



Theory in Architectural Restoration - Concept and Object

Héctor César Escudero Castro

National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico

Abstract: The concern to preserve the architectural heritage, for as long as a century and a half, has accumulated a wide series of theoretical positions, which have been used to lead the work aimed to safeguard this architecture. However, even now, many contradictions are observed in the results along the practices, grouping up these results into three general trends: "consistent", "apparent" and "indifferent". Hence, the theoretical framework in the present work is established to carry out and show the synthesis of the statements of Socrates and Karl Popper, inquiring the classical theorists' considerations on what the architectural restoration is and what their focus object should be, so as to demonstrate that in the practice of restoration, a series of assumptions are entangled because of the ambiguities, in the theory of the discipline, as much as in the definition and delimitation of the focus object, and even in the dispute, between quite a few areas of the human activity. Because of the nature of this theoretical analysis, the method used to carry it out follows the critical rationalism.

Key words: conservation; restoration; object; material; form

1. Introduction

History and experience, so far, have taught us that knowledge is a process that seems to have no end, so that every discipline of human knowledge is constantly in search of better and broader explanations and understanding of the part of the universe it studies.

In this sense, due to the focus on protecting architectural heritage for over a century and a half, the accumulation of knowledge has formed a series of unique viewpoints as theoretical support for its goals. Starting from these viewpoints, the issues of protecting architectural heritage have been discussed, and explanations and solutions have been proposed.

As the edges increased, there was a tense and intense debate between the purpose and values of each position in attempting to distinguish between historical architectures (Díaz-Berrio, 1985).

Therefore, with the purpose of clarifying the conditions that currently prevail on the subject, this article, taking up two classic references of analysis and knowledge of human endeavor, and setting them as a framework, opens a sui generis window, through which a basic but necessary reflection on architectural restoration is shown, understanding this as an excellent discipline responsible for architecture protection.

Therefore, first of all, Karl Popper came on the stage. He determined that for knowledge, the starting point is a problem. Without previous problems, there can be no knowledge. But he also pointed out that these problems will arise, especially when we see our expectations fall, when we compare our expectations with what we observe, or when our

theories involve us in difficulties or contradictions (Popper, 1967).

On the basis of what Popper said before, we now let the great demonstration philosopher of Demo Alopece in Athens, the great Socrates, explicitly agree with the necessary statement, as the necessary basis for the correct conduct of any thing or activity, to link it with technology and Greek art. This idea stipulates:

"Before having a clear and detailed concept of what needs to be done and the role that needs to be played, it is usually not said what the best tools and materials are, as well as the best ways to use them" (Guthrie, 1982).

Now, returning to architecture restoration and linking it to what Socrates said, our first question is to answer rationally, logically, and objectively what architectural restoration is. Closely related to this question is the demand to pay attention to what and what the object of this activity is, because we believe it is an object, which will be what we initially wanted to restore to protect it, thus clarifying the purpose of this point, which is why we should do so.

Indeed, these problems may not be new, but from what Karl Popper said about the deception between expectation and observation, it is very common in the repair discipline, and even now, they are also very relevant. Therefore, based on this framework, we will ask the classical theorists of the subject what they considered with respect to these two questions, and from there, through a series of reflections and analysis of their answers, we will present the resulting conclusions. The conclusion related to the implicit assumptions in the problem method indicates that in restoration practice, a series of assumptions are intertwined, making way for the protection of historical architectures, from the ambiguity of disciplinary theory, to the definition or delimitation of objects of concern, and to the controversy over the protection of historical architectures in many fields of human work. Confusing terms such as "value", "benefit", and "purpose" as synonyms make everything possible in architectural restoration without being greatly questioned.

Therefore, starting from the established interests of protecting historical architecture, almost all fields of knowledge undoubtedly express support for historical architecture, perhaps because they are concerned about harsh criticism towards sacred heritage and we have turned to many controversial results that can be observed in reality. In the foreground, the obligatory question about this situation comes to the forefront: where did the absolutely clear idea of preserving historic architecture take different conceptions and why?

In order to solve this problem and seek answers to the questions raised so far, as this work has been included in the debate of the theoretical community, the development method of this paper is the so-called critical rationalism, which generally stipulates that this method is based on the requirements of finding theoretical errors and makes empirical comparisons. Therefore, firstly, it shows a comprehensive similarity in the observation methods of common practices in this discipline.

2. Restoration Practice

When people focus their attention on historical architectures, they are no longer just waste or banks extracting materials from them. Instead, they realize that these ancient architectures are not just ruins or inert substances. They open the door to different positions and/or perspectives (moral, legal, economic, historical, aesthetic, archaeological, political, social, etc.), from which people have been striving to prove themselves correct, and to preserve the reason and direction of this heritage. However, it should not be ignored that ultimately, all the constants for starting and landing in these postures are a matter of architectural nature [I], whether physical or intangible, and it is ultimately decided to retain this.

Due to the involvement of many positions, there is no clear hierarchy, command, or principle for defining these positions; that is to say, when comparing the results of different intervention examples, broad and even contradictory differences in standards and intervention methods can be observed to determine what needs to be restored and thus protected. In this regard, let us remember those works that only retain the front or outer shell, or only retain the first crack,

or leave the architecture completely in ruins, for reference only; or, on the other hand, there are the total reconstructions. These examples are only intended to mention things directly related to certain architectures, currently without considering cities, where there are also many things that need to be analyzed, but overall, they seem to indicate that everything is possible in restoration activities.

These different and even discordant results can be observed in practice, and three general trends can be established in terms of performance criteria, namely: "consistent", "obvious" and "indifferent". These are combined with four categories of classified architectures, which are classified according to a certain range of values, mainly historical value, but not unique or main. These value ranges are: "symbolic", "religious", "government" and "private", which are more or less considered excellence.

