The Border of Cultures as a Zone of Formation of Eclectic Architecture
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Abstract. The article examines the process of formation of architectural styles from the position of a new style formation at the junctions of different cultures. The development of architecture is briefly studied on the example of the Mediterranean region as one of the most multicultural and highly developed. The local development of the architectural styles of the region in the period of antiquity and the Middle Ages is analyzed and the main centers for the eclecticization of architecture are identified. The process of translation of European architecture around the world during the formation of the colonial world is considered as well. The peculiarity of the integration of local and colonial architecture depending on the level of development of the colonies is studied. The principles of the distribution of architecture and its evolution at the joints of cultures, as well as the degree of integration at the levels of decorative, spatial planning and urban planning decisions are marked out.

1. Introduction
The formation of architecture is inextricably linked with the achievements of scientific and technological progress and the socio-cultural level of the development of the region. Wherein architectural styles in the centers of their formation, as a rule, undergo evolutionary changes. At the same time, on the periphery, especially on the border of different cultures, the synthesis of the developments of different architectural schools occurs, which is expressed in the formation of an eclectic architecture, that, with further development, often gives rise to new styles [1, 2].

This tendency is mostly pronounced in the formation of architecture on the border of cultures that have the same level of development and are formed autonomously from each other for a long time. One of the top examples of such development was the process of evolution of the architecture of the Mediterranean period of the Antiquity and the Middle Ages [1, 3–4].

The Age of Discovery made it possible to establish transcontinental relations, which in turn affected the development of architecture, primarily expressed in the expansion of European architectural styles. These styles underwent changes in the colonies which simultaneously influenced the traditional architecture of the region, as well as the processes of style formation in the metropolis [1, 5–6]. The greatest interest in this period is the process of formation of architecture on the basis of cultures of the East and West, which on the one hand were at a high level of development, and on the other—for a long time developed autonomously from each other [7–8].

2. European architecture as a result of the synthesis of Mediterranean cultures
The development and evolution of architectural styles, as a rule, are considered within a limited territory or period. At the same time, the problem of developing the architectural directions of the Mediterranean region was most thoroughly worked through, which was largely due to the subsequent formation of the Eurocentric world and the spread of its culture across all the continents. Also, the high level of development of the states of this region and their national, religious and cultural heterogeneity played an important role, leading to different vectors of development of architectural directions, which in the process of evolution, losing their genetic connection and passing bifurcation points, formed various directions that subsequently influenced each other. Considering the history of the formation of European architecture, it is necessary to note the various phases of its development [1, 10].

2.1. Ancient world and Antiquity

Analyzing the history of the Mediterranean, we can distinguish several of the largest cultures that have formed architectural directions, which have become the basis for the further development of the architecture of the whole region. These are Ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia and Crete. The latter was directly related to the European continent [9].

However, a significant increase in the zone of influence of the Crete-Mycenaean culture did not happen, which did not allow it to become a starting point for the genesis of the architecture of Europe. However, it had a significant impact on the formation of the architecture of ancient Greece as a result of its assimilation after the invasion of the Greek and Dorian tribes. At the same time, local development of ancient Greek culture took place at first time, which, beginning from the 8th century, BC, began to spread along the Mediterranean and Black Sea coasts through the Greek colonies. However, the most active stage of the translation of ancient Greek culture refers to the period of Hellenism, which began with the formation of the empire of Alexander the Great. The empire included Greek policies, Anatolia and part of Central Asia, Egypt. Despite the fact that after his death the empire disintegrated into independent states, its importance became crucial for the translation of ancient Greek culture, as well as for borrowing the cultural achievements of other nations, including Mesopotamia and Egypt. At the same time, the key factor in this proliferation was the construction of new cities. Thus, the formation of the empire predetermined the vector of the development of the culture and architecture of the Mediterranean for the next centuries [1, 4, 10–11].

