



THE ARCHEOLOGICAL OBJECTS IN UZBEKISTAN AND THE ISSUES OF PRESERVING THEM BY MUSEUMIFICATION

Kuryazova Darmonjon

Candidate of History (PhD), National painting and design institute named after Kamoliddin Behzod, Tashkent. Uzbekistan

ANNOTATION

The aim of this work is to study the features of the preservation of the material cultural heritage of Uzbekistan. The main aspects of the study of archaeological objects are analyzed and its place and role in modern practice are revealed. And also, theoretically substantiated the need for a complex of measures for the preservation and museumification of archaeological sites in the region.

KEY WORDS: *archeological objects, material cultural heritage, monument, museumification, preservation, study, resolution*

ACTUALITY

Because of the large number of archeological monuments in Uzbekistan, it takes one of the leading places in the world. The abundance of archeological monuments testifies that this highly civilized peoples, whose ancient culture was at an extremely high level inhabited in region. The number of archeological monuments that have come down to us is estimated by archaeologists at about 8.5 thousand. In order to clarify these figures, monuments of this type of material cultural heritage should be fully cadastral [1. – p.232-234.]. Today, the total number of cultural heritage sites is more than 10,000, of which 7,570 are under state protection. They include ancient architectural and archeological monuments, sculptures and monumental works of art, sightseeing and portable cultural heritage sites [2. - p. 206-208.]. As result of the analysis it has been known that only 25% of state-protected objects have protection signs - labels. Most cultural heritage sites do not have cadastral documents and their boundaries are not defined. The resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On measures to radically improve the activities in the field of protection of material cultural heritage" was adopted. The "Roadmap" of this resolution for the radical improvement of the protection, preservation, research, promotion and rational use of tangible cultural heritage in 2019-

2021 sets the following tasks: to create 3D model of 50 most important archeological monuments in the country on the basis of innovative technologies; Akshakhan Fortress in the Republic of Karakalpakstan; Mingtepa and Kushtepa in Andijan region, Poykent in Bukhara region; Kaliyatepa in the Jizzakh region; Yerkurgan in Kashkadarya region, Nurata fortress in Navoi region, Old Pop in Namangan region, Afrosiyob in Samarkand city, Dalvarzintepa and Kampirtepa in Surkhandarya region, Kanka in Tashkent region, Chilanzar Oktepa in Tashkent region, Kuva citadel Museum of Fergana region, Khumbuztepa archeological monuments in Khorezm region are among them to be preserved and museumified.

METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

Conclusions based on historical-comparative and generalized analysis, objectivity, scientific, historical approach, systematization are the methodological basis of the research. Moreover, the theoretical basis of the study is the decrees of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan and his works on spirituality, culture, ideology of national independence, the laws of the Republic of Uzbekistan, and the decrees of Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan on museum development.



RESEARCH RESULTS

The data presented in the research have a scientific basis, the main conclusions of it can be used to improve the activities of museums, the development of measures aimed at increasing its efficiency, the museumification of material cultural heritage. In addition, the results of the research can be used in museum affairs, lectures and seminars in the system of higher and secondary special educational institutions.

Museumification of the monuments, objects, of cultural heritage, works of art and artifacts of antiquity enables to preserve them to the maximum extent and reveals their historical, cultural, scientific and artistic value. In our opinion, the museumification of archeological monuments and objects is one of the means of preserving them for the future generations and has become an integral part of modern museum practice. The museumified archeological monuments under these conditions become an important part of the material cultural heritage. The solution to the problem of museumification of archeological heritage arises in the interdependence of several knowledge systems and scientific disciplines, with the help of specialists of different levels and specialties, state and public organizations.

According to A.I.Martinov, the world experience in the use of material cultural heritage is reflected not only in its preservation, but also in its use by modern society. On this basis, he emphasizes the need to create a single new system: monuments of material cultural heritage – museums – information tourism – museum-tourist service and museum-tourist business [3. - p. 13–22.]. As noted above, a significant part of the material and cultural heritage of Uzbekistan is occupied by archeological monuments. Today, the preservation of their most remarkable objects through museumification is one of the most actual issues. It should be noted that no specific method has been developed for the museumification of archeological monuments. Because, they all have reached to us in different situations and appearances. That is, some of them occupy an area of several hectares and are scattered, others have a holistic compositional appearance, but several historical layers are observed in them, and so on. Therefore, in the process of developing the problem of museumification of archeological monuments, a specific approach is needed in the identification and classification of archeological objects and monuments. N.M. Bulatov suggests their separation and characterization as follows: 1. Archeological monuments include cities, villages, cemeteries, irrigation systems, and manufacture and handicraft complexes. In this case, when we talk about the archeological monument, we mean the complex structures associated with the place of residence of ancient people, their creative and

industrial activities, burial places. 2. Archeological objects include separate constructions of archeological monuments and all separate constructions except archeological monuments. The concept of archeological object is included in this classification as an auxiliary category, because some archeological monuments may fall into the category of archeological object or vice versa. Archeological objects are included in the part of an archeological monument and can serve as an independent historical source. 3. Archeological finds – this category includes all objects found in the territory of archeological monuments and objects, as well as removable parts of archeological monuments and objects [4. - p. 81].

