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Preface

The publication you are reading is a record of the EAHN2021 International Conference, hosted by the University of Edinburgh. The abstracts and papers included in this publication offer a perspective on the themes and questions that are driving architectural history today. The labour that has contributed to this event by the scientific and organising committees, session chairs, speakers, and support staff has been enormous, and we are proud to be able to offer this record of the event.

Like all EAHN International Conferences, EAHN2021 was structured according to thematic tracks, which identify shared concerns across paper sessions. The themed tracks for EAHN2021 are:

- DESIGN AND MATERIALITY
- IDENTITIES AND CULTURES
- MEMORY, HERITAGE, AND THE PUBLIC
- MOVEMENT AND MIGRATION OF IDEAS
- PLANNING, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND THE COLLECTIVE
- WELFARE, HEALTH, AND INSTITUTIONS

We thank you for your interest in EAHN2021, and we hope this document will serve as an index of a very specific moment in the history of architectural history.

Richard Anderson & Richard Williams
EAHN2021 Co-Chairs
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The Progress of Coal-Fired Comfort
Aleksandr Bierig, Harvard University

Early Modern Living Comfort. Charles of Croÿ (1560-1612) and the Description of his Residence in Heverlee
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Parallel Papers 01
Split Cultures/New Dialogues: Research in Architectural History and Theory

Roundtable

Session Chairs:
Brigitte Sölch, Heidelberg University
Carsten Ruhl, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main

It is obvious that research in architectural history and theory is currently split into different academic cultures, namely art history and architectural theory. Of course, this was not always the case. Up to the second half of the 20th century art historians had a great impact on contemporary architectural debates and substantially contributed to theoretical issues. Simultaneously, authors trained both as architects and art historians guaranteed a constant flow between historical narratives and design practice, or even advocated the autonomy of architecture. In late 20th century these productive intersections between art history, architectural history and architectural theory came to an end. Art history widely withdrew from contemporary debates on architecture and theoretical production, whereas architectural theory claimed the status of an autonomous non-historic discipline. We argue that this led to a paradox situation.

In the 60s, in a time of political turmoil, theory substantially contributed to a critical discussion on widely accepted historical narratives hereby uncovering their political ideologies. Historical consciousness was fundamental to institutional critique and to debates on architecture as art, politics and theory. Since the 90s this totally changed. Philosophy remained part of both disciplines. But whereas the iconic turn came to play a vital role in art history, which began to understand itself also as 'Bildwissenschaften', architectural theory became part of post-critical debates and was defined as projective thinking. Furthermore, great parts of theoretical thinking turned into a legitimation strategy for architectural positions, aesthetic preferences and architectural design practice. On the other hand architectural history no longer played an important role within art history. While theory was increasingly regarded as mere speculation, not seeing that some of art history's most important contributions were exactly this, speculation. By consequence, the many attempts that had been made to differentiate between history and theory caused a great number of contradictions and misunderstandings rather than clarifying disciplinary boundaries.

Departing from this situation our round table is conceived as a twofold dialogue: it will reflect on the historical, institutional and political reasons of the above-mentioned split and open a new dialogue between
architectural history, theory and practice. It will address questions such as: What role do institutions and different genres of ‘writing’ play for the intensity and diversity but also the reinforced interruption of the dialogue? To what extend is critique already part of the ‘economy of attention’ and what does it mean to be critical? How far can history be understood (again) as critical practice?
Manfredo Tafuri’s call for ‘operative criticism’ as a progressive solution to the lack of political efficacy and of scholarly rigour in the militant architectural history of the mid-twentieth century had, in his time, little following. Architectural historians sought greater professional specialisation not ‘operativeness,’ whereas architectural theorists, by the late 1970s, were beginning to embrace the ‘linguistic turn’ and its nihilistic view of historical knowledge.

In spite of this and of the ever-widening split that has characterised the global scholarship of architecture ever since, Italy gave rise to several methods of typo-morphological studies founded upon both rigorous historiography and a coherent theory underpinning the operative use of this historical knowledge in architectural design. This paper argues that the Italian ‘school’—for want of a better word—is perhaps unique insofar as it defines a clear scope of objects and methods pertaining to the disciplinary field of architecture as a whole, thus providing a unified framework for both historiography and design.

