

# ARCHITECTURE AS INTERCHANGEABLE PHENOMENA

Oana Diaconescu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UAUIM - "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urbanism, Bucharest (ROMANIA)  
onk\_di@yahoo.com

## Abstract

Designing the archaeological sites has become a fact without significance along with the social and economic insufficiencies of the current period, concluding that the architectural values can be stored later than the interest of the causes of global destabilization. At the human and competitive relations system levels, the problems posed difficulties in understanding the role of history and in maintaining the cultural identity. Today the most important areas are becoming those of mass re-functioning and living.

Starting from the principle of stratigraphic research applied to architecture, there will be considered a number of archaeological sites whose value corresponds to the need of expressing the character of a community, in relation to the type of memory yielded. In this way of thinking, the monument becomes a contemporary element and can keep alive a significance widely recognized. The study will argue the need to integrate the ruins, seen as vital parts, which centralize the cultural development of any city. The idea, by which archaeological sites should be regarded as degraded architecture and not as petrified objects in their own history, will change the discourse of new museum insertion from the conservative-restorative area, into an architectural design object. The approaches of some experts in the field and their attempts to adapt the ancient forms to the contemporary needs of cultural space, will be presented in diagrams, through an analytical method, which can be an alternative to the current arbitrary way of theorizing the designing process.

Keywords: interchangeable architecture, elevation stratigraphy, collective memory

## 1 DEFINITION OF INTERCHANGEABLE ARCHITECTURE

The evidence of stratification in relation to the city, determines an amount of the most diverse circumstances to be investigated by appropriate critical knowledge, in order to value the numerous archaeological sites of interest. The limit is identified in this situation, with the place where a space ends and another begins. Its main feature from a certain point is recognized by proximity relations or by the remoteness ones [1]. Today the ruins are considered a breach between the city and its dialogue with the past. Their limits are defined according to their location in relation to neighborhoods: at the intersection with the city, isolated or between other archaeological sites. This intermediate conjunction space among remains and urbanity is difficult to control due to the fragmentation of the first and the overlapping of the two types of systems. In order to emphasize the limit it will be determined the "archaeological impact area" [2], due to a graphical configuration that circumscribes the entire territory, as consequence of the relationships with the archaeological site. This terminology delimits and focuses the study.

Comparative analysis becomes a major factor for determining the specificities of forms, the deviations from the model and their place in the genesis of the area. Starting from the definition of Henry Cleere, the "urban archaeology" is considered as the "practical of archaeological techniques applied to history of urban phenomenon in the current circumstances of the modern city" [3]. The horizontal stratigraphy (soil) and the vertical one (elevation structures) demonstrate, following the research, the need to preserve and highlight a historical period despite the destruction of another.

Today, the archaeological area becomes a place free of axis, a fluid space, by which the city can invade the ruins. This circumstance presents the vestiges as interchangeable elements with the contiguous contemporary environment.

To determine the meaning of historical value of the monument, it is necessary to define the ruins [4], as the remains of architecture, a complete structure in a certain moment of time, which fell into a state of abandonment, due to migration or lack of use. This will consider only those archaeological sites [5] whose value corresponds to the need to that present to the community, an identity in relation to the type of memory generated by it. The monument becomes the representation that can keep alive an extensively recognized significance. The relationship between the monument and the museum

depends, as museography sustains, on the ancient times, when the Mesopotamians and Egyptians built to express their strength and to recover property by exposing it in the first collections. Today the principle of this association is broader, because the monument "presents itself" to the public. Thus, the museum becomes the institution that preserves and transmits the representative architectural features and the scientific or arts objects of interest. The archaeological museum is a particular category, concluded on site and directly related to it, presenting both as outdoor trail and as independent entity, formally defined. The musealization of an historic space means transmitting to the public a series of information about the site, valuing and preserving it. To determine how ruins get exposed, the Italian term *allestimento* can be distinguished, which underlines the visual and auditory ways to establish the spatiality of an organized event [6]. For a better understanding of the historical information and the way they are narrated, it can be used the stratigraphic idiom. This science deals with the study of land levels sequence or architectural complex [7]. Archaeological layer can be determined by excavation campaigns or chronology. The connection with other accumulations and deposits is always researched due to the stratigraphic method. This study is one of the consolidated archiving forms of data, to highlight the character of settlements, or the cultural characteristics of communities to live in the area. The statement suggests the use of this term in the study of contemporary built space architecture extrapolating its meaning to architecture. Beyond the principles of (post-) processual archaeology, the stratigraphic method will underline and systematize all the analysis parameters of the urban context.

