

## TYPES OF INTERVENTIONS ON HISTORICAL MONUMENTS, APPROACHED IN THE CONTEXT OF THEIR CONCEPTUAL AND CONTENT PRECISION/

**Catalin Andrei Neagoe** - "Ion Mincu" University of Architecture and Urban Planning, Bucharest, Romania

*ncatalinandrei@gmail.com*

**Abstract.** The current investigation focuses on a particular type of buildings – existing properties, unclassified and classified as historical monuments, with an emphasis on the latter. From the perspective of protecting and enhancing their heritage component, of respecting quality requirements in construction, the issue of intervention works on this type of edifices is analyzed. At all stages of an intervention, starting with the beginning of the design, a single linguistic code becomes necessary as support for the exchange of information, cooperation, communication at the level of the teams of specialists and related stakeholders. Interventions involve a complex activity with multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary participation, where often routine gives way to innovative approaches or high skills prerequisites, and where uncertainties – especially in the early stages of design – are much more numerous and extensive than in the case of projects for new buildings or on existing unclassified buildings. Here, the architect's missions and their relevance are configured *sui generis*, considering the specific character of the project, the type of interventions aimed for, the limitations, conditions and alternative measures imposed by the requirements of preserving the cultural attributes. From the perspective of the defining notes of a specialized language, in this paper, we analyzed the terms that define the variety of interventions on existing buildings and which are materialized in their definitions and classifications. We studied the extent to which, through the definitions and classifications assigned, the various types of interventions included in the specific legislation of immovable cultural heritage and that of civil buildings in general, in other documents and specialized studies, comply with these demands, the difficulties encountered and their nature, possible complementary alternatives with a remedial role. The paper concludes by suggesting potential areas of improvements on this topic and with proposals for future investigations.

**The specialized language, a tool of professional communication.** Contemporary reality depicts a completely new world, in which technological development, artificial intelligence with implications in all sectors of life experience a revolutionary change and unprecedented evolutionary rhythms. Sciences located at the frontiers of knowledge approach phenomena and obtain cross-border exploitable results with profound changes in the conditions and manner of carrying out human activities, and implicitly this requires complementary adequate communication.

At this time we are talking about: unity in science as an expression of the relationship between novelty and tradition, between continuity and discontinuity; about a unification of the minds of the planet in order to ex-

plain world phenomena, unification of sciences on linguistic bases by moving from mundane to scientific and vice-versa towards the popular spread of science; about the democratization of science in the sense of access of the general public to the products, benefits of science. At the same time, we are witnessing: the increased need for specialists on the international labour market and, implicitly, the need for efficient communication; integration into science, with the meaning of bringing together, producing and collectively capitalizing on the results of highly specialized science; rapid technical progress, implicitly with sophisticated languages of use; secularization of science – communication of its results outside the specialized world (determinologization – use of terms from specialized language that have entered everyday use with diminished scientific density, accessible to the general public); frequent enrichment of specialized native languages (terminologization) and modification of the semantic content of terms [1]. In these conditions, the study of terminologies, professional languages, and terms from specialized lexicon are intensified.

Specialized (professional) lexicon refers to the (specialized) terms used in communication in a field or sector of activity (specialized vocabulary), as illustrated in Figure 1. A specialized language is the instrument of communication where the activity is carried out with the help of language, specialized words from a field of study, and other resources of the language; is language in action, a code used by a small group of speakers who aim to ensure the most efficient, least ambiguous communication possible, both with reference to the interlocutors but especially to the recipients and to the proposed purpose, a standardized, specialized communication, carried out unequivocally in a specific field of activity governed by professional criteria [2]. The basic function of specialized language is the referential one – of knowledge, language being thus a foundation of specialized knowledge, of scientific and professional progress in a certain field of study and practice.

Among the priority themes is also that of finding common characteristics, establishing an interfering/correlated specialized lexicon, a current and interesting problem especially for widely circulated languages in which inter- and transnational communication is frequently studied and communicated, for the languages specific to the field of artificial intelligence, those of codifying in a globalist science.

**Basic components in the study of terminology – the term as a symbiosis between concept and definition.**

**The term, the basic component of specialized language.** The term is a lexical-semantic unit, that is, a word to which a meaning has been assigned, a meaning independent of the various induced variations, thus becoming a specialized word. It names a notion/concept (this defined as the basic unit of thought) and it is used in a specific context with a certain meaning [2]. At the same time, the term is a linguistic sign that presents the name of some knowledge in a field of activity; it is a unit of knowledge with a stable informational content. Terms are located in the area of preparation of a theoretical or practical-applicative approach, guiding, directing and establishing the scope of the entire analysis process.