Based on the above, it is possible to develop more optimal methods of preservation, museumifying and use of archeological heritage. For example, in one area it is possible to organize various open-air museums and museum-reserves. The application of such an approach to the preservation of material cultural heritage can be seen in a large number of practical works on the preservation and use of archeological heritage abroad: archeological parks are among them, more often the surrounding natural environment is used in the implementation of museum programs of historical and cultural heritage [5. - p. 112]. According to its methodological solution, the problem of museumification of real material cultural heritage is quite complex and diverse. This, in turn, is due to the fact that the archeological heritage has come down to us, in many cases, in a state of disrepair. In this respect, in practice, museumified archeological monuments are difficult to accept by an unprepared spectator. This is often characteristic for the objects and territories that are not associated with the development of large urban centers and ancient civilization. In general, this problem can be successfully solved once it is determined what and how to museumify. There are two different solutions to the problem of what is museumified. The first is related to the suggestion to museumify almost all cultural monuments and even material cultural landscapes that may disappear as a result of the influence of human activity factor. In this regard, researchers believe that museumifying is the only way to preserve a monument that is in danger of extinction. Scientists also note that the civilization of a society is determined by the presence and number of museumified objects [6.–p.13]. The second solution assumes the determination of the criteria to be selected for the museumification of monuments. Despite the diversity of approaches, researchers have identified the following criteria of monuments and come to a single conclusion: the importance of the area for reconstruction, the relatively good preservation of the monument, external representativeness, convenience for watching should



be taken into account. These criteria are quite general in nature, and, of course, changes will be made when developing projects for the museumification of monuments in specific conditions. The methods of museumification of archeological monuments should be divided into several stages, based on world experience: identification; research, analysis if necessary; restoration or conservation work; organization of exhibitions, that is, restoration of storage areas, conservation, creation of expositions and organization of excursion activities. It is also necessary to take into account the differences in the approach of archaeologists and museum staff to the archaeological monument in the process of museumification. Because, archaeologists are the most important thing to identify and study the monument as much as possible. In many cases, when excavations are carried out, the monument suffers serious damage during the research process. The task of the museum staff is to additionally study, preserve and promote the identified monuments in a comprehensive scientific way. The interrelationship between the methodology of archaeological research and the issues of museumification is a complex problem that, in our opinion, can be solved in favor of museumification. It should be noted that there is no single method and approach to archaeological restoration, preservation and exposition of archeological excavations. The choice of methods in each case depends on how the monuments will be presented to the audience and what scientific information will be provided. Today, if it is considered as worldwide, the following methods of museumification of archeological monuments are used in practice: The top of the archeological object is completely covered. While the effect of this method on the preservation of monuments is enormous, the artificial structures covered over the ancient settlements, citadels, and villages undermine their overall appearance and interesting appearance in relation to the environment. In the next method, as few changes as possible are made to the archaeological, stratigraphic, architectural conditions. In this case, the object is fixed according to the physicochemical or conservative methods of construction, ensuring long-term storage and can be demonstrated. However, it should be noted that one of the main problems of modern museumification is the destruction of the original appearance of the remains of rare archeological monuments by strengthening them with various building materials. The study revealed that some of the objects of material cultural heritage are in need of repair, preservation areas are not determined, there are shortcomings in the cadastral documentation, engineering communication networks are not provided. Among them there are those which have reached the point of extinction today, and those that have already disappeared too. For example, during

the studies in Mirzo Ulugbek district of Tashkent, only the address, street names of the archeological monuments of Oltintepa dated back to the IV-VIII centuries and Shortepa of the X-XII centuries were preserved. Roads and other structures were built in their places. The Oktepa monument of VII-VIII centuries, located in Yunusabad district, is distinguished by its antiquity. Today, it is a ruin covered with weeds and turned into a garbage dump in the city. Land has been allocated to private homeowners in the hilly area with an ancient history, and a road and multi-storey houses have been built. As a result, today there are only the area of four hectares of the monument, which once had an area of seventy hectares. Similar cases were reported in Shoshtepa, Kuvgaytepa in Yunusabad and Sergeli districts, Foziltepa in Uchtepa district, and Mingorik in Mirabad district. As a result of inefficient use of the achievements of science and innovative technologies in the organization of fundamental and applied research in the field, designing, restoration works have a negative impact on the preservation of the uniqueness of material cultural heritage.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the scientific study, preservation and museumification of the material and cultural heritage of Uzbekistan is one of the most actual issues today. At present, the processes of urbanization and innovation are increasing in the socio-cultural life of our country.

These processes, in turn, can lead to the gradual disappearance of archaeological monuments. However, it is necessary to preserve the archeological objects and monuments, which have such wonderful projects that are disappearing, for the next generation. Thus, it is important to develop measures for their museumification based on world experience.

The problem of museumification remains as an integral part of modern museum practice and is in the focus of the world community.

REFERENCES

1. Berdimurodov A., Raimkulov A. *Archaeological heritage: preserving it is our civil duty to all. History and culture of Uzbekistan. // Thinking. - Tashkent, 2011. – P. 232-234.*
2. Abriev R. *The B. Current issues of research on the history of restoration and restoration of objects of cultural heritage in Uzbekistan. //The role of social history in the coverage of modern socio-cultural processes in Uzbekistan. Materials of the Republican scientific and practical conferences. Tashkent. The 2015. – P. 206-208.*
3. Martynov A.I. *The conservation and use of the archaeological heritage of Russia is a national problem // Preservation and study of the cultural heritage of the Altai Territory. Barnaul: Alphabet, 2001. Issue. XII. - P. 13 – 22.*
4. Bulatov N.M. *The principles of the organization*



- of archaeological museum reserves. // Issues of protection, restoration and propaganda of historical and cultural monuments. Vol. 3. NIIK. Proceedings 28. - M., 1975. - P. 81.*
5. Ahrens C. *Wiederaufgebaute Vorzeit. Archaologische Freilichtmuseen in Europa.* 1990. 112 p.;
 6. Alekseev V.P. *Museology, museumification, culture // Bulletin of the Museum Commission. - M., 1990. - P.13.*