Architecture is, above all, substance. It enters in the cycle of "eternal return", being considered, like the Stoics philosophy, a unique existence, which can't be separated into two entities: physical representation and meaning. The problem of understanding the topic is its relation to time. In this case we find ourselves in front of three assumptions:

The first one regards, from the etymology of the word *telos*, the sinusoidal changing of architecture, as an amount of items that are being "build" through the substance or disappear at a time, turning into matter and annexing to a cyclic process of existence. Almost all buildings are considered in this way. No edifice can be maintained forever, because in this way, nothing new will be built. In this formula the spirit of "place" remains as a "trace" in the context, whatever form the building takes.

In the second one, we are dealing with a semi-linear temporal journey determined by museumification. These buildings are considered "different", particular to a civilization, for which, despite of their finite being, it continues to be maintained. Even if their material is damaged, it will always act through restoration, consolidation etc. Thus, at a certain time, it will be taken care only of the intervention, so all initial operations will be thought as "historical" ones. This is the current conservationist attitude.

The third one is called "interchangeable" architecture and refers to those buildings, which at one time are considered representative and protected to survive or they disappear, because, by comparison, other "more important" buildings claim the care. This hypothesis represents nowadays museography, that must choose which of its monuments will be transmitted beyond, even by accepting the risk of forgetting certain values. The denomination "interchangeable" is associated with all architectures, because the current passing between the monument and abandoned building became extremely fragile.

Contemporary museum, on the other hand, is an intermediate in-between body. It communicates with the ruins and the buildings of the city, without belonging to neither of them. The museum, as Michel Foucault declaims, is a "different" space, which by definition of heterotopy can be easily identified as interchangeable. Its configuration will depend on the absolute dialogue with all proximity elements, by communicating and integrating a narration. The museum can be considered, due to its interpretative flexibility, the one that splits the monument from the city. Sometimes the intervention, interpreted strictly museographically, explores the historical material, by joining the archaeological data and investigating the composition or the fracturing processes.

## 2 MUSEOGRAPHIC METHODS

Within its new acceptance of archaeological park, the site is dealing with the concept of museum, through which works are displayed and assimilated by society. A series of actions such as recognizing the archaeological preexistence or its location in relation to the ancient structure, shows similarity to historical assumptions issued before the discovery. This type of analysis emphasizes the ability of a single vestige of narrating a historical fact of great importance to collective memory.

Creating an archaeological park leads, following the rigorous methodology of the excavation, to a constant verification of the theoretical assumptions and documentation from any new discovery or conservation of ruins. Its main purpose is the hypothetical reconstitution of the original context. In this case, mobile heritage gives important information about the nature, value and condition of the monument. The archaeological park is open to research and scientific interest, by providing a uniform preservation of all its components. This new-created relationship, by which the public may perceive one historical element (the form) and associate it to the entire archaeological site (the background), represents the spirit of contemporary monument. In an age of information and speed, man does not need surfaces, but landmarks. The related area is the one of flows and nodes, so the vestiges may provide to function for synthesizing facts, events, memories.

The best way to save the patrimony that has lost its original use for which it was designed, is to highlight the exhibition qualities, during an operation. The archaeological sites are already considered museums, through a series of acceptable demands, which favors forms of visual reading, using reversible solutions of reconstructive nature.

The two types of intervention: the conservative and the museographical one, should not influence the decrease of each other. If the first evokes the object due to the pedagogical and remembering functions, the exhibition aspect analyzes all layers that led to the current image and physiognomy of the complex and not at one of its dominant qualities. While instruments to practice conservation are becoming increasingly elaborate, archaeological heritage is growing, relying on social and cultural need of protection of all common property. It will exclude, in principle, all these forms of conservation that only researchers are allowed to study and identify the characteristics of the heritage elements, considering that the praxis gets to self de-contextualization of the museum. Important works, disposed remotely from the site, are closed in deposits to be investigated and modest works are exhibited. Such case is found in the exhibition spaces of the buildings from the XVIIIth century, where the psychological factor is completely denied, meanwhile the only criterion of the exhibition is the chronology of their discovery. This common phenomena causes confusion between archeology museums and those of ancient arts.