Thus, as a linguistic sign, the term is made up of a name – through a word or set of words seen as the material envelope of a notion plus a notion or

notional content – which is called a concept. The definition of the term entails the relationship between it and the word – concept/notion-object. Given that today there is no longer a radical break between scientific and public knowledge, there is a tendency to talk about expert concepts as parts of a specialized terminology and ordinary concepts, beyond the highly specialized area. Specialized terms, generically called technical terms, are among the most mobile elements of the lexicon, given the current dynamic changes in science. Terms systematize information, order it, classify it so that it can later be exploited.

The term represents a symbiosis, a combination between a logical form and a linguistic one. The word is the one that defines it, preserves it, transmits it. Depending on the specialization category, terms can be general, specific, interdisciplinary and depending on the structure they can be simple, complex, composite [2,3].

As lexical-semantic units, terms have clearly specified delimitations, being in different relationships with each other: of crossing, of ordering, of concordance, opposition, contrariety, contradiction.

As basic units of thought, the concepts/notions associated with specialized languages are defined by their content, by similar, common aspects, properties. Thus, they should be characterized by clarity, completeness, precision, topicality, relevance with respect to the circumscribed, interpreted, evaluated facts [5].

In the analysis of specialized terms there are several criteria of which we mention: monoreferentiality, denotative function, referential precision, transparency, consistency, conciseness, redundancy, derivability.

**The definition, means and form of explanation of terms.** The definition constitutes a bridge between the concept and the designated term, delimits a concept from other concepts, is a means of understanding and operating with concepts. The quality of a terminological activity is, to a large extent, given by the quality of the definitions and its precursor by the identification of the relationship between the defined concept and other related, generic concepts. The purpose of the definition and its destination are of significant importance.

A good definition gives the term the assurance of the above-mentioned criteria: stability, to which is added membership in a terminological field, invariable value in a certain professional and linguistic community – stability correlated with norming in expert communities or with codification by standardized norms, imposed by specialized bodies [6].

Several types of definitions can be used according to several criteria: nominal, lexical, explanatory or stipulative, descriptive, contextual, real definitions. For all, the rules of creation are the same: to express the essential and common properties for all objects in the defined class; to avoid circularity, the definition should be clear and precise, express objective aspects, be characteristic, consistent – not contradict other definitions regarding the same term from the same angle, pertain to the audience to which it is addressed. In certain situations, definitions can be replaced by descriptions, comparisons, characterizations; they can also be supplemented by illustrations, additional notes.

**Remarks regarding the terminological status of interventions on existing unclassified and classified buildings as historical monuments.** A brief analysis of the state of the specialized terminology related to interventions on existing buildings, unclassified or classified as a historical monuments simultaneously highlights several aspects that entail each other: the complexity and difficulty of the topic addressed; the short time since the concern for solving this problem gained greater visibility for specialists [7]; the practical and theoretical significance of the implications regarding the solutions offered to the concrete problems raised by the topic regarding the way of conceptual specification, of definition for each type of intervention [8,9].

As a global assessment, for Romania, we can say that the specialized language related to interventions on existing buildings does not meet the specific standard requirements mentioned in the paper and that such a goal is not easy to achieve. This increasingly determines practitioners, including architects, as users of specialized languages to get directly involved in the process of their analysis and elaboration, to identify alternative solutions, although it is not the express task of their activity [10].

An important aspect that requires analysis refers to the close connection between the terms that name types of interventions and those found in everyday language. Thus, the vast majority of the lexicon of interventions includes words with this origin. The consequence is that, due to their empirical nature, the respective terms lose what would theoretically define their scientific value: they are defined by a great semantic variety, by the local sociocultural imprint and influences, have a low level of abstraction/precision and potential for use with a general meaning. For this reason, the respective terms are prone during their use to the risk of ambiguity, generation of confusion, slippage of meaning, to imprecise use with variable meanings, making communication, specialized analyses and all the consequences that arise from this difficult (as exemplified by practice, in Figure 2). The difficulties are amplified when we talk about constructions that are to be protected on the line of their identity, which determines a high level of professional analysis, complementary skills for this purpose at all stages when the meaning of the terms becomes important for decisions.

Generally speaking, from the analyses regarding the terminological treatment found in the Romanian legislation in the field of construction, that of the protection of historical monuments [10], from the analyses of specialists interested in the codification of cultural heritage [11,12], of working groups for the analysis of the respective problems [13], from our own observations [14] a series of critical aspects can be revealed that should require greater attention. Regarding the terms about interventions, it is found that some are unclear, generating confusion at the level of design and execution. For example, the term research as a form of intervention in the heritage legislation; then, the term public utility is poorly understood by the way it is presented in the context, which is why we speak of equivocation; confusions between the term dismantling works and intervention works; the concept of destruction with reference to cultural heritage is used in a restrictive sense, without taking into account the specific differences implied by this term in the case of historical monuments; confusions based on the conceptual lack of differentiation between the term dismantling

and that of restoration or intervention which may in turn involve works to dismantle harmful, unnecessary components; substitution of terms with the implications that arise from this, for example modernization instead of rehabilitation; the existence of the same concept included in several laws but defined differently, as is the case of repair works, etc.

