

Objectivity and Subjectivity in Conservation-Restoration: Between Scientific Method and Human Interpretation

Theodora Musculeanu

Independent Researcher and Conservator-Restorer, Founder and Director, Imperio Restauro, Cluj Napoca, Romania

*Corresponding author

Theodora Musculeanu, Independent Researcher and Conservator-Restorer, Founder and Director, Imperio Restauro, Cluj Napoca, Romania.

Received: June 20, 2026; **Accepted:** June 24, 2026; **Published:** July 04, 2026

Introduction

The question of objectivity in conservation-restoration has accompanied the discipline since its emergence as a distinct field of study. Conservation-restoration presents itself as a profession grounded in science, relying on material analysis, historical research, and ethical guidelines to preserve cultural heritage. At the same time, every intervention requires human judgment, raising the question of whether complete objectivity is truly possible.

This research investigates the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity within conservation-restoration theory. The study aims to answer several fundamental questions:

- Can restoration ever be completely objective?
- At what stage does interpretation become subjectivity?
- What role should personal judgment play in conservation decisions?
- How can conservators preserve authenticity while inevitably acting as interpreters?

The subject was chosen because of its direct relevance to contemporary conservation practice. As a conservator-restorer, I have frequently encountered situations in which technical evidence alone could not determine the final treatment decision. Such situations reveal a tension between scientific methodology and human interpretation that deserves further examination.

The research adopts an interdisciplinary approach, drawing from conservation theory, philosophy, aesthetics, heritage studies, and restoration ethics. Through the analysis of major theoretical positions within restoration literature, this study seeks to examine how different authors understand objectivity and subjectivity and how these perspectives influence modern conservation practice.

Rather than treating subjectivity as a problem that can be completely eliminated, this article investigates whether it should instead be recognized as an unavoidable element that must be consciously controlled through professional ethics and scientific methodology.

Research Methodology and Selection of Case Studies

The present research adopts a qualitative and interdisciplinary approach to investigate the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity in conservation-restoration theory. Rather

than focusing on a specific restoration treatment or technical intervention, this study examines the conceptual foundations of the discipline through the analysis of influential theoretical texts and ethical frameworks.

The research combines perspectives from conservation-restoration theory, aesthetics, philosophy, heritage studies, and professional ethics. This interdisciplinary approach was chosen because the question of objectivity extends beyond technical practice and enters broader discussions concerning interpretation, authenticity, historical truth, and the role of the conservator in shaping the future perception of cultural heritage.

The primary sources selected for analysis consist of key theoretical contributions that have significantly influenced the development of conservation-restoration thought. These include the writings of Cesare Brandi, John Ruskin, Eugène Viollet-le-Duc, and Salvador Muñoz Viñas. Although these authors differ substantially in their views on restoration, together they represent some of the most influential positions in the historical and contemporary debate surrounding intervention, authenticity, and interpretation.

Cesare Brandi was selected because his Theory of Restoration remains one of the foundational texts of modern conservation theory. His concept of restoration as an act of recognition provides a valuable starting point for examining the role of interpretation in conservation practice.

John Ruskin was chosen as a representative of the preservationist perspective, offering one of the strongest critiques of restoration and raising important concerns regarding authenticity and historical integrity.

Eugène Viollet-le-Duc was included because his approach represents a contrasting position, one that accepts a greater degree of intervention and reconstruction in the pursuit of visual and structural unity.

Finally, Salvador Muñoz Viñas was selected as a contemporary theorist whose work directly addresses the limitations of objectivity and the influence of cultural and professional values on conservation decision-making.

The selection of these case studies was motivated by their ability to illustrate the diversity of theoretical positions within the discipline. By comparing their arguments, it becomes possible to identify recurring tensions between scientific methodology and personal judgment, between preservation and intervention, and between the ideal of objectivity and the reality of subjective decision-making.