Franco Minissi sustains that the surest way to make an archaeological ensemble known and understood by the public, is that of conservation *in situ*. The only major difference of site typologies is the location to the city. While an urban archaeological complex is already integrated in the environment, working and analyzing only the accessible historical levels and evoking partially its importance, those outside the city pursue a site conservation of all types of goods, in order to establish a generalized musealization. For ancient monuments inserted in contemporary cities, the urban context becomes also their exhibition frame. It is necessary to provide museographical methods to facilitate the environment comprehension, such as: highlighting detail and overall values, providing information on the monument, eliminating the problems of visibility, both on the trail and in the neighborhood, offering information about accesses and panoramic views, revitalizing artistic and historical traces, regardless of the period to which they belong [8].

The city becomes, for any monument that is integrated into its structure, a museum where every work of art is given to community. Whatever it would try to put in value an architecture element, in an enclosed space, it would lose the relationship with the environment and subsequently with its origin, becoming deprived of certain features. Monument is the one that gives the city the sign of belonging to the past, the ancient and historical value. The intervention in relation to the temporality of the context must be accentuated. This should remind the negative example of the new Acropolis Museum, designed by Bernard Tschumi, that destroys strategically the impact of the original archaic remains, conditioning the visitor to choose between authentic but inaccessible and imagined. The city must act as an unitary "museum", with tourist itineraries, information centers, visitor programs, provisions and restrictions on the traffic [9]. In Spain, the Roman Theater of Cartagena became the main attraction of the city. The museum conducted by Rafael Moneo is a signal, thus linking the archaeological site, as a cultural pole, to the rest of the urban tissue. Such open spaces that host commemorating works induce a new integration system, through permanent and unconditional participation of all visitors.

The conservation of cultural relics is often established within the museum's space. Consolidation has become a necessary operation in many sites of the Greco-Roman period. Last evaluation of the Roman forum [10], shows that most of the Palatine area and of the Domitian structures from the bases of the hill, are in danger of collapse. The same situation is encountered at the covering by a partial cupola at the *Grande Terme*, in Hadrian's Villa, that stood surprisingly, with no static reasons.

The monumental restoration problems, the active surviving of the remains and the museographical and scenographical message perceived by the public, are the major difficulties of the vestiges that become a container for the proposed functions. The distinction between types of elements (ruin and new construction) that live together, should be respected. On the other hand, the type of technology applied to the development of installations, besides being modern and innovative, should not alter the adjacent space.

The need to prevent degradation by limiting uses, results in a set of rules, depending on the risk zone, so that changes should be minimal and without any subsequent consequences. The ruins of an archaeological site are multi-layered buildings and their research institutions will involve interest, requiring multidisciplinary collaboration. Franco Minissi demonstrated that any protection work in an archaeological site will attest the image and the original meaning of the monument. The first form of "in situ musealization" and in fact the most common, is the covering. Many solutions, such as Malia (Crete), where contemporary materials and techniques change the actual connection with the antique or the ruins of the *Duomo del Feltre Piazza*, Carlo Scarpa's proposal, which redraws the urban space, determine major conflicts in the perception of other professionals, such as archaeologists or city administration, received appellatives such as "invasive" or "radical" [11]. Choosing the intervention method will not be damaging to the state of monument, its structure, wherever his position or attendance. The remains will be understood, known and put in value as any other existing object in a museum [12]. According to the *European Heritage Planning and Management*, the book of Howard Ashworth [13], degradation of cultural heritage can be prevented by: restoration, conservation (passive and active protection by special operations), reconstruction, copy and musealization. Thus, operations on the remains follow the typological research and the result of the percentage of items held for each category of buildings. For this reason, various design practices become contraindicated. In some cases by protecting a monument is considered to remove parts of it (or entirely) and move them permanently (or temporary) in a museum. Later on the site they will be replaced by a copy or an intervention, obtaining a new image of urban tissue.