Now, distinguishing each position, we know that in the so-called "consistent", it can be understood that restorative operability is based on a certain theoretical form and the current prescribed form. Actions are carried out in a specific and predetermined manner, and the results are largely expected because they are planned in this way. In the second position, the position known as "obvious" does not use theoretical references, and the norm is relaxed to such an extreme that it dominates the idea that everything is possible. The result is just to legalize the simulation, such as sectarianism, protect some parts of the real estate, or obtain an image that seems to be being repaired, for which the technology, materials and finishes accepted as ancient in the collective imagination are used. The final position that has been determined to be "indifferent" is that in this position, people do not consider the normative nature of restoration at all, let alone its theory, projects and actions that are not in line with the interests of restoration and therefore do not conform to the interests of protection. This situation almost always leads to significant damage and changes in historical architectures. It is clear that in this position, real estate itself is not important, and if any part is retained. Only within the scope that is in the interest of the intervention leader (Escudero, 2019, pp. 37-42). It is against this background that Karl Popper believes that this is the entanglement between the theory and the disappointment of the expectation of the results.

Of course, in order to understand why the protection of architectural heritage is in the described situation, in which the loss of such heritage is a concern, it is possible to propose the hypothesis that the direction of the protected and accepted intention to protect this architecture is forgotten, confused, or misguided. But it is almost impossible to assume that this interest in protection has been forgotten, as in addition to having a long tradition on this issue, there are also national and international institutions responsible for care and compliance with norms, as well as some institutions responsible for training experts on this issue. In addition, many activities have been held, with a constant focus on maintaining and disseminating this interest.

Regarding the errors in the curriculum, this is evident and can be demonstrated by observing the obvious results of the activities. However, this error is closely related to the confusion caused by the existence of so many positions from different fields of knowledge, as everyone tries to make their own values and interests prevail [II], and the ambiguity of the two fundamental concepts of the discipline is very profitable for each side. Therefore, returning to what Socrates said, one must know what one intends to do, and therefore raising a question: what is architectural restoration and what is the focus of historical architecture?

In order to have a starting point from which to trace the answers to these questions, we proceed to review what the classics of the discipline have considered in this regard.

3. The Restoration Thought of Classical Theorists

Firstly, the consideration of Violet Le Duc was raised because his definition was important, and also because he was the first author to provide formal and written structures for architectural restoration activities [III]. There, he first clarified

what restoration is and clarified that no culture had ever understood or planned to carry out such activities as before (Chanfón, 1988, p. 57).

For him, architectural restoration is not "maintaining" the object in the sense of the archaeological positions [IV] of his time, that is, it is not about "freezing" the remains of the architecture; it's not about "fixing" or restitution, or following the trends of the moment; not accepting targeted restoration work that the architecture may require; not to mention "redo". The commentary says that restoring architectures is not about rebuilding something that has been lost or almost lost. He went so far as to argue that no action should be taken on the basis of guesswork without the necessary data after research prior to repair activities, because "... There is nothing more dangerous in restoration than assumptions..." (Viollet le Duc, Chanfón, 1988, p. 79).

Viollet believed that restoration refers to restoring a complete state, that is, achieving a completed and ready to use functional building unit, following pure classical architectural ideas, that is, the relationship between parts and the whole [V]. Therefore, the solutions required for the missing or damaged parts and new requirements in the architecture must be proposed in accordance with the guidelines that led to the property. In this sense, freeing it from everything unrelated to it, and even bringing it to an unprecedented perfect state (Dias-Bellio, 1985, p. 11). According to this understanding, the job of the catering industry is to design and implement satisfactory architectures to appropriately update and use them, but always try to maintain the purity of the original style as much as possible.

This position, as Villagrán (2007) says, is distinguished by its architectural character. For Viollet, a true architectural work never loses this consistency and therefore must be understood and treated. Therefore, for this author, in his architectural restoration philosophy, the definition is "form" [VI], which is why he concludes that restoration is: "restoring a complete state that may not exist at a certain moment" (Viollet le Duc, Chanfón, 1988, p. 57).

The position of Viollet is corresponding to the idea of John Ruskin, an Englishman. He claims that it is impossible to repair, thus denying the repair of architectures, because he claims that the word "repair" means the most thorough damage that the architectures may suffer. This damage is accompanied by the false display of the destroyed monument. This activity is just as impossible as trying to revive the dead. The so-called restoration only resulted in an object that was neither a historical architecture nor a true work of his time (Ruskin, 2015). Since restoration is considered impossible, the only thing to do is to preserve, especially without modification, and the materials that make up the architectural work as a whole remain unchanged.

Everyone's attitude towards real estate must focus on striving to maintain it. To this end, it is necessary to prevent and correct any damage that affects them, regardless of the appearance of the solution, and emphasize that present and future generations only have the responsibility to maintain this heritage, because the right to these heritages is the right of those who created them, and also the right of those who will understand them in the future (Ruskin, 2015).

With this character, a moral demand in the treatment of the architectural heritage is introduced in the work of restoration, reflecting on the aspects of the rights that could be held on this architecture.

The next reflection on the concept of restoration in archaeology was provided by archaeology [VII], which identified a way of intervening in architectural remains from other eras as its research material. Its definition is very in line with the idea cited by Rivera by Ventura Rodríguez, who believes that this is a true restoration action, the action "... includes protecting the value of architectural works while not altering their existence and historical status, and not providing interventions that alter their essence..." (Rivera, 2008, p. 103).

In archaeological work, the action of "consolidating" [VIII] is considered synonymous with restoration in practice, which has been observed since the mid-18th century, when the discipline suggested defining restoration as "a series of

actions aimed at not updating or enriching monuments, but rather serving them as witnesses to the past (Miarelli, Prado 2010, p. 18).

The characteristic of the archaeological position is to propose full respect for historical architecture, which has been maintained until now, only to make it clear and distinguishable. It is defined as: "... archaeological restoration... the operation carried out to complete or consolidate the architecture after scientific research, excavation, and correct drawing of the architecture...". (Rivera, 2008, p. 124-130).

