

BASIC CONCEPTS OF PROTECTING ARCHITECTURAL MONUMENTS.

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10872818>

Odilova F.O

*Teacher of the Department of Reconstruction and Restoration of Architectural
Monuments*

Musurmonov Q.T Jumayeva M.A.

*301- Students of the reconstruction and restoration of architectural monuments
group.*

SAMARKAND STATE UNIVERSITY OF ARCHITECTURAL CONSTRUCTION

fayzoaodilova@gmail.com

Abstract

In this article, any actions related to architectural structures, the historical formation bases of architectural monument repair for the protection of artistically significant areas and monuments. Any activity related to architectural structures is covered. A utilitarian goal or, conversely, an attempt to distinguish purely artistic and formal qualities can lead to an abstract theory of real and living reality. Experiences of repairing architectural monuments, constructive solutions of architectural monuments, architectural decorations used in monuments, technological processes of repair and restoration, methods and rules for maintaining the structural strength of monuments are explained.

Key words

Wood, canvas, restoration, reconstruction, photography, metal, plaster, cardboard, mold, fresco, coating.

Introduction A monument is not just a building. He changes and is influenced by his environment, so the combination of these qualities determines his artistic value. Even if the monument is located separately from other buildings, it is an element of a large natural or man-made composition. At the same time, architectural structures are not simple works of art: they rightfully belong to the category of more complex phenomena, which can be understood only by following high aesthetic and historical criteria. Of all the works of art, only they have a practical purpose, which in most cases determines their artistic form. Architecture, like no other work of art, responds to certain human needs, therefore it has a significant and active influence on the material and spiritual life of the time.

In a sense, this is its advantage, but on the other hand, architectural works are more prone to rearrangement and destruction than other works of art, because they



must meet the ever-changing needs of society. In its highest concept, architecture is the only inseparable symbiosis between the unique aesthetic qualities inherent in works of art and the material requirements for objects of practical use. A utilitarian goal or, conversely, an attempt to distinguish purely artistic and formal qualities can lead to an abstract theory

of real and living reality. This is an immutable fact that art history has only just begun to understand and which art theory has not yet recognized. In the past and even recently, such a combination of opposite phenomena in architecture was not even suspected. The two schools and two views were opposed to each other: some believed that architecture reflected social and technical progress, others considered the work of architecture as a painting or sculpture that expressed the artist's culture and personal aesthetic aspirations. Therefore, it is not surprising that only in our time it was possible to approach the correct assessment of the essence and significance of the architectural works and start writing the history of architecture, the history that needs to be created. Successes in the conservation and restoration of architectural monuments turned out to be much more modest than in visual arts, since it was not possible to properly assess the importance of architectural works until recently. Every time it seems necessary to start restoration work, the existing legislation is not a basis for practical work, as it is based on incorrect and superficial rules for the assessment of architecture. The experience of restoration of painting and sculptural works has shown that there is a real possibility of determining the principles and practical methods of restoration works that correspond to the historical characteristics of the monument. Old masters, as a rule, did not restore paintings and sculptures, even in the 15th and 16th centuries. the frescoes were periodically moved to other places. At the same time, this or that image has been preserved not because of its aesthetic value, but because of the content of the work or the qualities characteristic of it over the centuries, which is the purpose of pilgrimage. The desire to preserve the work not for its artistic merits, but for its ideological content explains the taking of measures to prolong the life of especially famous monuments. These measures were called "recovery", although they had nothing in common with what we mean by this concept today.

The sole purpose of restoring the damaged work was to restore the image as accurately as possible to the original. This was necessary to preserve the traditional prestige of the work, which was not less than its material value. These were the

reasons that resolved the issue of the need for restoration and determined the methodology of restoration work. In all cases, the main task was to repeat the plot as accurately and completely as possible. The restoration of objects, especially for religious purposes, was rarely carried out, but over time it became more frequent. The same criteria, by analogy, began to be applied to works of lesser interest or of no importance at all.