The notion of integrating to ambient defines the configuration of the indoor and outdoor spaces, in order to function as exposition area. Conversion is more difficult for the remains because they are conditioned by their structure, regular care, the capacity of space to "receive" visitors, limiting the possibilities of intervention. Of course, these spaces can be transformed over time, therefore any thought of *allestimento* will be reversibly and flexible.

## 2.1 Open spaces

The open spaces refer to outdoor locations, through the ruins or as an extension of those outside limit, through a green inaccessible area (or patio). All items proposed, fit with the artifacts in the landscape. The detail was created for the first time by Carlo Scarpa, by placing the statue of Cangrande on a suspended walkway, before entering the museum of Castelvecchio, a form of expression of the interior over the environment. The main function of an archaeological building, is first of all to expose itself.

Opening items between them, formal communication and obtainment of a complex visual representations are the means by which space can produce a strong impression to visitors. Thus, any development in an archaeological site involves a qualitative assessment of its components, in order to determine a specific environment of each museum. Reading remains arrangement is based on a route that will highlight the nature and the complexity of the given archaeological sequence. One of the sites that best expresses the state before the "end" is an ancient civilization city of Pompeii, where a stratigraphic analysis shows the traces of the absolute human tragedy [14]. Following studies conducted by the International Organization of Archaeological Open Air Museums and Experimental Archaeology, it was concluded that each site narrates in his own way relationship between context, landscape and archeology, while the museum as physical presence, always in a diffuse form, may be regarded as a crossing element between the different natures of the place [15].

## 2.2 Closed spaces

By the meaning of indoors, it is understood the use, in order to musealize [16], the surroundings defined by the delimitation of an outer envelope, represented both by ancient enclosures, structurally stable and interventions on the monument, which outline the transition between areas and the new inserts made on the site. Treatment is different for everyone, because the message itself varies.

These spaces may become museum areas with the purpose of their contemporary understanding the museum, inducing an exclusive report between collection and surroundings.

In the ancient indoors the interpretation is stratigraphic, from the interior of the structure plan, to the inserted artifacts or the existing exhibit. The musealization goal is first of all to present the site, for which crossing an interior place must be accompanied by narration and by creating a superlative state, due to the direct contact with the ruin. Man must realize that it can "live" together with a surviving history, described in detail and identified by visiting. The concept of museum "outside the museum" refers to those public spaces that present an exposition character by their origin, their disposal in the city or through the confined associations between different sites, avoiding thus institutionalized forms. In these cases the musealization is a natural phenomenon, which includes parts of the assembly, according to their representation in time. For archaeological areas the preexistence itself and the original site, associate themselves to the cultural function.

A distinctive example is the Temple of Hadrian, the Pantheon in Rome, which didn't lose its devotional character, being used as a church and also presenting expository valences, because of the numerous sculptural works, frescoes and tombs.

The difference between an archaeological museum and an art one, involves a differential achievement of the entire frame set, since for the second, the employed techniques can be repeated to several collections. Wide variety of remains found on a site leads to the development of practices adapted to each material, using the most flexible application. On the other hand, any architectural detail or ruin, as part of a building can not communicate anything by itself, but only by an appropriate development context or by its history. In such cases including a collection to the artifacts conditions the exhibition space, which may lose its independence and semantics.

The new museum space inserted is impersonal and uniform. The way of transmitting the information is direct, through the implementation of technology without outside interference. This will use the media narrative based on interactivity, sound, video projections, which brings the visitor in an imagined environment, reconstructing a past period. Even if initially the entire museum system will be adapted and dedicated to the remains, some closed spaces can facilitate the overall understanding of the site. Lucia Cataldo compares the crossing of the archaeological area with a chess game [17], played by professional and amateur, saying that the former remembers the relations between parties, while the second category could at most find their place on the board. Thus, if the scientific route is addressed to specialists, for the others, the musealization of the ruins constitute the only form of appropriation of space, initially inaccessible. The major difference between a contemporary museum of archeology and the ones on archaeological areas is the continuous reporting at the vestiges. Frequently, the recomposing of the context is not necessary, because the comprehension is based on the analogies form-background with the environment. The techniques of generating a new ambient in the enclosed spaces through exhibits, displays, racks and equipment, constitutes new borders for the research. They depend, as demonstrated, on the trail configuration. The two types of rooms: the one-side accessible from an adjacent corridor as chained spaces, which passes from one room to another, must be set in relation to collection for reporting at human scale.