The analysis proceeds through a critical examination of each author's position, followed by a comparative discussion that evaluates the implications of these theories for contemporary conservation-restoration practice. Particular attention is given to the ethical responsibilities of the conservator-restorer and to the question of whether subjectivity should be understood as an unavoidable condition of the profession or as a factor that must be continuously restrained through methodological rigor and ethical awareness.

Case Study I: Cesare Brandi and the Problem of Recognition

Any discussion regarding objectivity and subjectivity in conservation-restoration must begin with the work of Cesare Brandi. As one of the most influential theorists in the history of restoration, Brandi fundamentally shaped modern conservation ethics through his attempt to establish a coherent theoretical framework capable of guiding intervention while respecting the integrity of the artwork. At the center of Brandi's theory stands his famous definition of restoration as "the methodological moment in which the work of art is recognized in its physical consistency and in its dual aesthetic and historical nature, with a view to transmitting it to the future" [1].

This definition is particularly significant because it shifts restoration away from a purely technical operation and toward an act of intellectual recognition. Restoration does not begin with treatment. It begins with understanding.

This distinction is crucial. Before a conservator can consolidate a paint layer, remove overpaint, fill losses, or undertake any form of intervention, the artwork must first be understood. The conservator must identify what constitutes the work itself, distinguish original material from later additions, evaluate historical transformations, and assess the relationship between material condition and aesthetic perception. For Brandi, restoration is therefore not merely a technical procedure but an intellectual act.

The concept of recognition immediately introduces a philosophical problem. Recognition is not equivalent to observation. Observation may describe the measurable characteristics of an object, but recognition requires interpretation. To recognize a work of art is to assign meaning to what is seen. The conservator does not simply record information; they evaluate significance, authenticity, and value.

This becomes particularly evident in Brandi's distinction between the historical and aesthetic instances of the artwork. According to Brandi, every work of art exists simultaneously as a historical document and as an aesthetic image. The historical instance concerns the material reality of the object and the evidence of its passage through time. The aesthetic instance concerns the artistic image that allows the work to function as art.

The challenge emerges when these two dimensions appear to conflict.

A damaged painting may preserve important historical evidence through areas of loss, discoloration, or alteration. At the same

time, these same features may disrupt the aesthetic unity of the image. The conservator is therefore required to determine how much intervention is justified in order to recover visual legibility without compromising historical authenticity.

Brandi attempted to resolve this tension through the principle of critical restoration. Intervention should neither erase history nor falsify the artistic image. Instead, restoration should seek a balance that respects both dimensions of the work. Yet the practical implementation of this principle raises important questions. How is this balance determined? What criteria establish the point at which aesthetic reintegration becomes excessive? Who decides when visual unity has been sufficiently restored?

It is at this stage that the question of objectivity becomes unavoidable.

Brandi's theory is often presented as a defense of methodological rigor and disciplined intervention. However, the very process he describes depends upon human judgment. Recognition requires interpretation; interpretation requires evaluation; evaluation requires decision-making. Each step introduces the possibility of subjective influence.

This does not imply that Brandi advocated unrestricted personal expression within restoration. On the contrary, his theory sought to establish limits capable of protecting the artwork from arbitrary intervention. Nevertheless, the framework remains dependent upon the conservator's ability to interpret the work correctly. The conservator becomes both observer and mediator, occupying a position that is neither entirely objective nor entirely subjective.

From this perspective, Brandi's contribution reveals a paradox at the heart of conservation-restoration. The discipline aspires toward objectivity through documentation, scientific analysis, and ethical principles. Yet the moment intervention begins, objective data must be translated into practical decisions. Scientific examination can identify pigments, binders, deterioration mechanisms, and structural weaknesses, but it cannot independently determine how a work should appear after treatment. The final decision remains inseparable from human judgment.

For this reason, Brandi's theory demonstrates that subjectivity is not introduced into restoration through carelessness or professional failure. Rather, it emerges from the very act of recognizing the artwork. The challenge for the conservator is therefore not the complete elimination of subjectivity, which may be impossible, but its continuous awareness and restraint. The artwork must remain the primary subject of restoration, while the conservator's interpretation must remain secondary to the preservation of its historical and aesthetic identity.