Such a restoration consisted only of replacing the missing parts: the deleted parts of the picture were revived with a brush, the transition from the old part to the new was smoothed; the missing parts were replaced with new ones. The age-old belief in the constant progress of art led to the destruction of the old and its replacement by new works. Fine art monuments were destroyed, and new forms of artistic expression appeared in their place. A similar fate befell many works of architecture, sculpture, and wall-paintings, which fell into disrepute, not because they had become unusable, but because of changing tastes. A sculpture or easel painted on canvas or wood can be removed, moved and replaced. The monument must be destroyed to make way for a new, more modern monument. If it was not possible to use the monument in new conditions, its interior decoration - sculpture and stucco decorations, paintings were looted or destroyed and replaced with a new one in accordance with the spirit of the times. The thoughtless and narrow-minded enmity caused by ignorance, arrogance, intolerance towards the past and the present has led to the complete derailment, destruction, destruction of many monuments, which will later lead to sad regret. No less fatal were the consequences of the wild and superstitious "love" which led to the restoration of monuments, the desire to restore them to their lost glory, and the desire to worship the ruins as a result of romantic interests. The subtle features of the past, barely perceptible in fragments of ancient ruins, have a very attractive power (in this context, we must preserve excellent examples of historical artistic creation). But the shapeless pieces and fragments of the almost completely erased artworks are fascinating to many people. Where nothing can be separated, a wide field for improvisation opens up.



The situation remained unchanged during those times when the old art prevailed over the new. Looting or destruction of ancient monuments continued. But over time, the situation changed for the better, the aesthetic qualities of ancient art attracted attention; researchers interested in the form understood the logic of the historical development of past civilizations. In our time, the systematic criticism of modern art sometimes leads to a reassessment of antiquity, which, in turn, arouses the desire to preserve the monuments of the past from the damage and destruction caused by time, to continue their life through restoration. However, the desire to preserve "living" monuments typical of the Renaissance should not be confused with the desire to return to antiquity. Preservation is a new phenomenon, and if previously the protection of monuments was the competence of historians, now it involves technical personnel and even ignorant people in the production process, creating new opportunities to damage the protected object. Conservation of monuments should be considered only as a preliminary step before a thorough restoration intended to give the monument its true value.

For a whole century, restoration was experimental and only empirical. Randomly selected tools and materials were used; the restoration workers had no idea about the history of the monument and the scientific research conducted in this regard. In most cases, the measures taken have done more harm than good. But the most dangerous thing is that the personality of the restorer inevitably left its mark on the monument. Restoration work was carried out by artists or sculptors

who, without receiving recognition for their creative work, sought to exploit their modest and controversial talent by reproducing works of art. As for architectural monuments, the exact reproduction of the original architectural forms of the past was seen as an admission of the architect's inability to be truly creative, with which a self-respecting architect would never agree. Until recently, all restorers in all branches of art, without exception, considered it their duty and recognized the right to "improve" what they were called to restore. They made every effort to revive the monument, to compensate for the damage caused by time, to correct the stylistic character of the monument in a way that suits their spirit and taste. The restorers did not set themselves the task of understanding the technology of production of the work, the characteristic features of the work of the author of the structure, his way of thinking and creative style, they did not study the achievements of science in this regard. The restorers of paintings were usually alchemists who did not reveal the secrets of making and mixing paint; They went about their business in secret, and as a result, the paintings they restored looked like defenseless guinea pigs. In ancient times, literary texts were also sometimes restored, but under the constant and strict control of experts, and from the 18th century onwards. Attempting to fill not less paragraphs and pages of manuscripts or texts considered untouchable. These prohibitions did not apply to works of art, and if the latter remained untouched, it was mainly for economic reasons. Secrets of composition, proportions and methods used are jealously guarded. Since the restoration work was usually not done by major artists, but by assistants who had no idea about the original studies, they were not allowed to examine the originals, they had to do the work that was commissioned blindly. Thus, the performers of the work could never be independent in their creations and could not compete with their teachers, which left the honor of receiving new orders to the latter. A student who realized the wisdom of scientific restoration and wanted to achieve independence had to turn to sources and learn skills from restored paintings. The direct and indirect damage caused by artists and art historians to paintings was sometimes more serious than time and natural conditions. Poorly executed restorations required new, sometimes temporary restorations. Art theorists lost interest in such restored works, which opened up the possibility of new, more dangerous experiments. There are two types of damage to monuments: either they are destroyed by the effects of time and atmospheric phenomena, or (in addition to the reasons already mentioned) they are damaged by rude attempts to restore them, which, as a result of casual use, lead to unfortunate consequences. will come. paints or other materials.