## **2.3 Semi-open or semi-closed spaces**

Semi-open or semi-closed spaces refer to the current architecture forms, remains surrounded by the ruins, by which the two entities come to form a coherent entire. Whether it's shielding, coverings, closures, structures, between ancient and contemporary body will always be an "interval", which outlines a fracture in the substance. Most times these spaces appear from a restoration, protection and consolidation intervention. In order to cancel its strictly technical function there will be searched for the stylistic means, possibly scenographical ones, for the enhancement of the monument. Architect Alberto Ferlenga was amazed by ruins ability to integrate pieces of metal or glass of the structures proposed for musealization, from the operation of "bringing to life" [18]. The coverings, for example, shape the environment making it proper for the presentation in situ of the ruins, as a sequence of general trail. Most times these areas are represented and detailed in archaeological risk charts. One of the specialists of Italian museography, Clara Maria Ruggeri Tricoli speaks about the exceeding of the enclosure barriers with new visual techniques, represented by the glass cover [19] or polycarbonate [20].

### 3 VOLUMETRIC ARTICULATION

The museum of the archaeological site is not a formal object, represented by the conceptual power of the architect, but, as discussed above, it is fully constrained by the elements it connects. These entities define new operating principles based on the capacity to deal with history and to respect it, from the first parameters of their configuration: morphology, site relationships, building techniques and appropriate means to exposure.

The thesis presents four possibilities of locating the new functions: in an area free of elevated or underground vestiges (through a physical building), bounded by preexistence (through the site musealization), on the archaeological site (temporary installation), in areas where the historic trace was completely erased, proposing the memorials.

Typologies proposed to interchangeable architecture will be configured in both ways: one the one hand to include a new museum building and on the other hand, to re-establish the historic use, in order to structure within its future exhibitions. Interventions intend to interfere with heritage goods, mediating the differences between conservative restoration and museography principles. Their typology will depend primarily on where they are being located along the itinerary: at the entrance, as junction node on the trail or terminus point. The more close to the ruins and to having good perspective contact, the lighter and more discreet the intervention will become. Thus, depending on the degree of flexibility and spatial characteristics to be used, a range of architectural types of external envelope may be indicated, such as:

#### 3.1 Gallery

The gallery is a longitudinal type, close to a corridor. It can be proposed on extended archaeological areas. It can be treated unitary or modulated to accommodate simultaneously different exhibitions. A Gallery can follow the recommended direction of the museum buildings, or can receive an arbitrary one, depending on the location of the main artifacts to which it comes into contact. Most of the times it is proposed for the reconstruction of architectural elements that were not kept, like porticos, contact areas of different volumes, crypto porticos, scene buildings and vomitories (in theaters), corridors of the catacombs. Some of these are known as antiquarium sites, such as the one from Tivoli, dedicated to the sanctuary of Hercules [21]. A notable gallery example is the archaeological museum and the research center from Breche and Noye of the group N! Studio. Conceived as an extension of the landscape, it is well-established in the context, continuing the movement idea of the landforms. Dug in the ground, but evident on its surface, like a linear element running through the archeological site, it opens up at the ends and on the sides, to the Roman-Gallic theater through extensive glazing. An amount of studies, such as the ones from Trajan's Thermae, *Colle Oppio* and Anfiteatro Flavio, propose the gallery as a connection over the neronian pavilion baths zone [22]. In most cases it is used to relate visually the interior (the collections) with the site. There are cases in which the museum is developing in the form of attached and connected galleries strings, such as Stonehenge Visitor Centre [23], which follows by a slight curve the gesture of the monument.