"In summary, archaeological restoration is understood as the series of actions that are carried out to fully consolidate an architecture or reintegrate (through anastylosis) missing parts..." (Prado, 2010, p. 32).

The interest in this discipline is only focused on acquiring historical and cultural knowledge, which can be inferred from the composition and disposal of preserved material remains, so they must be preserved in the manner of discovery. This is the only and most important thing.

The next concept of architectural restoration was provided by the so-called modern and scientific schools, first and foremost by Camilo Boito, who advocated the establishment of this activity as a "serious and autonomous discipline" (Rivera, 2008, p. 159), based on the performance methods of the eight general points [IX] of all historical works (Díaz-Berrio, 1985). The architect paradoxically used the concept of "restoration", because he still believed that the term inevitably led to "stylistic complementarity [X]". When he suggested consolidating before restoration, repairing before restoration (Boito, 1883), or as Díaz-Berrio commented when referring to Boito's method, he said that without touching anything, but it is not in the absence of invention or "over recovery" (Díaz-Berrio, 1985, p. 17). On the other hand, he supported the restoration of the monument for use, adopting the architectural stance of the time (Rivera, 2008, p. 158).

Boito's conception of restoration is more like "conservation", defining it as: "... the activity of consolidating and completing a historic architecture..." (Capitel, 2009, p. 32), where consolidation is applied to the historic material without proscription of any stage, maintaining the principle of "honesty and respect" for the authentic, and in case of having to complete the architecture, it will be either an anastylosis, or something obviously different from the existing material and form.

The second member of this current is Gustavo Giovannoni, who, in his eagerness to organize restoration on the basis of a scientific method, establishes that it is, from a single one, to the sum of the five categories of action that he institutes (consolidation, recomposition, liberation, complementation, innovation) (Díaz-Berrio, 1985).

Although, when defining these categories with the term of restoration, the main term in its application to historical issues is "merging" (and suggesting a minimum necessity). The following two categories will be applied in a very cautious manner, that is to say, "liberation" only applies to the removal of everything that does not contribute or minimize the aesthetics of property, and "restructuring" is only for the possibility of matching. As for the remaining "complementarity" and "innovation", their application must follow Boito's hypothesis.

The restoration is for modern and scientific schools: strictly maintaining (consolidating) historical materials while carrying out architectural work that only involves new works, which supplements old works and maintains a clear visibility between history and newly added works in all aspects of design and construction. Supervise the entire process with an 8-point assumption and 5 categories of operability to ensure that the architecture has an architectural purpose.

The following positions have been brewing since the early 19th century and are objectively based on historical research to defend their actions, which are divided into two aspects. The first can be linked to French heritage inspectors Ludovic Vitet and Prosper Merimee. Among them, the lead author defines restoration as: "... A style integration operation, through which the architect must tend to achieve the unity that matches its original state in the monument..." (Rivera, 2008,

p. 135). First of all, rely on the methods of archaeology and art history to infer the parts that need reconstruction; secondly, material remains must be respected, as they are a means of inducing reconstruction.

Following this idea, Merimée considers that restoration is the conservation of what exists and the reconstruction of what existed: "what was built is what must be recovered" (Capitel, 2009, p. 18). Although this inspector clarifies that solutions should never be invented, and that "...when the vestiges of the ancient state have been lost, the wisest thing to do is to copy the analogous motifs of a architecture of the same period and region..." (Prado, 2010, p. 35).

For this aspect, restoration is: "a reconstruction based on research, deduction, induction and/or analogies". All of this is aimed at completing the architecture, to ideally achieve the recovery of what was once built.

The second wave has the color of historicism, which began at the end of the 19th century. It is mainly connected with Italian architects Luca Bertrami and Gatano Moretti (Grassi, p. 19). For them and their followers, it is different from the first group of historicism. Restoration is "partial or complete reconstruction of the historical reality of the monument", that is to say, the restoration of editorial form has proven the rationality of this action in so-called documented, verifiable and objective facts (Rivera, 2008).

The disappearance of real estate is not important. If there are any types of documents, providing data and proving his past situation, his reconstruction is reasonable, and this attitude was widely used at the end of World War II, although we had an early example in our campaign in San Marcos Square.

It can be considered that restoration is for the purpose of this trend: the restoration of the reconstruction state indicated by literature, sources, and historical era. For these historicism views, it is important to restore the conditions that real estate presents at a certain time, which are considered to be true and can be restored.

As a response to the historicism vision, it also opposes scientific modern restoration, questioning the former's exclusive desire to restore the architectural form (reconstruction), and the latter's desire to preserve museum items. A new (critical) thought has burst out under the support of aesthetic arguments, and its main representatives are Cesare Brandi, Renato Bonelli and Roberto Pane.

The fate experienced by these figures is caused, on the one hand, by the artistic values that are subordinate to the morphological process, i.e., the aesthetic deterioration due to the evolution of history, which leaves the object as nonsense or even in a state of destruction; on the other hand, the value of the architectural type influenced by the documentary and historical interest (Rivera, 2008).

Under this novel consideration, R. Bonelli defined restoration as "protecting and re-integrating the expression value of the works to make them a unity of image". To this end, we must release its true form and abide by two principles: determine the artistic value of the monument, that is, recognize the importance and value of the works in its image; and the sum of restoring and releasing these elements constitutes the image that expresses the personality and spirit of this work (Rivera, 2008, p. 181).

The author believes that projects and comprehensive architectural actions are feasible and necessary for historical architectures, as long as they enhance their aesthetics and functionality without compromising history.

While for Cesare Brandi, the "... restoration constitutes the methodological moment of the art work recognition in its physical consistency and in its double aesthetic-historical polarity, in order to transmit it to the future." (Brandi, 1990, p. 8). This definition responds to Brandi's classification of the restoration action in general, which he divides into "mechanical restoration", applicable to any human work and "restoration", exclusive to the artistic object.