Case Study II: John Ruskin and the Defense of Authenticity

If Cesare Brandi represents one of the most influential attempts to establish a theoretical framework for restoration, John Ruskin represents one of its most powerful critics. Writing during the nineteenth century, a period marked by extensive architectural restoration throughout Europe, Ruskin became deeply concerned with what he perceived as the destruction of historical authenticity through intervention.

Ruskin's position is perhaps best summarized by his famous statement that restoration is "the most total destruction which a building can suffer" [2]. Although often regarded as extreme, this observation reflects his belief that historical authenticity resides

within the material traces of time itself. From this perspective, restoration risks replacing historical reality with contemporary interpretation.

For Ruskin, the value of a monument or artwork did not reside solely in its visual appearance. Rather, it existed in the material traces accumulated through time. Signs of aging, weathering, repairs, deterioration, and even damage formed part of the object's historical reality. These marks were not imperfections to be corrected but evidence of the object's journey through history.

Consequently, Ruskin believed that restoration often produced a dangerous illusion. By replacing lost elements, reconstructing damaged sections, or attempting to return an object to an earlier appearance, restorers risked creating something that appeared historically authentic while no longer possessing genuine historical authenticity. In attempting to recover the past, they could inadvertently erase it.

Underlying Ruskin's critique is a fundamental concern regarding authority. Who possesses the right to determine what an artwork or monument should look like? Can a restorer ever know with certainty what has been lost? And even if sufficient evidence exists, does reconstruction preserve the original work or create a new interpretation of it?

These questions reveal a deeper skepticism toward the possibility of objective restoration. Unlike later theorists who sought methodologies capable of guiding intervention, Ruskin doubted whether intervention itself could escape subjective influence. Every restoration decision required an individual to choose what should be preserved, what should be removed, and what should be reconstructed. Such decisions inevitably reflected contemporary values rather than historical reality.

From a contemporary perspective, Ruskin's position appears difficult to apply in its pure form. Complete non-intervention would place countless artworks and monuments at risk of irreversible deterioration. Paint layers detach, supports weaken, materials degrade, and environmental conditions continue to threaten cultural heritage. Conservation-restoration emerged precisely because passive preservation alone is often insufficient to ensure long-term survival.

Nevertheless, dismissing Ruskin entirely would be a mistake. Although modern conservation no longer follows his rejection of restoration, many of the ethical principles that govern contemporary practice reflect concerns that he identified more than a century ago. The emphasis on minimal intervention, reversibility, documentation, and respect for original material can all be understood as responses to the dangers he described.

Ruskin's greatest contribution may therefore not be his opposition to restoration itself, but his insistence that intervention carries consequences beyond technical treatment. Every act of restoration alters the relationship between the object and its history. Every addition, reconstruction, or aesthetic correction risks replacing historical evidence with contemporary interpretation.

This concern remains highly relevant to the question of objectivity. While Brandi demonstrated that interpretation is unavoidable within restoration, Ruskin highlights the potential dangers of allowing interpretation to extend beyond preservation. If recognition inevitably introduces subjectivity, then restoration must continuously establish boundaries that prevent subjective

judgment from becoming historical falsification.

In this sense, Ruskin serves as an important counterbalance to restoration theory. He reminds conservators that the ultimate purpose of intervention is not visual perfection but the preservation of authenticity. The artwork does not exist to demonstrate the skill of the conservator. Rather, the conservator exists to ensure the survival of the artwork and the historical truth it embodies.

Case Study III: Eugène Viollet-le-Duc and the Temptation of Completion

If John Ruskin feared restoration because of its capacity to alter authenticity, Eugène Viollet-le-Duc embraced intervention as a legitimate means of recovering the integrity of a monument. His famous statement that restoration consists of re-establishing a building in a complete state, which may never have existed at any given moment, remains one of the most influential and controversial ideas in restoration history.