Simultaneously with the culture of Ancient Greece, the Etruscan culture developed architecture. It was strongly influenced by the Greek and Asia Minor, but at the same time preserved its features, such as arcade systems and domed vaults. The growing territorial expansion of the Roman Republic led to the conquest of Greece and the integration of its culture into the Roman one. However, the most important thing was further expansion of the state, whose culture and architecture spread throughout Europe, including Britain, as well as in Asia Minor and the northern coast of Africa. The unified development continued until the partition of the Roman Empire into two parts, after which two development centers were formed. West, soon conquered by Germanic tribes, became the basis for the development of barbarian states, which, however, due to the small degree of development, could not fully adopt the achievements of a highly developed empire. East—became the center of the development of Byzantine architecture [1, 10–13].

2.2. Middle Ages

Characterizing the architecture of the Middle Ages, it is necessary to distinguish three zones: the barbarian states created on the basis of the Western Roman Empire; Byzantium; and the Islamic world, which appeared in the 7th century. All of them to some extent were based on the achievements of ancient Roman architecture, but the further evolution took place independently of each other [1, 14].

Considering the architecture of Western Europe, it is necessary to note the general level of decline in all spheres of life. Pre-Romanesque architecture is distinguished by the synthesis of Roman architecture with local architecture and is characterized by a significant simplification of forms. Its further development was called the Romanesque style, which appeared in the 10th century, when the
level of European states allowed to borrow the remaining achievements of the Roman Empire, expressed in the form of arched systems and arches. A certain influence was exerted by the architecture of Byzantium, which was at a higher level of development. A feature of Romanesque architecture was its widespread distribution throughout Europe. At the same time, depending on the location, it could borrow features of local culture. Its further development was Gothic, in which the wall system gave way to the frame system. In general, by that time, national trends had formed in the territories of Western and Northern Europe, the connecting factor was the development of building guilds that travelled throughout Europe and relayed the achievements in the field of architecture, formed in different regions [1, 3 11].

At the same time Byzantine architecture was flourishing. Its development took place on the basis of ancient culture and in different periods of its existence it covered the territory of Asia Minor, the Balkans, and Northern Africa. At the same time, the formation of architecture within the framework of a single state, at the initial stages significantly exceeding the surrounding ones, led to evolutionary development within the framework of a single style that had a significant impact on the surrounding territories, primarily the ancient Russian princedoms, the Caucasus, Italy and the Arab states [1, 3].

Even at the initial stages the architecture of Islamic states already was a synthesis of Greco-Roman and Mesopotamian culture, which only increased as territorial expansion in subsequent epochs. It included the Pyrenees, the Northern coast of Africa, Anatolia and Middle Asia, and India at the time of the caliphate. In the latter, at that time, the elements of Greek architecture were practically lost. Such an expansion of the territory led to a significant eclecticization of architectural styles. Characteristic feature of the Arab states was wavy formation of large empires, which periodically disintegrated and formed again. That tendency resulted in periods of autonomous development of architecture with subsequent synthesis, which architecture of Byzantium lacked [1, 4, 10].

However, the most interesting from the point of formation of the architecture of the region are the border areas, in which the features of the three above mentioned directions were synthesized, generating new ones. These include the Iberian Peninsula, where Arab and Western European cultures coexisted for a long time, giving rise to the Mudejar style. Another territory was Asia Minor, which was constantly under the influence of Byzantium and the Arab, and after the conquest by the Crusaders and the Western European worlds, many cultures coexisted on its territory and their achievements were synthesized. At the same time, the Crusades gave a significant impulse to the development of European architecture itself. Nevertheless, it was Italy that played the greatest part in further development of European architecture, which was facilitated by a number of factors. The most significant one was the heritage of the Western Roman Empire, the ruins and structures of which were mostly represented on the Italian peninsula. Its geographic location was also of great importance. Being separated from Northern Europe by the Alps, this territory had much less communication with Northern Europe than with Byzantium, which had a huge impact on its architecture and culture. The beneficial location presupposed the development of trade that united the Western European, Byzantine and Arab worlds, and also predetermined the development of the region's economic well-being and cultural exchange, which was expressed in the synthesis of the features of the various architectural schools. This was mostly expressed during the Renaissance, a period when active work on the theory of European architecture started [1, 10–13].