With the help of such a "method", serious aesthetic and economic damage is caused to the artistic heritage of the country. Such works can no longer be preserved. The costs of their restoration will increase in proportion to the damage caused earlier, philological and historical research will become extremely difficult, the educational value of the monuments will decrease, and the reliability of documentation will be lost.

Modern principles. Even in our time, unfortunately, it cannot be said that restorers in their practical work always follow the strict principles established by art theorists. The reasons why modern restoration work is often empirical remain the same, namely: insufficient training of specialists, professional jealousy, oversimplification, belief that the work can be rejuvenated by applying specific surgical aesthetics.

Methods that are completely unacceptable in artistic texts and are considered by historians as forgery of the original are still widely used in the field of plastic arts. In addition, such an initiative is sometimes praised, because usually the formal qualities of a work are appreciated only when seen in its finished form. While scientific restoration seeks to guarantee respect for the original and eliminate possible additions and distortions of the monument, natural or artificial, empirical restoration seeks to give the impression of completeness to the work through pedantic tricks. Only a superficial and naive observer would be misled by this camouflage of the original, as the restored work resembles the original. The new parts never harmonize with the original structure of the work, because the restorer cannot reproduce the work of the original author absolutely exactly, but the new parts often leave an independent impression. These parts, in turn, are subject to the aging process. And even if at first they are so clearly executed that they seem to merge with the compositional fabric of the original, over time they differ from it and are perceived as alien. This applies to all forms of visual art: even replacing or adding missing parts is a risk. The introduction of new elements in place of the missing elements is not able to create the impression that the monument is completely finished. The void itself is alien to the work, but the element intended to fill this void is perceived as alien. In many restoration works carried out in the past, it can be seen that in order to simplify and speed up the work, their authors leveled the tone of the existing parts of the work in such a way that they seemed to form a whole with the added parts. Needless to say, the results obtained from such tricks are an example of artistic lies and create a terrible impression. The results of such restorations are wrong and the methods of doing these things are illegal. A work of art, be it architecture, sculpture, or painting, still loses its original poetry, its

authenticity is irrevocably destroyed. This practice is condemned today, but not abandoned; it is still recognized in unqualified circles and among art speculators. Leaving a lost item blank, even if done with great courtesy, is considered an admission of the helplessness of the restorer and the inferiority of the scientific methodology of restoration. In other words, the work of the restorer is considered as the ability to hide the updated parts, give the monument a finished and updated look, replace damaged or missing parts with new ones. Strengthening damaged parts is, in addition, a difficult, delicate, time-consuming and expensive operation, which is why it is not popular among inexperienced managers and executives. Thus, the task is to raise the level of culture and, therefore, education. The paintings, panels, frescoes and sculptures, examples of which can be seen in museums, art galleries and churches, have been restored to the highest standards, as well as some examples of architectural monuments, unfortunately very rare, restored with great care. a skill capable of slowly shaping people's tastes. This will help to overcome existing prejudices, superficial approach, philistinism, as well as the dominant opinion that a work of art is judged only by its appearance.

In order for restoration to become an educational subject, historians and specialists must unite their efforts, practical knowledge and experience. If the results achieved in the past were so disastrous, then the main initiative belonged not to historians, but to unprincipled opportunists. Henceforth, in the practice of restoration, every restoration project must be submitted to the historian for approval, because only he can propose a correct and truly scientific way of restoring a work of art. In addition to studying the aesthetic aspects of an architectural monument, experts must determine the purpose of the original structure, the additions made later, and its place in the history of art. It would be a serious mistake to consider only the utilitarian purpose in relation to a certain period. However, it would also be wrong to have a functional purpose that is only interested in aesthetic value, or to consider an architectural monument as a "special thing" outside of its main social function.