This aesthetic trend is based on the following considerations: painting, sculpture, and architecture are art, therefore painting, sculpture, and architectural works are works of art. Since it has been determined that the primary task of

restoration is to restore and protect this malleable quality, we cannot see any other way to achieve this task except through artistic work. This means that restoration itself is a work of art, as its followers view this activity as a typical critical process and creative behavior of all artistic activities. But the condition is that what is sought in this situation is to re-establish its potential aesthetic unity, without any historical or artistic forgery (Brandi, 1990).

For followers of this trend, the focus of restoration is on the concrete aspect of the physical substance of the work. Brandi made this clear by stating that his first fundamental axiom is "... only the material of an artistic work is restored" (Brandi, 1990, p. 8). Therefore, it can be concluded that for followers of this trend, restoration is generally: "restoring the potential aesthetic unity hidden in historical things through artistic behavior" (Brandi, 1990).

This is not the first time that emotions and spirits have been used as guidelines for defining repair. There has been a position since ancient times that, although it is related to specific places or architectures, it does not focus on tangible things, but rather on meaning, sanctity, and/or mysterious magical qualities. A position that seeks to restore this attribute, located outside of physical matter and closely related to different religions, has its own practices and rituals, as well as collective meanings and concepts of historical or traditional nature (Rivera, 2008, p.121).

At this location, the substance and form of the architecture are lowered into the background even if they have not completely disappeared. The relevant aspect is beyond matter, which is a characteristic of a place that only human consciousness can imagine, and we can call it its "concept", "essence", or "meaning".

Díaz-Berrio quotes F. Choay as describing why Japanese Shinto temples need to be regularly destroyed and rebuilt to fulfill their functions and purification. This purification not only purifies the site where they are built, but also the corrosive materials in their structure. Through this behavior, one does not attempt to deceive anyone, as they are not considered replicas or historical forgeries, but rather real (Díaz-Berrio, 2011, p. 40).

Although this approach is common, there is no formal structured background. Few people have mentioned it and only made personal comments on its application and results, but for this type of recovery, we can call it "transcendent" [XI]. Recovery is: "By taking necessary actions to maintain all important references in collective memory, making this transcendent clear and visible". It does not have or consider physical objects, mainly depending on preserving certain symbols in collective memory, and using these symbols to maintain a clear understanding of history emotional or mysterious awakening.

The last clearly identifiable position will be called "utilitarianism", which focuses on the architectural utility provided by the "value" found in historical properties.

José Villagrán García can be regarded as one of the representatives of this trend, believing that the activity of restoring historical relics is: "... the art of protecting the stability of relics and historical forms of material through operation and supplementation, in order to demonstrate their realistic and procedural purposes" (Villagrán, 2007, p. 532). He believes that all restoration work is aimed at making the intervened architectural practice, and the problem faced by restorers is how to utilize history in new uses. To this end, he inserted the work of an architect restorer into his "values" and "planned" architectural theory.

Therefore, when defining the boundary between each "effectiveness" and restoration work, his conclusion is that in each value category of his theory (useful, factual, aesthetic, social), historical property always has shortcomings or deficiencies, which leads to the supplementation and updating of historical materials (Villagrán, 2007).

Another author who was inserted into the trend of architectural practicality as a guiding axis for restoration is Antón González-Capitel Martínez. For him, the field of restoration has always been and is "... an overly vague, obscure, and ever-changing field systematically plagued by contradictions..." (Capitel, 2009, p.12), which is why this activity can only find

"its true criticism and its most synthetic rigor" in the field of architecture. It occupies an important position there.

This character defines restoration as: "... mandatory renovation of existing architectures..." (Capitel, 2009, p.13). In order to derive his definition, taking into account the shortcomings of historical architectures, their advantages as guiding principles for project action, their value must be restored and the impossibility of complete restoration.

When using terms such as "transformation" or "metamorphosis", González-Capitel was convinced that there could be no "recovery" because he assumed that any intervention would cause one object to completely transform into another. The rest is to integrate the value of historical architectures into new architectures.

These two utilitarian visions are based on two basic ideas. The first idea is that "not everything can be, or even should not be protected". The second idea is that historical architectures, or "destroyed architectural relics," as Villagrán said, "... is the most important raw material that needs to be changed through restoration," because "... must be used to create a new architectural work (Villagrán, 2007, p. 534).

So far, it can be seen that among the different concepts held as products of different appreciation, some seem to complement each other, while others are clearly inconsistent in terms of the concept that architectural restoration should be understood. As Karl Popper said, this led to the difficulties, contradictions and entanglements of the discipline.

It can also be seen that all positions believe that, as an important component of protection, action should be taken to restore their "objects of concern" [XII]. Because the conditions it proposes require it to restore what it should have lost, needed, or, in appropriate circumstances. Therefore, ultimately, everyone attempts to restore their abstract and spiritual representation of him - on what is considered a solid foundation - because people notice that all positions work under the guidance of a preconceived concept that tells them "what this is" and what they want to protect.

And it is precisely because of the consideration of what should be the focus of this concern that there are more and more suggestions on why architectural restoration should be understood. It is obvious that the definition of this discipline largely depends on what it focuses on. Therefore, it is necessary to review the objects of each aforementioned positions.

4. Considerations of the Object of Attention

Undoubtedly, any intention of preservation necessarily implies the existence of the thing or entity to be preserved (in some way). And for this thing or entity to be properly preserved, it needs to be predetermined, that is, people must know what it is, because people's certainty about it will lead to what they intend to preserve, as Socrates pointed out in the sentence he quoted above.

This is related to the proposition of maintaining historical architectures, which in most cases presents a conditional factor, that is, due to the historical and physical environment in which the architecture is located, all participants who have been declared to protect this object hold different positions that it requires intervention, that is, they all believe that this thing is incomplete, lacking, deteriorating, altered, unusable, or in danger of collapse.