Unlike Ruskin, Viollet-le-Duc did not view restoration as a threat to cultural heritage. On the contrary, he believed that careful study of a monument's structure, style, and historical context could allow the restorer to recover a coherent vision that had been compromised by time, damage, or alteration. Restoration therefore became an act of intellectual reconstruction. Through knowledge and expertise, the restorer could identify what was missing and restore the unity of the work.

At first glance, such an approach appears reasonable. Artworks and monuments often reach conservators in incomplete conditions. Materials deteriorate, decorative elements disappear, surfaces become fragmented, and structural failures compromise visual legibility. In these circumstances, intervention may seem necessary in order to restore the object's ability to communicate its original purpose.

Yet it is precisely here that the question of subjectivity becomes unavoidable.

Who determines what constitutes completeness? Who decides which historical moment should be recovered? On what basis can a restorer claim to understand what was intended but never realized, or what once existed but has since disappeared?

The problem is not a lack of knowledge. The problem is the confidence that knowledge can eliminate uncertainty.

Viollet-le-Duc's theory assumes that sufficient expertise can bridge the gap between surviving evidence and lost reality. However, every reconstruction contains an interpretative leap. No matter how extensive the research, the restorer eventually reaches a point where evidence ends and judgment begins. At this moment, personal interpretation risks entering the work.

This observation is particularly significant when considered from the perspective of contemporary conservation-restoration. Modern conservators are highly trained professionals. They possess scientific tools, advanced imaging technologies, material analyses, and historical documentation unavailable to earlier generations. Yet the existence of better information does not remove the ethical dilemma. It merely increases the conservator's capacity to intervene.

The danger is not incompetence. The danger is certainty.

The more skilled the conservator becomes, the easier it becomes to justify intervention. Technical mastery may create the illusion that every loss can be compensated, every disruption corrected, and every fragment returned to a perceived state of completeness. Yet conservation-restoration was never intended to be an act of perfection.

At this point, a deeper question emerges concerning professional identity itself. What is the role of the conservator-restorer?

If the objective of restoration becomes the realization of a complete visual image, the conservator risks approaching the position of an artist. The intervention begins to reflect not only the surviving evidence of the object but also the restorer's understanding of how the object ought to appear. The artwork gradually becomes a dialogue between two creators separated by centuries.

Such a transformation carries significant ethical implications. The central figure of conservation-restoration should never be the conservator. The significance of the discipline lies not in demonstrating technical ability, artistic sensitivity, or intellectual authority. Its purpose is the preservation of cultural heritage.

This distinction is fundamental because cultural heritage extends beyond the individual object. Artworks, monuments, and historical artifacts function as repositories of collective memory. They preserve evidence of human experience, creativity, belief systems, and historical development. Through them, societies maintain continuity with the past and establish a foundation upon which future generations can build their understanding of identity and culture.

Consequently, when excessive subjectivity enters restoration, the consequences extend beyond the object itself. The intervention influences how future audiences encounter history. A restoration that privileges the vision of the conservator over the evidence of the artifact risks altering not merely material reality but cultural memory itself.

For this reason, the value of conservation-restoration cannot be measured by the visibility of the conservator's contribution. The most successful intervention may often be the one in which the conservator's presence remains least apparent. Professional achievement should not be understood as the ability to impose order upon the past, but as the ability to preserve it without allowing personal ambition, preference, or interpretation to overshadow the object's own historical voice.

From this perspective, Viollet-le-Duc's theory reveals an enduring challenge within conservation-restoration. The profession possesses the power to shape the future perception of cultural heritage. The ethical question is therefore not whether intervention is possible, but how far it should be permitted to go before preservation becomes authorship.

Case Study IV: Salvador Muñoz Viñas and the Limits of Objectivity

Contemporary conservation theory has increasingly moved away from the search for absolute objectivity. Among the most influential voices in this shift is Salvador Muñoz Viñas, whose work challenges many of the assumptions that traditionally shaped conservation-restoration ethics.