#### 3.2 Tholos

It represents a central space, defined initially by a circular plan edifice [24] and further by regular inscribed polygons (square, hexagon, octagon etc.) and ellipses. Practically by means of *tholos*, all volumes are considered with a basic geometric form, as planimetric representation. In terms of typology it refers to museum trails, characterized by a major perceptual capacity or at the specific report between the exhibit collection and the architectural space. *Museo della Interactivo Historia de Lugo*, a museum park, where Nieto Sobejano Arquitectos made constructive elements to engage directly with the nature, functions after these rules. The only volumetric expression discouraged is the tower, or any other derivative element that has a height greater than its planimetric proportions, especially when surrounded by historical low buildings. This may become the relic background, when used with caution and through the detailed analysis of optical cones.

In the contemporary architecture project, the *tholos* acquires an introverted aspect, that, similar to an articulation may connect different destructured areas of the site. Seeking the general configuration, the intervention is placed inside an ancient structure (Octagonal Aula from the Diocletian Bath, the project of Gianni Bulian [25]) or outside it (*Centro Arqueologico l'Almoina*, Valencia, architect José Maria Herrera Garcia). This typology may be easily assimilated into the site. Its slightly conformation and simple form allows the dialogue with the proximities. An advantage of the solution represents the use

of a repeatable module, in different parts of the archaeological site, which can function as the nodes of a system, by which their entire internal configuration is subsequently organized.

### 3.3 Grid

The grid derives from the conjunction of gallery and *tholos*. Regarding the extensive frame of its use, it offers the simplest way of intervening in an archaeological site, applying graphically the conclusions of an amount of analysis that may concern the developing of the museum, as a controlled entity around the ruins. Most of the projects intended by the employ of the concept, choose to distance themselves from the vestiges, because, due to its modularity the space may amplify successively, requiring a bigger area for its functions. *Medinat al Zahra Museum* in Cordoba is one of the solutions, proposed by Nieto Sobejano Arquitectos group, that determined a new landscape by reconfiguring the surroundings area after an imaginary grid. Without invading the nature of Andalusia, the architects preferred to bury an important part of the museum, by opening it to the site and seeing it's covering as the fifth elevation [26], through the techniques of camouflage. The project of Jean Nouvel, from Perigueux is remarkable both by conservatory and exhibition attitude, or by the means of opening through the context. The industrial area where the vestiges of the Roman-Gallic town of Vesunna where located, was screened by green elements, new office buildings and mainly by the valorization of all the rests presented between the archaeological area and the urbanity (meaning the tower and the inner wall, dating from the third century) [27]. The museum based on the grid allows to the architect to enter the inner structure of the *domus* and reconstitute the life of a lost civilization, by small quotidian details. The spaces and the green areas in the internal courtyard are well individualized, by underling the internal circulations, the upper level floor, from the ground and the redoubling of all the parietal elements, by marking them on the ceiling.

### 3.4 Organic (ameba)

The museum configured by following this typology does not respect the rules of the grid, reason for which it will be hard to adapt to a Greek-Roman area. Since many of the Baroque covering forms are found in the Imperial Roman architecture, the sinuosity of an insertion could be applied only in case of a reconstruction or imitation of nature and in relationship to it. Renzo Piano's project for Pompeii proves that even a valuable site is well confined by current architectural forms. The four bubbles almost entirely buried, are to cover the third zone of the city, yet not excavated, thus facilitating the visitor-ruin relation, by participating directly to the site operations. Probably one of the most unusual projects is *Metropol Parasol*, of Jurgen Mayer H. Architects, who, by a wooden cover, located in the old center of Seville, homes the ruins of the Roman city [28], discovered at the beginning of the construction works for the underground parking. By an urban requalification process, the insertion became, shortly after, the image of the Piazza de la Encarnación, offering a new stratification to the archaeological level.

### 3.5 Loft

Loft is a planimetric form which does not relate to the stereotype already encoded, but functions only in an undetermined connection with the context. The notion has two meanings, which can be used simultaneously. The first refers to the conversion of archaeological zones, well preserved, characterized by high interiors and large windows or empty areas. It may be used as a method of representation of big art works, through specially projected installation for exhibition or events. Due to its flexibility, this typology can be transformed from exhibition rooms, or performance and spectacle halls, into extensive cultural events, by its internal or external use. Most of the archaeological enclosures, subject to the conversion processes, are found in Rome. L'*Aula Decima*, at the Diocletian Bath, which hosts the National Roman Museum, remained one of the last spaces covered with the original volts [29]. In *Mercati Traiane*, the space thought by Appollodorus of Damascus revitalized through the *allestimento* of Paolo Martelotti [30]. In this way the entire complex can be crossed through a series of internal ambient along the portico and Southern exedra, enriched by antique sculptures, ending with the hemicycle from the Northern Aula, to the forum of Augustus, located at a 40 meters lower level. Through the actual museum path, the tourist recognizes impressive urban structure, even for nowadays vision on architecture. It is considered the first recomposition exercise at a monumental scale of the current period [31].