In this sense, considering that all repairs imply some kind of modification, through which an object is brought to a different state than when it was discovered. This modification is based on the certainty that the legitimate object has been restored. The question is: How do we know what the legitimate object is? What defines it? To what extent is this object still as it was, even with changes, losses, and defects? When or why did it become something else, and how is it possible to save it? What qualities must this object possess, even if it is interfered with (which does not necessarily mean returning to its previous material state), it is still considered the same, even in the case of tangible objects, such as historical architectures, may not be essential?

Therefore, as mentioned earlier, it is necessary to review the object concepts held by the convened theorists. To this end, we start from the normality shown by them in their papers, that is, positioning their focus in the restorative debate

between two extremes, where one tends to view the object as primitive and entirely physical matter, believing that this tangible substance is itself an object. On the contrary, at the other extreme are those who tend to identify objects as immaterial. For these people, objects can be an entity, an idea, a concept, a memory, an architectural style, or even a creed of faith.

Starting from the flow of physical matter, archaeological ideas were first proposed, and this discipline is also related to past architecture. It points out that this should only be consolidated and kept as unchanged as possible (Rivera, 2008), inferring that its object is a combination of material passed down from ancient times to the present. For archaeology, its focus is not on anything else, but on the material remains of past architecture.

Therefore, materials, their arrangement and appearance are their only concerns in their work, and they suggest that these conditions should be preserved for future generations, as an important part of this object is its ancient image, its dilapidated appearance, evoking a distant, unknown, mysterious, tragic, and perhaps mysterious past. From this object, one can infer a certain understanding of the past, but in the end, it will be displayed for appreciation, enjoyment, and to some extent, as a preaching work, becoming a source of knowledge for the public.

The next position in this trend was found in the thoughts of the British man J. Ruskin, who not only saw a unique and unrepeatable object in his composition materials, but also believed that it was a being with its own life and a soul entity that must be preserved (Ruskin, 1956). The specific combination of this material is his goal.

By denying the possibility of repairing this object ("... because it's like trying to resurrect a dead person..." (Ruskin, 1956) and suggesting that every effort should be made to maintain every part and component of the architecture. Ruskin believes that this material, integrated, processed, and shaped by craftsmen, along with the continuous habitation of its users, gives birth to life. This is the object of his concern and the reason why he focuses on protection (Capitel, 1988, p. 29). Another proposition of Ruskin's protection of this existence is not to accept modification, as for him, this existence is a pure and unchangeable original work (Ruskin, 1956). For this theorist, the object is: "the material that is processed, assembled, and inhabited, from which it obtains its own untransferable soul, living and dying together with it. As a living entity, it is useful, but to this extent short-lived, so it must be allowed to die with dignity, believing that the time will come when it completely disappears (Ruskin, 1956).

The next position also believes that its focus is mainly on material things, first represented by the images of Camilo Boito and the so-called modern restoration school. For Boito, its object is the sum of all constructive contributions and the traces of vicissitudes formed in architecture throughout history: "... Monuments are documents of human history, and all their constructive stages are documents of every moment of their existence..." (Rivera, 2008, p. 160), which has been strongly defended by the author, who believes that the newly added parts have artistic, archaeological, or historical importance. Although the oldest part can be considered the most important, the newly added parts may have a series of details, positioning them as one of the aforementioned importance.

Boito believes that completing and repairing it is effective, even more necessary, under the premise of using guaranteed protection - the latter is "not more than necessary" (Díaz-Berrio, 1985, p. 17). For him, this object mainly includes as a "historical document", which means that the materials that make up the architecture can not only tell us a series of past events, but also continue to add narratives.

His clear focus on this material document object is very obvious, as even if it is no longer integrated into a unit, it is also a motivation for recognition and appreciation. This is why he suggests that an exhibition should be considered together with the architecture, showcasing the remaining relics and replaced fragments (Díaz-Berrio, 1985, p. 17), like leaves separated from an old cabin, placed next to them.

On the other hand, under Giovanoni's scientific inclination, although relying on materials like the modern school, a series of conceptualized aspects were considered in the object of concern that had not been previously considered. The first innovation was Giovanni's division of memorials into living and dead, the former being those belonging to western culture that maintain their own functions or can be used in architecture. As for the dead, they are the remains and ruins of ancient architecture from a culture that has already disappeared (Rivera, 2008, p. 168). Living, in addition to being a historical document (in the sense of not prohibiting second history), is also considered a form of architectural art that can be classified as primary or secondary, but not based on their size, but rather on their relevance as artistic works or historical documents (Díaz-Berrio, 1985).

He will use another novel observation to define his focus, which is its breadth, because its understanding and cognition, in addition to the different architectural stages it presents, are determined by the architectural complex in its environment, that is, the object is no longer just a single work, nor a commemorative work, but a comprehensive architectural complex that constitutes the urban structure, according to this author. This architectural complex provides features and signage (Díaz-Berrio, 1985).

In this position, material is the object, which is also very clear, because as a document, people should not change what has already been written on it, and as an artwork, people should not distort its information. In both cases, it should only be preserved. Giovannoni emphasized that as an architectural work of art, the most important thing is to pay attention to the interior, not the exterior walls, as they conform to logic, hygiene, order, and etiquette (Díaz-Berrio, 1985, p. 22), that is, the materials and their arrangement, as well as the aesthetics and history within them. Therefore, it can be inferred that for this author, the object is the "historical - aesthetic - architectural document", where architecture is very relevant.

It should be pointed out that whether in the modern school or the scientific school, literature historical objects can always add new stories. Its existence is dynamic, not static.

Perhaps the most influential aspect of material orientation from the second half of the 20th century to today is the emphasis on object aesthetics, which characterizes objects as works of art. Here, different authors who align with this orientation believe that material is the medium of artistic expression, and this is not limited to decorative elements in architecture, as the typological aspects of works are also valued as part of aesthetic advice.

For Renato Bonelli, artistic works will be recognized for their importance and value in terms of image, which is also the reason for endowing objects with personality and spirit (Rivera, 2008). For this author, as for the members of this position (critical-aesthetic), the visual, the physiognomy, the figure and the plasticity of the material is what is positioned in the foreground for the identification of its object.