In other words, the restorer must, first of all, study the inner essence (content and form) of the monument, then its surroundings in detail, and then proceed from the set of data collected by him. Such an approach, as required by recent advances in the science of history, has not been used in the past, which has led to two false results. In one case, the desire to preserve historical authenticity prevailed over other factors (for example, during the restoration of the Colosseum), in another, the aesthetic qualities of the monuments were completely ignored and rejected with

disdain. In either case, the memorial is not faked, which is still better than the half-measures that are rarely used in reality.

REFERENCES

1. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining 2022-yil 8-noyabrdagi PQ-416-son Arxitektura-qurilish sohasida kadrlar tayyorlash tizimini yanada takomillashtirish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida qarori
2. И.И.Суходрев., Ж.С.Розенбаума Консервация и реставрация памятников и исторических зданий 1978 г. 74-85с.
3. Qo'ziyevich, E. I., & Elmuradovna, J. E. (2023). Qadimgi qarshi shahri arxiologik yodgorliklari arxitekturasini ilmiy tahlili. *Arxitektura, muhandislik va zamonaviy texnologiyalar jurnali*, 2(2), 58-61.
4. Qo'ziyevich, E. I., & Elmuradovna, J. E. (2023). The scheme of territorial placement of agglomeration commercial and household complexes in Uzbekistan. *Arxitektura, muhandislik va zamonaviy texnologiyalar jurnali*, 2(2), 62-67.
5. Doniyorbek, N. (2023). BOLALAR UCHUN ZAMONAVIY SUV MUOLAJALARI MAJMUASINI YARATISH. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF ARTS AND DESIGN*, 523-527.
6. Odilova, F., Mamatkulov, U. B., & Muxtorov, Z. K. (2023). BASIC CONCEPTS OF TRAINING EXPERT-RESTORATOR FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND RESTORATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE OBJECTS. *JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING, MECHANICS AND MODERN ARCHITECTURE*, 291-299.
7. Elmuradovna, J. E., & Qo'ziyevich, E. I. (2023). BUXORO ARKINING ARXITEKTURAVIY SHAKLLANISHI. *ARXITEKTURA, MUHANDISLIK VA ZAMONAVIY TEXNOLOGIYALAR JURNALI*, 2(2), 75-78.
8. Maxmatqulov, I. T. (2022). Scientific analysis of the Erkurgan historical and archeological complex in Karshi district of Kashkadarya region. *Journal of Architectural Design*, 4, 27-31.
9. Fayoz, O., & Baljan, X. (2024). ANALYSIS OF SCIENTIFIC AND PRACTICAL WORKS ON HISTORICAL MONUMENTS IN UZBEKISTAN. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, 2(17), 403-406.
10. Luqmonov, D., & Jurayeva, E. (2023). Muqarnas Decorations: A Masterpiece of Islamic Architecture. *Genius Repository*, 22, 13-18.
11. Bazarovna, N. Y. (2023). O'ZBEKISTONDA TURAR-JOYLAR ARXITEKTURASINING TARIXIY SHAKLLANISHI. *Central Asian Journal of Arts and Design*, 358-362.

11. *Kayumov, H. I., & Fazilova, Z. K. (2023). Organization of traffic flow and optimization of underground-overground passages. the importance of studying optimization of the road transport network in the training of architects–urban planners. journal of engineering, mechanics and modern architecture, 477-482.*
12. **Фарангиз К. (2023). СПОСОБЫ ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ И РАЗВИТИЯ ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ ЦЕНТРОВ. ЖУРНАЛ ИНЖЕНЕРИИ, МЕХАНИКИ И СОВРЕМЕННОЙ АРХИТЕКТУРЫ, 280-284.**