3. Formation of the Eurocentric world and global spread of European architecture
The end of the medieval period in Europe, in addition to changing socio-cultural ways of life of society and the gradual transition to the Renaissance, is closely connected with the beginning of the transoceanic sea transitions and the period of the Great Geographical Discoveries, which served as a starting point for the development of international trade relations and European colonial expansion [15]. Some processes of style formation in mainland Europe and the spread of the dominant architecture over the colonies were going in parallel. Polylogue of cultures, high level of development and periodic change of the ruling powers on the continent soon led to the formation of a multitude of national variations of styles and directions. They were developing taking into account each other’s
achievements, which in their turn, however, merged into general mainstreams, such as baroque and classicism [1, 4–5].

3.1. Development of colonial architecture

The translation of architecture over colonial possessions was limited to utilitarian constructions on the first stages. However, as outposts and settlements had been developing and, as a consequence, there appeared trade and government offices on their territories, the architectural expressiveness of the buildings became more complex, repeating the characteristics of the metropolises. The appearance of such type of architecture could not but affect the development of local architecture, the level of assimilation and eclecticization of which directly depended on the level of development of the local architectural and urban-planning culture [1, 16–17].

The dominant type was the translation of European architecture, which, in view of the significant advantage in the level of development, almost completely replaced the national one. This primarily concerns South and Central America, where architecture of Spain and Portugal was dominant, North America with significant influence of the architectural schools of Great Britain and France, Australia with English influence, the territory of the Russian Far East, South and Central Africa, in various areas of which constructions of different European powers can be traced. All these centers are characterized by relative stability of development, reflecting the stylistic directions of the metropolis. Transformation was primarily associated with adaptation to climatic conditions and local building materials, and also depended on the level of skill of local designers and builders. The degree of synthesis of local architecture and colonial architecture directly correlates with the level of its development and integration of local and European populations. While architecture of the colonies had been developing, it was gradually separating from the metropolis, becoming autonomous and generating new vectors for style formation. This tendency is especially noticeable in the decolonization that took place in North and South Americas in the 18th–19th centuries [1, 5, 15–18].

The second type of colonies is a territory with a low level of development of local culture, but with constant change of colonial countries. These include the islands of South-East Asia, where the synthesis of various European directions can be added to the above-listed processes. Formation of the architecture of the Middle East, North Africa, India, Indochina is of much greater interest. Here, by the time of the arrival of the Europeans, a highly developed original culture had already existed and could not be assimilated, and that factor itself had a great influence on the formation of local colonial architecture. At the same time, it could influence the formation of metropolitan development, giving rise to such styles as orientalism and chinoiserie. However, considering these directions, for all their diversity, it should be noted that all of them (with the exception of the countries of Eastern Indochina) continued to be based more or less on the ancient and medieval architecture, which had been considered earlier. This architecture was still translated as the Arab world expanded, and it had been developing for centuries regardless of the European architecture and, in the case of the Indian and Indo-Chinese, had been largely transformed under the influence of local culture [1, 5, 15, 17–18].

3.2. Development of Chinese architecture

It is worth mentioning separately the synthesis of the European and national architecture of China. Here, in contrast to the previously presented samples, architecture and urban development had developed over the millennia in almost total isolation, primarily related to geographical location. Most of the neighboring regions, being at a lower level of development, were focused on the architecture of China. Influences from India, and especially the Middle East or Europe were insignificant and did not play any important role in its formation. In addition, the worldview and philosophical views, which predetermined its evolutionary development and the high level of semantic significance of various elements, had a noticeable influence [19–20].