As far as he is concerned, Cesare Brandi (1990) publicly declared that his object was a work of art, a work that needed to be recognized in collective consciousness before, and as a human work, it dialectically linked aesthetics and history.

In the eyes of these two authors, it is evident that this type of artistic work is associated with a specific material in which the symbolism of aesthetics is manifested. Although according to Brandi's argument, it should be understood that materials are divided into two types based on their functionality. The first type is used as a support material, which fully functions structurally and can be replaced if necessary. The second type is the realization of art through materials, in which the expressiveness and imagery of aesthetics become concrete (Brandi, 1995).

As the objects of artistic works, for these characters, it is also a unique and unrepeatable existence, which is inspired through a unique and irreplaceable material. The audience will experience emotions upon seeing it. And this special material and the aesthetic halo surrounding it is itself objects, making people understand that without this material, there would be no existence or artistic experience, that is to say, "... a work of art is defined by the substance or matter it

contains..." (Brandi, 1995, p. 47).

We can observe that all the positions listed so far, even if they focus on the constituent matter, still believe that this object is the carrier of a super sensory thing, which is inherent in the constituent matter and cannot be recognized in or outside it.

Now let's review those who project objects to the extreme of non matter, first citing the French inspector of the early 19th century (L. Vitet, P. Merimée), who believed that objects are products of architectural art, not historical documents or sculptural expressions, but works that respond to principles and rules, guided by classical traditional teachings, which stipulate that "... in architecture, unity is the primary condition for a good work" (Rivera, 2008, p. 137).

Under the premise of respecting this rule, they recognize the monument as a "real" object, believing that authenticity is the sum of architectural technology and language "style", and for its restoration, "... materials are not important unless they meet this requirement" (Rivera, 2008, p. 136). Materials are only the foundation and are necessary to restore the architectural work to its original state.

In this sense, when dealing with the permanence of an architecture, they do not associate it with the importance that materials may acquire, but rather with the authenticity of its form, proportion, and structure, that is, with its style and type (previously existing configurations). Moreover, in order to protect it, it can even play a role in damaging the constituent materials.

The object of attention is discovered and glimpsed in the architectural art, although incomplete or deteriorating, it maintains a certain consistency, making it possible to understand and restore. In other words, the object is: "an idea, a concept, and a formal idea of a style that has been concretized and existed at a certain moment in history, with a specific composition and appearance." It can and must be restored to reconstruct its appearance at that specific and ideal moment.

Somehow, influenced by this stance, Viollet le Duc emerged. For him, his main focus was on the "form" of the materials he submitted, as it must meet the characteristics of being an architecture "... architecture of other eras, art, ancient monuments...", "...glorious architecture of the country..." (Chanfón, 1988, p. 57), and it must prove to be an architecture, that is to say, a wise thinking and calculation work, in which there is no excess or useless, like a delicate organism that responds and corresponds to the material. It must prove to be an architecture, that is, a carefully thought out and calculated work without any unnecessary or useless things, like a delicate organism that responds and corresponds to certain guiding principles (Chanfón, 1988, p. 78). And it has to be done under certain physical conditions that are conducive to understanding and recovery, because it is fundamental. Its object does not cease to exist, but depends on the architectural idea, specifically that it was originally shaped.

This architectural ideology, for him, is the realization of only putting necessary mechanical forces into the work, endowing it with accurate and unique qualities, thus giving the work technical legitimacy. It seems to combine truth, goodness, and beauty together (Capitel, 1988, p. 19), and is a complete art and a product of law and reason. It is a product of principles, which enables it to become a product of all eras and meet all needs (Chanfón, 1988, p. 76). Therefore, its restoration will tend to achieve this goal through the guidance of its style (formal thinking), even sacrificing the material and form of the work.

Based on these considerations, we can understand that for Viollet le Duc, the appropriate object for architectural restoration is: "formal architectural ideas (style for some, theory for others), which are reflected in the material relics of past works. Therefore, these relics can be brought to a perfect state, just as they cannot be.

Now, let's turn to the so-called utilitarianism position along the ideal line. Its interest is guided by the reuse of certain parts of the architecture, which are considered as the carriers of value.

For followers of this trend, their focus is only on the "revealed value". They do not defend it at all, nor are they interested in the entire material remains of the architecture, nor are they interested in the architectural concepts behind the architecture, nor do they have a decisive impact on the second architectural history of the object. The only thing that guides them is their interest in using architecture components that they consider valuable in order to incorporate them into their new designs.

The reason for this position is that there is almost no doubt about words aimed at maintaining the value of the object. However, given the ongoing debate between objectivity and subjectivity regarding the conceptualization of the term "value [XIV]" in axiom, this means that due to the lack of complete certainty in this regard, it is used to explain the value of architectures and their elements for each generation or role. Under the protection of existing relativity, the valuation of architecture and its elements is arbitrary in many cases, either located on the exterior walls or in the protection of the first bay, and in extreme cases, it has been reduced to a decorative element.

For followers of this position, the focus is on "a range of values - useful, factual, aesthetic, and social" (Villagrán, 2007), and historical and architectural (Capitel, 2009), inherent in certain parts of property, in a matter that must be liberated, consolidated, completed, utilized, modified, and integrated into a new work.

So far, the formalism position still starts first, even at the lowest level, from the physical relics to determine and locate their objects, even if there is no objection to modifying it. However, for the following positions, the existence of matter is irrelevant, as they will have little or no reliance on existing relics to determine their objects. This attitude is consistent with the historicism method led by Luca Beltrami. In this method, the decisive factor to determine the object of concern is to rely on the documents proving the existence of this or that architecture in a certain period. In addition, these materials provide sufficient data on architecture configurations, so material relics are secondary and their existence is not even important.

Therefore, whether an architecture or urban structure can be completed or even remade, the existing materials have no reference value. What really matters is the future materialization of the information provided by the document. In this sense, by identifying objects with documents, it becomes the sum of witness documents.