Unlike earlier theorists who sought universal principles capable of guiding intervention, Muñoz Viñas argues that conservation

decisions are fundamentally influenced by values. According to this perspective, the conservator does not operate within a neutral environment governed solely by scientific facts. Instead, every conservation project exists within a network of cultural, historical, institutional, social, and personal considerations that shape decision-making.

This position begins with an important observation. Scientific analysis can provide information regarding the physical condition of an object, its materials, its deterioration processes, and its history. However, scientific analysis alone cannot determine what ought to be done with that information. The decision to intervene, the extent of intervention, and the desired outcome all require value judgments that extend beyond empirical evidence.

A painting may contain discolored varnish, overpaint from previous restorations, losses within the paint layer, and signs of aging. Scientific examination can identify these conditions with increasing precision. Yet science cannot independently answer whether the varnish should be removed, whether overpaint should be preserved as part of the object's history, or whether losses should be visually reintegrated. These decisions ultimately depend upon human priorities and interpretations.

For Muñoz Viñas, this reality challenges the traditional aspiration toward complete objectivity. He argues that conservation is not simply the preservation of material matter but the preservation of values attributed to cultural heritage by individuals and communities. Consequently, different stakeholders may reasonably arrive at different conclusions regarding the same object.

This argument represents a significant departure from earlier restoration theories. Rather than viewing subjectivity as a limitation to be minimized, contemporary value-based conservation recognizes subjectivity as an unavoidable component of professional practice. The role of the conservator becomes less about discovering a single correct solution and more about navigating competing values in a transparent and responsible manner.

The strength of this position lies in its honesty. It acknowledges that conservation-restoration is performed by human beings rather than machines. Every intervention occurs within a particular cultural context and reflects contemporary understandings of authenticity, significance, and preservation. The ideal of complete neutrality becomes increasingly difficult to sustain when examined against the realities of professional practice.

However, this perspective also raises important concerns.

If all conservation decisions are understood primarily as expressions of values, where should professional boundaries be established? If subjectivity is accepted as unavoidable, what prevents it from gradually expanding beyond ethical limits? At what point does the recognition of multiple perspectives begin to weaken the authority of conservation principles designed to protect authenticity?

These questions are particularly relevant in an era characterized by rapidly changing cultural expectations and increasing demands for accessibility, aesthetic presentation, and public engagement. While cultural values undoubtedly influence conservation decisions, the discipline risks losing its methodological foundation if every intervention becomes equally justified through subjective interpretation.

The challenge therefore lies in balancing two realities. On one hand, complete objectivity may be unattainable. Conservation decisions inevitably involve human judgment. On the other hand, the impossibility of perfect objectivity does not eliminate the need for objective standards.

Scientific analysis, documentation, reversibility, minimal intervention, and respect for original material remain essential not because they remove subjectivity entirely, but because they establish limits around it. These principles serve as safeguards against the possibility that personal preferences, institutional pressures, or contemporary tastes might overshadow the historical reality of the object itself.

Muñoz Viñas ultimately reveals one of the most important truths within modern conservation-restoration: subjectivity cannot be eliminated from practice. Yet this realization should not lead to the abandonment of objectivity as a professional ideal. Rather, it reinforces the need for constant critical reflection. The conservator must remain aware not only of the object being treated, but also of the values and assumptions influencing the treatment itself.

The recognition of subjectivity is therefore not the conclusion of the debate. It is the beginning of an ethical responsibility to ensure that personal interpretation never exceeds the limits imposed by the preservation of cultural heritage.

Discussion: The Conservator as Steward Rather Than Author

The analysis of the theoretical positions presented above demonstrates that complete objectivity in conservation-restoration is unlikely to be achieved. Brandi reveals the interpretative nature of recognition, Ruskin warns of the dangers of intervention, Viollet-le-Duc illustrates the risks associated with reconstruction, and Muñoz Viñas acknowledges the influence of values upon conservation decisions. Together, these perspectives suggest that some degree of subjectivity is unavoidable within professional practice.

However, acknowledging the existence of subjectivity should not lead to its acceptance as a defining characteristic of the profession.