As a compensatory aspect of the deficiencies regarding the concepts in the field of cultural heritage, specialists, researchers and practitioners in the field have made proposals for the development of glossaries, the transfer of internationally validated terms, codification efforts, revision of definitions. But these suggestions, although welcome, are not immediately at hand for several reasons. For example, achieving linguistic equivalences in the case of concrete terms such as those we are referring to is not an easy activity to implement in practice. On the other hand, creating glossaries presumes the ability to provide good definitions. There are very few initiatives for defining terms in this field and their quality is not always satisfactory. As such, we can encounter definitions that are too narrow in relation to the types of interventions, such as that of destruction in the context of historical monuments; definitions that are too broad in which the mentions made to define a type of intervention also include other operations as if they were an integrating category of them – such as conservation which also includes repair operations, etc. or the case of the term modification works; definitions by negation; incomplete listings of types of interventions but presented as if the lists were exhaustive; tautological, circular definitions, for example: “Modification works - Intervention works (...) having as effect the modification of...” [16]; definitions in the form of descriptions that do not include typical, characteristic features but only insignificant aspects.

All these aspects offer a wide field of involvement for interdisciplinary working groups in which specialists knowledgeable in the field of cultural heritage and architecture must necessarily be included.

**The classification, a constructive operation of forming classes of objects integrated into a term.** Classification, along with the definition of terms, is an operation of forming classes, integrating objects of the same kind. This involves establishing the similarities and differences between the classified objects, and in this way it appears as one of the fundamental activities that make an activity intelligible [3]. In fact, it involves a process of ordering a variety of objects, phenomena, activities.

The terms integrated into any terminology do not remain isolated but interact symbiotically, thus taking place the systematization of information, its ordering, its classification so as to be adequately exploited. Through this, communication between specialists becomes possible, the thinking of the interlocutors is oriented towards the same aspects, the knowledge acquired in a field is crystallized and even transformed under the influence of new acquisitions.

The components of a classification are the universe of the classification, in our case, the intervention works on existing constructions, the classification criterion and the resulting classes. To these is added the purpose of classification. As a rule for establishing classes, we mention: the precision of the criterion – it must be formulated in such a way as to unambiguously determine any element – it must not be vague, insignificant; the rule of complete-

ness in classification – all objects included in the universe of classification must be distributed in the formed classes and an element must not appear in more than one class (implicitly, several aspects arise from the failure to comply with this criterion). Another rule – that of uniformity or the rule of homogeneity – states that the similarities between the elements of a class must be more important than the differences between them.

As types of classification related to the issue of interventions, we mention conventional classification, when the classification criterion is an artificial one and whose utility results from the pragmatic ordering of the domain according to needs. This is also the case for classifying interventions based on existing constructions. Another is ordinal classification, when objects are distributed in a class, measured and ordered from lower to higher, establishing a hierarchical relationship. Then, the cardinal classification divides the elements into classes without pursuing a qualitative relationship between them, and, finally, the dichotomous classification.

The classifications of interventions on existing buildings, both unclassified and classified as historical monuments, are determined by various purposes. In this sense, we mention the proposed classification carried out under the initiative of the Romanian Order of Architects [17], aiming at quantifying the costs of such works. In recent years, interventions on historical monument buildings have been subject to several classifications, based on numerous criteria – the extent to which the intervention affects the historical substance of the building; the extent of the work carried out on the buildings; the extent to which certain components are harmful to the historical monument and can be decommissioned, etc. We also encounter a cardinal classification, in fact, an incomplete list of terms [18,19].

The classification of interventions on historical monument buildings and also on unclassified ones is of theoretical and practical importance. But to this end, we believe that the respective definition and classification operations should be prepared correctly from the perspective of the purpose for which the classification is initiated, the classification criteria, and other aspects complementary to them.

**Conclusion.** The specialized language, the terms that define different interventions on historical monuments, as well as the criteria for their classification reveal numerous vulnerabilities, imperfections highlighted by valid scientific reports, by the Preliminary Theses of the Cultural Heritage Code, by the opinions of specialists expressed on the occasion of various scientific events.