Yet, this Italian ‘school’ of typo-morphological history and theory is diverse, exposing rifts between traditionalists and modernists. The former are tributary of Aldo Rossi’s postmodernist formal relationships derived from a concept of ‘collective memory,’ whereas the latter adopt Saverio Muratori’s ‘procedural typology’ as a tool for generating abstract spatial relationships. This paper will focus on recent historical studies in nineteenth century architecture as well as new projects in the cities of the river Po plains—Alessandria, Parma, Bologna—that clarify these theoretical conflicts, yet show the way forward for an ‘operative’ dialogue between historiography and typological design theory. These recent contributions have displaced, ever so slightly but significantly, the long-standing Italian emphasis on Medieval and Renaissance historiography and on the iconic post-war building campaigns in Rome, Milan, and Venice.

The struggle for rigour in architectural scholarship in post-war Italy resulted in an engaging and diverse body of argumentative and exemplary writings by well-known authors such as Saverio Muratori (1910–73), Aldo Rossi (1931–97), and Manfredo Tafuri (1935–94). Their often conflicting positions on the craft of architectural history, its relationship to design practice, and the establishment of disciplinary parameters for either history or design, set the foundational arguments for much of the international debate around these themes. The validity of extracting ‘operative’ knowledge from history for use in architectural and urban practice is one among many debates in which these architects engaged. This controversy is expressed most clearly in their differing attitudes towards typology as either an art historical device or a theory of the architectural planning process.

The Italian universe of typological studies is probably best known from Aldo Rossi’s idiosyncratic definition of the concept, in The Architecture of the City, as the study of ‘constants’ underlying urban and architectural ‘facts’ and discernible in them:1 Saverio Muratori’s contribution, on the other hand, was restricted to the technical domain of urban morphology.2 Tafuri himself towers tall as one of
the most acclaimed architectural historians of the post–1968 era, not the least for his combative argument in favour of critical autonomy of architectural history. Nowadays, however, and especially outside Italy, the critical perspectives around these three architects are mostly cut off from one another, being concerned with specific subfields in research and practice. Their respective scopes have been increasingly delimited to reflect their respective methodological and ideological partis pris. This segmentation of theories and scholarship derived from Muratori, Rossi, and Tafuri is not only a misrepresentation of their frequent engagement with one another’s theories; it also obscures the claim put forward by each one of them to a systematic representation of and agency on the urban environment.

These claims unfolded throughout their careers and legacies on four successive levels I shall develop in this paper. At first, Muratori, Rossi, and Tafuri all grappled with the fragmented nature of historical evidence and the conflicting ways by which they sought to explain architecture as a process. Their various responses to this problem led to the second level, in which Tafuri’s strictly critical stance breaks away from the operative methods laid out by Muratori and Rossi. In the third level, Muratori’s legacy of an all-encompassing theory of urban succession, carried on by his disciples, came to be at odds with the later work of Rossi, increasingly interested in local and visual references over abstract theories. Finally, in the fourth level I will look at a few living architects who have carried on the operative typologies of both Muratori and Rossi.

Architecture as process, history as fragments

Let us start out with the scope of objects and methods pertaining to the architectural discipline, reaching back to the superimposition of Idealist philosophy and socialist politics that was pervasive in post-war Italian architectural circles. This disciplinary framing understood architecture to be not a specific set of objects, real or potential, but a process of bringing about change in the urban fabric. Conversely, history was not envisaged as a coherent narrative to be ‘found’; but as a collection of fragments to make sense of in a piecemeal fashion. The ‘methodology of collecting’ fragments as an analogy for the study of architectural history had been made explicit by Bruno Zevi as early as 1950. However, Zevi refused to relate this collection of fragments within any sort of physical context; the only process he would admit of was the emergence of the ‘awareness of making architecture’ itself; that is, the rise of creative freedom, following Benedetto Croce’s aesthetic theory. Zevi’s ‘operative critique’ of architecture predicated on ever growing artistic originality failed, however, to respond to the urgent threat to historic centres posed by post-war development.

Throughout the 1950s, Muratori developed another Idealist theory in response to this threat to the historic city. Against Zevi’s concept of ‘operative critique,’ he proposed an ‘operative history’ in which the reality of the city as a piecemeal accumulation of interventions paradoxically proved its nature to be that of a coherent organism. Thus, even though historical and archaeological evidence would always be fragmentary, the coherent process of becoming that is the built environment could be understood through evidence based synthetic judgment. Aldo Rossi later picked up where Muratori’s 1959 article left off. In his 1966 book *The Architecture of the City*, Rossi thus portrayed the urban phenomenon as the present state of a continuous, yet heterogeneous, process of grafting changes onto a fabric that persists across the ages. Despite the incoherence of this ‘creation born out of numerous and diverse moments of formation,’ the city can still, at any one moment, be grasped as ‘a unit in its whole,’ because ‘the possibility of reading the city in continuity lies in its pre-eminent formal and spatial character.’

