vase, which is restored by museum technicians long time after it was destroyed. Parts of the vase, made by destruction, are not a phase of its existence, but termination of its being. They are the connective link between the antic vase and its restauration in the museum, i.e. they are the medium of preservation of the vase's identity. However, in case that this substance is destroyed, there is no restauration procedure that could renew the initial vase. Consequently, an object may cease to be for an interim period, until it is made to be again, and the state of destroyed substance is the determining factor of the possibility of preservation of identity of an object.

Origination of the first vase is different from origination of its restauration, but in this case the second origination is irrelevant, as it does not condition the termination of the new object, but its new existence, re-establishment. Analogously, we can use an example of a prefabricated house, which is originally made in a factory, and then repeatedly assembled and disassembled. Although the house repeatedly erected has a different origination each time, the original creation of the house is at the same time the origination of each successive construction. In this case too, the continuity of identity is not interrupted by multiple originations.

Somewhat different is the example of a structure made of building blocks by a boy, who decides to keep it as it is. In case it acquires the properties of historicity prior to destruction (two years later, it is inadvertently destroyed, and the boy builds the same structure), the re-established structure is not new, it is the restored two years old structure. However, the second structure is numerically identical to the first one, but of different origination. Coming into being of the first structure is not, as in case of the vase or the house, also the origination of the second. Origination of the second creation is equally important for the vase of the second structure as the origination of the first one for the original creation. And again, in this case too the origination does not play a role in creating the identity of the structure.

\textsuperscript{10} This time he uses the example of a wax figure, deliberately destroyed by the artist right after its creation, and then immediately, using the same wax and the same form, made into a new figure. The new creation, in this case, is not identical to the destroyed one.

In a setting where a statue had existed for many years until the artist destroyed it by accident, reconstruction made of the same wax and in the same form would be considered an identical figure.
3.2.3. **Intention and creation in restauration process**

The idea of unification of creation and reconstruction is present in many modern theoreticians of heritage conservation. Hillier, Houber and Bandi, consciously or unconsciously, introduce the notion of creativity into the act of renewal of truthfulness, but also in preservation of such truthfulness, while Renato Bonelli very explicitly defines the restauration as a critical process [24].

Houbert, presents a very provocative thesis of even greater authenticity of the renewed compared to the original structure, based on the Goodman’s connection of the degree of authenticity with the degree of allography or autography. Namely, while the autography of a painting or a sculpture is linked to the original, in the arts of literature or music the notion of originality is irrelevant. Architectural domain is much more complex, and this condition of programmatic and intention is where one may discern the greater authenticity of a replica. One illustration of such a case is reconstruction of the Pavillon de l’Esprit Nouveau, which is by programmatic character allographic, and as it bears the mark of primarily conceptual and intellectual work, each reconstruction brings it back to life in its full meaning.\(^1\)

Intentional factor has, therefore, conditioned a creative approach to the historic character of heritage [25].

Providing guidance on the method of renewing their temples, the Japanese legislation requires that the traditional knowledge and skills are transferred exactly as learned, not forcing absolute replication, and not restricting the craftsmen’s creativity when expressing their own vision of the continued existence. “Therefore, there is a certain similarity to that relationship between the composer who creates a piece of music, and a musician who interprets it. [...] From time to time, creativity may be dismissed in favour of “protection of purity”; in other cases, one may go to the extreme of inventing new forms that refer to the traditional language of architecture. Both may be acceptable, depending on the character and quality of the subject resource of heritage.

In his theory of restauration, Cesare Brandi emphasised that the fundamental idea of modern restauration of artwork must be the possibility to recognise the work of art as a work of art: “Renewal consists of methodological moments where the work of arts is recognised in its physical essence, and in its duality of aesthetic and historic nature, and in view of their ability to be transferred into future” [26]. Fixler [27] also discusses the creative process of conservation, elaborating on the example of an object whose predominant value is the symbolism of improving social values. Such specific creative intention required creativity in the process of implementation of conservation.\(^2\) The intention is also in the background of the decision regarding the creative approach to restauration. Any deviation from the original, done while fully respecting the semantics of the original fabric, produces a phenomenon that

\(^1\) While the original pavilion was for practical reason built of wood in 1925, mass production of pavilion elements ensures its greater authenticity than the original, because of the now possible embodiment of the main intention, which is the serial production of architecture.

\(^2\) These involve the interventions on rehabilitation of the building of UNHQ (United Nations Headquarters) in New York, the largest modern building complex from mid-last century, whose designers included among the others, Le Corbusier and Oscar Niemeyer. The symbolism of the building is grounded on the idea of civilizational progress, while the emphasis is on its dynamics, the process of permanent change. The rehabilitation guidelines promoted the requirement that, besides the historicity of the materials that need to be carefully preserved, the rehabilitation should also reflect the social progress achieved over more than half century, which is evident in the area of security, sustainability, and generally science and technology. It was not possible to separate the concept of authenticity of the UNHQ building from the symbolism of social meaning. The language used in implementation of such changes, the language of modernism has itself evolved in the meantime, and it was used to additionally underline the aesthetics of modernism from the mid-last century.
is often wrongly nominated as a new authenticity, while they in fact represent a reflection of the original here and now. It was created by appropriate reconstruction and conservation, which will, ultimately, be felt as authentic.¹³

Ongoing development of the value is also emphasised in the Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, the so-called Faro Convention, adopted in 2005 by the Council of Europe. The Convention defines the cultural heritage as a set of resources “inherited from the past, which are identified by people, irrespective of the right of ownership, as a reflection and expression of their continuously developed values, convictions, knowledge and tradition. They include all aspects of environment that is a result of interaction between the people and the place in their passage through time” [28].

4. Conclusions
Recognising the specificities of each individual case of rehabilitation/restauration in relation to its core value and context where it exists and propagate, when deciding on the authenticity of replication, the importance of historicity and what was the intention must be taken into consideration.

The character of replication that has happened in both environments where the appearance of the secondary metal sheet roof has been registered – both rural and urban context – is historical, and therefore, while recognising the fact of the 'environmental skill' to 'restore the initial building' we conclude that the origination is not essential for its identity. As a historic component in the existence of traditional houses and economic buildings, such roofs had had a very specific intention in the background of its appearance. The context that marks the intention of replication – sociological, geographical or bio-climate, restricted the choice of materials to what could be found within the limits of cost-effectiveness, availability and sustainability in very unique climate conditions.

In the urban environment, however, in terms of theoretical basis and the examined sample, we recognised two forms of creative intention in replication/reproduction, and their reflection on the determined approach to restauration:

1. The first case – where the social circumstances and thus the creative intention are identical to those in rural context. Here we have authentic creation, a historical development and unchanged identity of the buildings. An original idea has been embodied at different times. Restauration should, therefore, respect the creative intention and itself become a part of the act of creation which is the proclamation of authentic way of life of a traditional community. In restauration, the recommended appropriate material is metal sheet roof cover.

2. The second case – where the structural factors of authentic intention have been lost. The intention to lower costs is the only thing that has been preserved in the new social circumstances. Such altered motives make this occurrence ahistorical. Creative continuance of historicity has lost its truthfulness, and the origination of the secondary creation of this element becomes critical for its identity, 'making it different from the first one – unidentical'. The recommended appropriate material to be used in restauration is the shingles or šimla roof cover.
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