From the perspective of the author, conservation and restoration should remain as objective as possible. While complete neutrality may be unattainable, the profession should continuously strive toward objectivity rather than accommodate increasing levels of interpretation. The existence of subjectivity should be recognized as a limitation that requires management, not as a principle that guides intervention.

This distinction becomes particularly evident when considering the relationship between conservation and restoration. Conservation is primarily concerned with stabilizing and preserving cultural heritage in order to ensure its survival. Through environmental control, preventive measures, structural stabilization, and material preservation, conservation seeks to extend the life of an object while minimizing unnecessary intervention. In many respects, conservation represents the most objective dimension of the profession because its focus remains directed toward the physical survival of the object itself.

Restoration introduces greater complexity. Decisions regarding reintegration, reconstruction, cleaning, and visual presentation inevitably require interpretation. Nevertheless, interpretation should not be confused with creative freedom. The purpose of restoration is not to produce a visually satisfying object according

to contemporary expectations, nor to demonstrate the skill or artistic sensitivity of the conservator. Its purpose is to assist the viewer in understanding the work while preserving its authenticity and historical integrity.

For this reason, restoration should remain firmly grounded in evidence. Every intervention should emerge from material analysis, historical documentation, technical examination, and observable facts rather than personal preference. The objective is not to recreate what the conservator imagines the artwork once looked like, but to communicate what can be reasonably supported through evidence.

The distinction is fundamental because conservators are not artists working on their own creations. They are professionals entrusted with the care of objects created by others. Their responsibility is not self-expression but stewardship.

This understanding has important implications for professional identity. In contemporary discussions surrounding conservation-restoration, there is occasionally a tendency to focus on the individual conservator and the visibility of their contribution. Yet the true significance of the profession lies elsewhere. The artwork, monument, manuscript, or artifact remains the central subject of every intervention. Without the object, the profession itself would have no purpose.

An analogy may be drawn with the medical profession. In an emergency room, the physician's expertise is indispensable, but the physician is not the center of attention. The patient is. Every member of the medical team works toward a common objective: preserving life. Success is measured not by the visibility of the doctor's actions, but by the well-being of the patient.

A similar principle should apply to conservation-restoration. The conservator, art historian, scientist, curator, and technician all form part of a larger system dedicated to the preservation of cultural heritage. The ultimate objective is not professional recognition but the survival of the object itself.

This perspective becomes particularly important when considering the broader social role of conservation. Cultural heritage is not merely a collection of objects. It represents collective memory, historical knowledge, artistic achievement, and cultural identity. Through artworks, monuments, and historical artifacts, societies maintain a connection with previous generations and transmit knowledge to those that follow.

Consequently, excessive subjectivity within restoration has consequences that extend beyond individual objects. When interpretation exceeds evidence, future generations may inherit not the historical reality of the object, but the assumptions and preferences of the conservator. In this sense, an intervention motivated by personal certainty may unintentionally obscure the very heritage it seeks to protect.

For this reason, objectivity should remain a professional ideal, even if it can never be fully attained. The ethical responsibility of the conservator is not to eliminate subjectivity entirely, but to ensure that it remains subordinate to evidence, documentation, scientific analysis, and respect for the cultural object.

The most successful conservation-restoration project is not the one in which the conservator's presence is most visible. It is the one in which the cultural object continues to speak for itself.

Conclusion

The present research set out to examine one of the most enduring questions within conservation-restoration theory: to what extent can the discipline be considered objective, and what role should subjectivity play in the preservation of cultural heritage?

Several questions guided this investigation. Can restoration ever be completely objective? At what point does interpretation become subjectivity? What role should personal judgment play in conservation decisions? And how can authenticity be preserved while acknowledging the inevitable presence of human interpretation?