The second meaning of *loft* refers to adding or extending an existing space. Thus it can be defined: the walkways, semi-levels, balconies, volume extensions and stairs that included in the vestiges, give a new understanding of the perception above ruins. Peter Zumthor articulated all the modalities of



representing *loft*, inside the Diocesan Museum of Cologne. Putting together another building body reunites the historical fragments into one single volume, Kolumba, combining archaeological parts of the late Gothic masonry with the new proposal [32]. The limit between "what is not finished" and the recent building, is a gradually presence, marked by the signs of history in the voids imprinted on the façade. Due to its geometrical forms, even if they belong to the same plan, Zumthor's intervention constitutes the background on which the changes of another epoch are kept. In the interior space, a metal colored footbridge joins compositionally the fragmentarily and the stylistically multitude of the presented elements.

On the original Greek-Roman sites, the wealth of information and of ornament, specific to the construction in latest times (as the Renaissance or the Baroque palaces) is not found, many of them being outlined only at a structural level. Such an insertion can be easily achieved without disturbing in any way the surroundings. Thus, the design of "secondary" areas in a monumental set, becomes the architect's own activity.

The form-background relation, representing the whole conclusion of the research, aims to determine the "place" where one space ends and another begins. The analysis reveals the interchangeable architectural character, decomposing archaeological site in single actions, autonomous or parts of ensembles and showing them relative to: the history and anthropology; the overlap; the city by neighborhood; the values of the monument by reference to other similar sites; the environment, to determine the state of equilibrium with nature; the characteristic components representing the entire and solutions action, with the ultimate objective - the musealization.

#### **4 INTERCHANGEABLE ARCHITECTURE BETWEEN MUSEALIZATION AND CONSERVATION**

Why the transforming into a museum is the best solution for any monument which tends to survive to the present? The musealization, beyond its conservative function, helps the building to communicate its public aspects. Meanwhile, this change of destination represents a minimum adaptation interference to new use. Thus, the research, integrated in a PhD thesis, will seek, within an archaeological area, locations for the exposure functions identifiable, autonomous and separated from other parts of the assembly. An example is the project for the Villa Chigi, known as "The Varsaglia" from Formello. When emphasizing the individual elements of the framework site, it is considered the reading of all these components, without causing a hierarchical relationship or excluding one of the musealization criteria, based on the reliable historical importance.

All new interventions will be adapted to the nature and language of the monument, as well as dated and reversible. The preserving and/or restoring of the ensemble determine(s) the original configuration. The lack of urban policy applied to safeguarded areas has a number of repercussions, because, most of the times, the legislative rigidity does not allow to transform these areas. Generating a continuity of historical and archaeological system should provide a framework, by specifying the complex transformations: possible, proposed or incompatible.

Museums have become places frequented by a public increasingly oriented on the heritage knowledge. Issues related to the nature of these institutions and conservation in general, are discussed by all means of communication, becoming part of the everyday life. Beyond the scientific research of the historical-critical type, between the object to be exposed and the discipline that regards the museum, a number of factors of social integration interpose. The problem concerns the manner in which the artifact will be transformed into an active good and not just in a preserved one, according to the tradition in this field. The difference between making a physical object to survive and make it reusable for future generations, changes various aspects of discipline, related to the sending of accurate information on cultural values of an analyzed good.