You only need to record data in some files, archives, photos, plans, literature, or materials to have an object, because as mentioned earlier, this is the object.

In short, an object is: a "file source, it self witnesses its existence in the past", which is enough to make it reappear, believing that matter is fleeting because it can disappear again, but an object is not because it is a file and can be objectified again (Escudero, 2019), as long as the file does not disappear.

Similar situations also occur in certain Japanese architectures. Let's think of the temples of Shinto, which are regularly rebuilt, but in this case, starting from their concept, it is determined that they will be like this. Their architectural principles establish and accept regular destruction and reconstruction, so the object is: "one architectural idea - regular reconstruction".

Although it is acceptable to redo the object if necessary in both cases, the difference is that in the former case, the operation is reasonable as it is a source object document; that is to say, a work constructed at a specific time, when used as written evidence of its existence, becomes such a witness. Unlike Japanese temples, the possibility of rebuilding Japanese temples completely depends on their objective architectural stance; that is to say, temples are not material, but rather architectural theories that establish typology, which stipulate the characteristics that must be regularly rebuilt.

As a final stance, we cite a direction that completely erases physical matter when determining the object of concern, which may not even be urban architectural, despite the fact that some recent discussions are invoking it to expand the

concept of heritage and to some extent, it has been identified as part of the field of urban architectural restoration by linking it to certain geographical locations.

Some authors, such as Rivera Blanco, under the protection of these ideas, compare this object to the place of memory, that is, "the space, architecture, and/or place where historical figures lived, or the place where transcendental events occurred" (Rivera, 2008, p. 15), elevating the boundaries of the object to be preserved to non material, non memory, or spiritual. To elevate the boundaries of the objects to be preserved to intangible, memory, or spiritual, the commentary states, "... a new legacy has emerged forcefully... including folklore, ideas, and even spaces without physical relics..." (Rivera, 2008, p. 19).

This transcendental perspective can be considered as an extreme opposite to the materialist perspective, as it determines the object of its concern without the need for specific materials to determine, and the awakening of memory, history, tradition, or mystical magic that causes it to be felt spiritually. It is at that time that the object no longer depends on what is constructed and becomes completely void. Although in most cases, not all cases, it can be geographically located.

In the Krakow Charter, we can determine the degree to which this new object is considered when it mentions: "It may not necessarily be material"; or when it points out that not only traditional monuments, but also "... scientific objects, intangible and spiritual intangible assets, gardens with landscapes and territories, spiritual and memory and commemorative places, are the motivation and concern for protection" (Krakow, 2000).

So far, it is clear that the focus of architectural restoration can be determined from very different perspectives, and everyone will seek to restore and protect the objects they consider. In this work, we only proposed the relationship between material form and objects, which can be determined in the discussions of the consulted theorists.

5. Conclusion

As can be seen from the analysis of the two categories discussed [XV], in the field of architectural restoration [XVI], there are disputes, contradictions and ambiguities between popular theories. According to Karl Popper, this is a favorable condition for problems and a disappointment between results and expectations. As Socrates said, this is mainly due to the lack of knowledge or clarity about what these two categories are, which is a necessary principle and foundation for fully realizing any work. However, people did not attempt to focus on this goal, but instead made increasingly broad, innovative, and imprecise suggestions.

Therefore, as part of the conclusion, the following viewpoints and reflections are proposed:

Generally speaking, it is clear that in any intention to preserve an entity, regardless of what people think of it and their intention to preserve it, it must start from a reference object, that is, from a material (material or immaterial) that awakens a "form" in consciousness, thereby evoking the intention to preserve it. But in this sense, the awakened substance must present sufficient minimum conditions, whether physical, symbolic, ideological, historical, architectural, or any other nature, in order for this entity to be clearly discovered within this substance. This clearly indicates that for the protection of historical architectures, the relationship between matter and form represents a permanent debate.

However, it also indicates that each position proposed is immersed in a circular relationship, with a common dependency between the objects considered to be protected, the purpose of protecting them, and the needs and ideas for restoring them. Therefore, as long as one part changes, the other parts will be modified.

However, each element of this trilogy depends on a different field of knowledge. Therefore, the consideration of what is the object of concern (historical architecture) must be defined in the ontological debate, in order to know, inter alia: what is historical architecture; when an architectural work becomes history; what is the scope and limitations of architectural concepts, and under what conditions it is no longer what it is, but transformed into something else; this, as well as other

issues related to its existence. Obviously, this kind of reflection is the most necessary because it is not constructing objects from a theoretical perspective, but rather adding more and more aspects to it, making it even more ambiguous.

Regarding the purpose of protecting it, it is necessary to think in the field of values, taking into account the levels and scales of these values, because in this regard, the initial considerations mainly focused on historical and aesthetic values (Rielg, 1987). However, over time, architectural, economic, cultural, political, and even fashion values were added, leading to the logic of architectural intervention and obedience to these values being allowed.

With respect to architectural restoration, due to the different points of view and edges from which the object of attention has been considered, three alternatives are presented as probable results intended by the restorative action; namely: the first alternative seeks to leave the architecture as "what it is", that is, to maintain it as it is found; the pretension in the second alternative is focused on "what it should be", in this one the idea of correcting the object and taking it to an ideal state predominates; and in the third one "what it was" is pursued, the architectural form, considered authentic, that at some point in the past presented the object, usually its first history.