Through the analysis of key theoretical positions, it became evident that complete objectivity is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve. Cesare Brandi demonstrated that restoration begins with recognition, a process that necessarily involves interpretation. John Ruskin highlighted the dangers of intervention that exceeds the limits of preservation and risks replacing historical authenticity with contemporary reconstruction. Eugène Viollet-le-Duc illustrated the possibilities and dangers associated with restoration as completion, revealing how easily intervention can approach authorship. Finally, Salvador Muñoz Viñas emphasized the influence of values and cultural perspectives upon conservation decision-making, challenging the notion of absolute neutrality.

Taken together, these perspectives demonstrate that subjectivity cannot be entirely removed from conservation-restoration practice. Every intervention involves decisions that require professional judgment. Scientific analysis can provide information, but it cannot independently determine every course of action. The conservator must inevitably interpret evidence and transform it into treatment decisions.

However, the findings of this research also suggest that the impossibility of complete objectivity should not lead to the acceptance of unrestricted subjectivity. On the contrary, the existence of subjective influence reinforces the importance of maintaining rigorous ethical and methodological standards. Documentation, scientific examination, minimal intervention, reversibility, and respect for original material remain essential precisely because they establish boundaries around interpretation.

A distinction must also be made between conservation and restoration. Conservation, focused primarily on stabilization and preservation, represents the most objective aspect of the profession. Restoration introduces greater interpretative challenges because it addresses the visual and perceptual dimensions of cultural heritage. Yet even within restoration, intervention should remain grounded in evidence rather than personal preference.

The central argument of this study is therefore not that subjectivity should be eliminated, but that it should be continuously recognized, questioned, and restrained. Conservation-restoration is not an artistic practice whose purpose is self-expression. The conservator does not create cultural heritage but safeguards it. The profession exists to ensure that artworks, monuments, and historical objects continue to communicate their own histories rather than those imposed upon them by later interpreters.

Ultimately, the significance of conservation-restoration extends beyond individual objects. Cultural heritage serves as a repository of collective memory, identity, and historical knowledge. Every intervention influences how future generations will encounter and understand the past. For this reason, the ethical responsibility of

the conservator extends beyond technical competence. It requires humility, critical reflection, and a constant awareness that the true subject of the profession is not the conservator, but the cultural object itself [3-12].

Objectivity may remain an unattainable ideal. Nevertheless, it is an ideal worth pursuing, because the closer conservation-restoration remains to evidence and authenticity, the more faithfully it fulfills its responsibility to both the past and the future.

References

1. Brandi C (2005) *Theory of Restoration*. Translated by Cynthia Rockwell. Florence: Nardini Editore 1-191.
2. Ruskin J (1849) *The Seven Lamps of Architecture*. London: Smith, Elder and Co.
3. Muñoz Viñas S (2005) *Contemporary Theory of Conservation*. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann https://ia800106.us.archive.org/0/items/ContemporaryTheoryOfConservation_201711/Contemporary%20Theory%20of%20Conservation.pdf.
4. Viollet-le-Duc EE (1990) *The Foundations of Architecture: Selections from the Dictionnaire Raisonné*. New York: George Braziller.
5. Jokilehto J (1999) *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann https://www.icrom.org/sites/default/files/ICCROM_05_HistoryofConservation00_en.pdf.
6. Staniforth S (2013) *Historical Perspectives on Preventive Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute https://www.getty.edu/conservation/publications_resources/books/historical_perspectives.html.
7. Avrami E, Mason R, de la Torre M (2000) *Values and Heritage Conservation*. Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute 1-14.
8. Ashley-Smith J (1994) *Risk Assessment for Object Conservation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9781135144739_A23799748/preview-9781135144739_A23799748.pdf.
9. Caple C (2000) *Conservation Skills: Judgement, Method and Decision Making*. London: Routledge 1-247.
10. ICOM-CC (2008) *Terminology to Characterize the Conservation of Tangible Cultural Heritage*. International Council of Museums – Committee for Conservation <https://www.icom-cc.org/en/terminology-for-conservation>.
11. (1964) *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*. International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/venice_e.pdf.
12. Muir R (2007) *The New Reading the Landscape: Fieldwork in Landscape History*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Copyright: ©2026 Theodora Musceleanu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.