Starting from the '50, by the merit of Franco Minissi there remained some examples through which the architecture object is becoming an in situ museum, following maintenance and protection operations. These are thought to be the first methods of operating on monument, through which it is possible to determine the influence of the conservative component, further emphasized. In one of his books [33], the architect reminds, by the model of Carlo Scarpa [34], the close bond between the processes of restoration and the musealization. This bi-univocal combination facilitates through the project, any operation on the monument, leading to its interpretation and appropriation as exhibition space.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Mihali C., *Inventarea spațiului*, Editura Paideia, București, 2001, p.166.
- [2] CIMEC 2011, *Site evaluation*, Anexa 2, 2011, p.93.
- [3] Manacorda D., "Prospettiva di archeologia urbana nel cantiere della Crypta Balbi a Roma", in *Metamorfosi*, nr.1-2, aprile-agosto, Roma, 1985, p.10.
- [4] Oxford Dictionary, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- [5] Institutul de Lingvistică din București, *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române*, Editura Academiei, București, 1975.
- [6] Ministero per i Beni e Attività Culturali, 2000, p.170.
- [7] Harris E.C., *Principles of archaeological stratigraphy*, London, 2nd edition, Academic Press, 1989.
- [8] Minissi F., *Conservazione, vitalizzazione, musealizzazione*, Multigrafica Editrice, Roma, 1988, p.30.
- [9] *Idem*, p.45.
- [10] Soprintendenza per i Beni Culturali, *Project*, Roma, 2006.
- [11] Danzi E., *Coperture. Metodologie di indagine*. La schedatura delle coperture archeologiche: alcune riflessioni sull'impostazione metodologica del progetto, Università IUAV di Venezia, 2010, p.9.
- [12] Minissi F., *Conservazione, vitalizzazione, musealizzazione*, Multigrafica Editrice, Roma, 1988, p.34.
- [13] Ashworth H., *European Heritage. Planning and Management*, Intellect, 1999. p.45.
- [14] Mck. Camp II J., *The Athenian Agora*, The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003, p.35.
- [15] Giberti M., *Schemi organizzativi per museo Open Air*, p.1.
- [16] Niccolucci F., "Virtual Museums and Archaeology: an international perspective", in *Archeologia e Calcolatori*, Supplemento 1, 2007, pp. 15-30.
- [17] Cataldo L., Paraventi M., *Il museo oggi*, Hoepli, Milano, 2007, p.118.
- [18] Ferlanga A., *Il dialogo interrotto delle rovine di ogni tempo*, IUAV 81, 2010, p.2.
- [19] Ruggeri Tricoli M. C., Accardi Aldo R. D., *Prospettive per un museo archeologico: il caso di Modica*, Offset Studio, 2008, p. 22.
- [20] Ferlanga A., *Il dialogo interrotto delle rovine di ogni tempo*, IUAV 81, 2010, p. 8.
- [21] Soprintendenza per i Beni archeologici di Lazio, June 2011.
- [22] Caliarì P. F., *Museografia*, Alinea Editrice, 2003, p.176.
- [23] Guccione M., *Museums-Musei nel XXI secolo*, DARC, 2011.
- [24] VerMeulen E., *The Tholos of Athena Pronaia*, Coastal Carolina University, 2009.

- [25] Pala G., „Ricognizione del sistema museale romano: Museo Nazionale Romano”, *Progetti*, Nr. 3, Roma.
- [26] Slessor C., “Madinat Al-Zahra Museum”, in *Architectural Review*, April, 2009.
- [27] Indrigo A., Pedersoli A., *Archeologia e contemporaneo*, IUAV 81, Grafiche Veneziane, Venezia, 2010, p. 9.
- [28] Moore R., „Metropol Parasol”, *The Guardian*, UK, 27th of March, 2011.
- [29] Palladio A., ed. Da Ottavio Bertotti Scamozzi, *Le terme dei romani*, Bibliothek Muenchen, Arch. H, 1832, p.41.
- [30] Del Moro M. P., Milella M., Ungaro L., Vitti M., *Il Museo dei Fori Imperiali nei Mercati di Traiano*, Milano, Mondadori Electa, 2007.
- [31] Ungaro L., *Il sistema Museale dei Fori Imperiali nei Mercati di Traiano*, Simulacra Romae, 2003, p.35.
- [32] International Architecture Biennale, Venice, 2002.
- [33] Minissi F., *Conservazione, vitalizzazione, musealizzazione*, Multigrafica Editrice, Roma, 1988, p.8.
- [34] Dal Co F., Mazzariol G., *Carlo Scarpa*, Electa, 1984.