Largely due to these factors in the territory of China in various regions, the development of eclectic architecture had taken place in common framework. Decorative elements were undergoing greatest transformation and were finally replaced by European ones with interpretation from the position of
local semantics. The spatial structure continued to be based on local architecture and predetermined typological and compositional features. The layout of most of the facilities repeated local samples, though with strengthening integration with Western culture western planning decisions began to appear. Urban development did not undergo any changes and continued to be based on the laws of geomancy. At the same time, it should be noted that it was in China where a poly-logue of cultures appeared, formed by various directions of Western and Eastern European architecture, as well as its derivatives, represented by the United States and Japan (since the Meiji period). A distinctive feature was that, in view of the considerable difference in cultures patterns of East and West, different style directions of European architecture did not have any significant impact, since the local population did not identify differences in stylistic trends, defining only the largest and most characteristic features of all European architecture. A similar process occurred earlier in the translation of Chinese culture to Europe and the formation of chinoiseries, in which not only did not the architecture of various regions of China stand out, but it also did not differentiate with Indochinese architecture [7–8, 21].

4. Principles of architecture development at the crossroads of cultures

Considering the principles of evolution of architectural styles at the joints of cultures, briefly described earlier, it is necessary to single out several stages of their development. The first stage includes distribution, which is carried out through cultural, trade and political ties and contacts, but does not give a high level of penetration. It is territorial expansion that usually leads to the global translation of architecture. It is expressed by the formation of colonies or empires. In this period different cultures come in contact with each other, and their synthesis, acculturation, or assimilation take place.

The level of integration directly depended on the degree of development of local and imported culture, as well as on the level of presence of this imported culture. Thus, at the same level of development, there is mutual integration of two cultures and their synthesis, whereas if one of them dominates, gradual acculturation or complete assimilation of architecture of the culture which is on the lower level of its development occurs. It is necessary to maintain conditions to support active urban planning policies, to create a springboard for further development and expansion of introduced architectural styles. The duration of contact between two cultures is another important factor, since at the first stages only decorative elements undergo transformation. The next stage of integration is the synthesis in the area of space-planning solutions. Urban structure, in the presence of the developed canons of its construction, practically does not change. Most of its transformations are connected with the erection of new settlements, or global reconstruction of existing ones.

Under the conditions of centralization, architecture in empires begins to develop in a single channel. However, as they develop, local cultural and national centers are formed, which gradually generate new branches from the main direction of architecture. To a large extent, this process is strengthened with decentralization, and especially with the collapse of empires. The emergence of independent development centers leads to different vectors of style formation. At the same time, both natural, socio-cultural and foreign policy conditions act as borders. The zones of intersection of various cultures, usually related to their periphery, become centers of eclectic style formation. At the same time, passing through unique points of bifurcations, directions either unite into one large style, or they give rise to the new ones. It should also be noted that the increase in the overall level of development of the society that took place on all continents and, as a result, the development of culture and architecture, led to the integration of the developments of various architectural schools, rather than the dominance of one of them. In Europe, these processes began during the late Middle Ages, while in some regions of the colonial world it was only at the beginning of the 20th century.

5. Conclusion

Brief analysis of some principles of the development of architectural styles, ending in the period of completion of the colonial partition of the world, shows the structure of the development of architecture in which there was a possibility of replacing one culture with another, as well as their integration and the emergence of new style directions. The transition to globalization in the early
20th century gradually lead to the unification and standardization of architectural forms. The reaction to this process by the middle of 20th century was transition to postmodernism, in which a significant role was played by historical reminiscences. The development of new directions of architecture based on computer-aided design, as well as high dependence on technological and economic bases, led to the appearance of a new phase in the development of architecture, in which not national styles but international architectural schools dominate and influence the peripheral ones, some of which synthesizing some directions generate new tendencies.
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