The words in the specialized lexicon that refer to interventions on existing constructions, including historical monuments, are overwhelmingly part of everyday language. They are empirical concepts, based on experience, and their own meanings are not sufficiently restricted, particularized when used as specialized terms, nor can they be too restricted compared to their broad meaning. For this reason, extensive descriptions with many insignificant aspects are resorted to, and the definitions are often too broad or too narrow, or present many interferences with other types of interventions and their definitions. Under these conditions, natural language has a much greater say on specialized vocabulary than in the case of highly specialized terms.

Since we are talking about terms with widespread use in everyday language,

difficult to define from a strictly scientific point of view, a series of procedures such as: characterization, comparison, differentiation, indication and description may prove to be useful, the latter being the most frequent procedure as a starting point in science, with the mention of avoiding inclusion and secondary features.

It is recommended to consider when analyzing a term not only what it communicates in its abstraction, with its isolated meaning, but also in its situational and contextual individualization of its meaning associated with sociocultural patterns, natural language and the multitude and variety of contexts.

Correlated to this state of affairs, a major role falls to specialists involved in various activities integrated into the conception of the architectural project and execution, and the management of the intervention work. The formation of professional skills, of the specialized thinking style in this type of analysis requires a longer approach, where we believe that undergraduate, master's and doctoral studies can play a decisive role in what constitutes basic skills in this sense, skills with generic potential. Investigating the appropriate ways and means for the formation of the aforementioned professional skills can constitute a consistent research topic, of course with multidisciplinary participation.

#### References.

1. A. Bidu-Vrâncănu (coord), *Lexic comun, Lexic specializat* (University of Bucharest Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000), 180 p.
2. E. Pavel & C. Rucăreanu. *Introducere în terminologie. Noțiuni fundamentale* (Publishing House of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, 2001), 158 p.
3. M. Pitar, *Manual de terminologie și termografie. Ediția a II-a.* (Mitron, Timișoara, 2013).
4. P. Rivenc, "État actuel des enquêtes sur la langue parlée et les langues de spécialité", in *Les Théories linguistiques et leurs applications*, Collection "L'Éducation en Europe (Collection "L'Éducation en Europe" Strasbourg, Conseil de l'Europe et AIDELA, 1967).
5. M. Gotti, *Investigating Specialized Discourse. Third Revised Edition* (Peter Lang, 2011), p. 15-47.
6. International Organization for Standardization, *Terminology work – Principles and methods* (ISO 704:2022).
7. B. M. Feilden and J. Jokilehto, *Management Guidelines for World Cultural Heritage Sites. Second Edition* (ICCROM, Rome, 1998), 141 p.
8. M. Petzet, "International principles of preservation. Documentation", *Monuments & Sites*, 20, ICOMOS – Hendrik Bäfler Verlag, Berlin, Germany, p. 106 (2009).
9. R. Nardi, "Conservation, Restoration, and Preservation in Classical Archaeology", in *Encyclopedia of Global Archaeology*, edited by C. Smith (Springer, Cham, 2020), [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30018-0\\_1444](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30018-0_1444)
10. L. C. Ratoiu, *Restaurarea monumentelor istorice: concepte, teorii, practice* (ACS, Bucharest, 2021), p. 448.
11. Ministry of Culture, *Preliminary Theses of the Cultural Heritage Code* (Romanian Government Decision 905/2016), 2016.
12. National Institute of Heritage, *Code for the evaluation and proposal of interventions regarding constructions with cultural value* (Code P 100-8), 2020.

13. R. Crișan, *Reabilitarea patrimoniului construit. Teorie și tehnică* (Ozalid, Bucharest, 2023), pp. 35-44.

14. C. A. Neago, "Healthcare architecture in the context of rehabilitative interventions and modernization of hospital buildings", in: *Proceedings of the 20 Architectural Experiences International Conference of Architecture and Design* (Accademia Adrianea Edizioni, 2024), pp. 150-154.

15. Romanian Order of Architects, Bucharest – Report for Bucharest (in Romanian), 2016.

16. Law No. 50 of 29 July 1991 (republished) On the approval of execution of construction works.

17. Romanian Order of Architects, Bucharest – Classification of the types of interventions on existing buildings (classified or unclassified) and the method of determining the degree of specific complexity of these types of works (in Romanian), 2022.

18. Law No. 422 of 18 July 2001 (republished) On the protection of historical monuments.

19. Law No. 10 of 18 January 1995 (republished) On the quality in constructions.

#### Figures.

FIGURE 1 – The connection between general and specialized language. (in [3], adapted from [4]).

FIGURE 2 – Incorrect intervention on a historic building with cultural attributes. (a) Before the intervention (Photo: © Dincolo de Fatade, 2012); (b) After the "rehabilitation" of the façade (Photo: © Rezistenta Urbana, 2014) [15].