However, as a summary, it could be suggested that architectural restoration should be "the potential reestablishment of the architectural object (tangible or intangible) that presents the minimum conditions necessary to be restored". And in this sense, this activity depends mainly on the object, which presents the following categories for its understanding: the "place" of its location; the "matter" that constitutes it; the "form" that defines it; and the historical trajectory ("journey") that makes it return to its consistency. These aspects must be analyzed in order to define its potential to be understood, restored and conserved.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

- [1] Boito, C. (1883). Voto conclusivo. IV Congreso de Ingenieros y Arquitectos Italianos. Roma. <https://docplayer.es/6073438-Cartas-italianas-del-restauro-camillo-boito-voto-conclusivo-iv-congreso-de-ingenieros-y-arquitectos-italianos-roma-1883.html>
- [2] Bonfil Castro, R. (1971). Apuntes sobre restauración de monumentos. Secretaría de Educación Pública, Subsecretaría de Asuntos Culturales.
- [3] Brandi, C. (1990). Teoría de la restauración. Editorial INAH-Colección.
- [4] Brandi, C. (1995). Teoría de la restauración. Editorial Alianza Forma.
- [5] Chanfón Olmos, C. (1988). Eugène Emmanuel Viollet Le Duc (1814-1879) su idea de Restauración (1ª Parte). Cuadernos de Arquitectura Virreinal, (5). UNAM, México.
- [6] Chanfón Olmos, C. (1996). Fundamentos teóricos de la restauración. Editorial UNAM – Facultad de Arquitectura.
- [7] Díaz-Berrio Fernández, S. (1985). Conservación de monumentos y zonas. INAH Colección Fuentes.
- [8] Díaz-Berrio Fernández, S. (2011). Estudios y restauración del patrimonio arquitectónico y urbano. Editorial UAM-Xochimilco.
- [9] Escudero Castro, H. C. (2019). Restauración arquitectónica, problema teórico [Tesis de Maestría, Escuela Nacional de Conservación, Restauración y Museografía "Manuel del Castillo Negrete", Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia, Ciudad de México].
- [10] González-Capitel Martínez, A. (2009). Metamorfosis de movimientos y teorías de la restauración. Alianza Forma.
- [11] Grassi, L. (1961). Momenti e Problemi di Storia del Restauro. Restauro Architettonico, 24-28.
- [12] Guthrie, William K. C. (1982). Los filósofos griegos; octava reimpresión. Editorial FCE.

[13] Popper, K. (1967). Conjeturas y refutaciones (El Desarrollo del Conocimiento Científico). Editorial Paidós Básica.

[14] Prado Núñez, R. I. (2010). La teoría y la práctica en el proyecto de restauración. Editorial Eneágono.

[15] Riegl, A. (1987): El culto moderno a los monumentos. Visor.

[16] Rivera Blanco, J. (2008). De varia restauratione. Teoría e historia de la restauración arquitectónica. Abada Editores.

[17] Ruskin, J. (1956). Las siete lámparas de la arquitectura. Editorial El Ateneo.

[18] Ruskin, J. (2015). Las siete lámparas de la arquitectura. Editorial Biblok.

[19] The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2020). Carta de Cracovia: Principios para la Conservación y Restauración del Patrimonio Construido. https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/guatemala_carta_cracovia_2000_spa_orof.pdf

[20] Villagrán García, J. (2007). Obras 1: doctrina de la arquitectura. El Colegio Nacional.

Note

[I] Entendiendo como arquitectura: "toda aquella expresión de una idea tridimensional, la cual puede o no tener carácter formal, pero siempre fundada en una intención de habitabilidad y que, además, puede o no estar materializada".

[II] El análisis tan necesario sobre los diferentes valores e intereses que confluyen y se confrontan en la restauración arquitectónica será motivo de un trabajo posterior; en el presente sólo se hace patente la existencia de esta situación y el conflicto al que conduce.

[III] "Dictionnaire raisonné de l'architecture française du XIe au XVIe siècle"

[IV] La arqueología promueve la consolidación como acción única e ideal, y denomina a esta acción restauración arqueológica, como lo indica Rivera Blanco en su libro "De varia restauratione", 2008: 68

[V] Para Viollet, el estilo en arquitectura es como la sangre en el ser humano.

[VI] Entendido este término como lo consideraba el pensamiento filosófico griego, a saber: la conformación mental de lineamientos apegados a razón y lógica, es decir, un pensamiento o idea, que dicta las pautas que se deben cumplir en la elaboración y orden de las cosas, como lo expresa K. C. Guthrie William en su libro LOS FILÓSOFOS GRIEGOS (1982), que en el caso de la arquitectura es su teoría.

[VII] Entendida como la disciplina consolidada en el siglo XIX, y que en el DRAE se define como: Del gr. ἀρχαιολογία archaiología "leyenda o historia antigua". Ciencia que estudia las artes, los monumentos y los objetos de la antigüedad. A las antiguas culturas a través de sus manifestaciones materiales.

[VIII] Entendido el término "consolidación", en la forma como se emplea en la restauración arquitectónica, según Ramón Bonfil Castro en su libro APUNTES SOBRE RESTAURACIÓN DE MONUMENTOS.

[IX] 1. Diferencia de estilo entre lo nuevo y lo viejo; 2. Diferencia de los materiales utilizados en la obra; 3. Supresión de elementos ornamentales en la parte restaurada; 4. Exposición de los restos o piezas sustituidas; 5. Incisión de signo a elementos nuevos; 6. Colocación de epígrafe descriptivo del edificio; 7. Exposición y publicación de planos, documentos y fotografías; 8. Notoriedad entre lo nuevo y lo antiguo.

[X] Lo que se ha dado en llamar desde finales del XIX, falso histórico.

[XI] Pues está más allá de cualquier objeto específico o materia física.

[XII] Denominado también como: "arquitectura histórica", "memoria construida", "patrimonio cultural", "monumento", "monumento histórico", y algunas otras variantes o combinaciones que se usan como sinónimos.

[XIII] Esto es evidente, ya que el objeto de estudio de la arqueología son las sociedades del pasado, empleando para

sus fines los vestigios y restos que estas comunidades han dejado.

[XIV] Debate en extremo complejo, pues de su origen económico ha emigrado a todos los ámbitos del quehacer humano, y su aclaración sigue en proceso.

[XV] Aunque es evidente que también hace falta analizar, como fundamentales, las categorías de Fines y Valores, quedando pendientes para un posterior trabajo.

[XVI] Como la disciplina encargada de la salvaguarda de la arquitectura histórica.