Tafuri, a former student of both Muratori’s and Zevi’s, took issue with both of their brands of
Idealism in his 1968 book, *Theories and History of Architecture*. To approach the concept of history as a collection of fragments, he used a Marxist lens predating a clear-cut separation between the production of the built environment and its historiographic critique. Ostensibly, this was a plea for an architectural history endowed with ‘positive skills’ to counteract vapid theorizing. In practice, it stemmed from his Marxist belief that the practice of architecture was, by the late twentieth century, well on its way to dissolving in the undifferentiated scope of ‘planning’. Architecture, in Tafuri’s view, became the stuff of history much in the same way Hegel had proclaimed Art belonged to the past.

Muratori’s ‘operative history’ and Tafuri’s ‘critical history’ both looked at the problem of the historical fragment as the starting point for a discussion of the built environment in a process of becoming, but they looked at it from opposite ends. Muratori took the fragments that made up the built environment as instances of *a priori* types, then sought to explain the overall coherence of the historic city as an outcome of the typological process. To Tafuri, on the other hand, it is the nature of the historical process that was given *a priori*: the deterministic advance of capitalist technocracy since the early Renaissance. The historian’s task was then to fit, provisionally, the fragments of architecture’s increasingly dead body onto an ever-changing picture of this advance.

**Historiographic critique and operative synthesis**

The difference between Muratori’s and Tafuri’s treatment of the historical process stemmed from their different philosophies of reality. In the Idealist theory developed by Muratori, the historic territory and its reconstructed past had real, if not immediately tangible, existence. Tafuri’s dialectic, on the other hand, handled the ‘perpetual critique’ of historical fragments as a way of exorcizing, so to speak, the very existence of a tangible reality.

Tafuri wielded a historiographic ‘scalpel’ to ‘pry open the compactness of historical constructs, problematize them, and prevent them from presenting themselves as ‘truths’. Exposing all ideology as contradictory enabled him to produce sophisticated analyses of Renaissance architectural theory. Yet, when the only tool one wields is critique, everything ends up looking like a crisis. Tafuri’s ideal contemporary architect was, therefore, perennially locked into this state of crisis: either a planner not designer, who would accept the transitional (and therefore ambiguous) role played nowadays by a dismembered and multifarious discipline, or a destroyer of conventional meaning such as the younger Aldo Rossi, who took the existing city ‘as a mere pretext’ and let architecture ‘hang dangerously in the balance: its reality, never denied outright, but mischievously mingled with the unreal’.

In contrast to Tafuri’s argument for a permanent state of crisis, Muratori and Rossi sought to overcome the crisis of modernity, which is ultimately a disjunction between what society values and what it makes. This crisis, as described by Muratori, lay in the social desire to preserve the coherence of traditional territories in an age when the ‘spontaneous’ and incremental practice that had given rise to them was being lost to the ‘self-conscious’ and destructive practices of modern architecture. To this end, the processes that gave rise to the mature traditional city ought not be seen merely as products of their (past) ages. Rather, they were intrinsically legitimate and necessary means of carrying on the city-building process, because the city was by definition the outcome of such processes—and departing from them would entail building anything but a real city. In turn, Muratori saw the crafting of a historical narrative as analogous to the process of city-building, inasmuch as either is only legitimate when it convincingly presents the structural reality of the historical process.

The tension between the fragmentary nature of the city and its resulting coherence was, to Rossi, the embodiment of its physical ‘memory’, made possible by Marcel Poëte’s law of persistence in plan. Such persistence is driven,
primarily, by embodied memory. This refers to those ‘urban facts’ that hold back the continuous process of urban transformation: monumental architecture at one end, and the enduring pattern of land subdivision and ownership at the other. When these factors are not at play, as in greenfield projects, the physical urban memory must then be replicated by means of reconstructed classifications present in human memory. Both Muratori and Rossi thus claimed identity between the synthetic reconstruction of the process that has brought about the historic city as it exists and a normative theory of how best to build upon this process. For both Muratori and Rossi, the concept of type was central to this unified operation that both describes and directs city-building.

**Typology, abstraction, and figuration**

The concept of typology as a descriptive device in architectural history has been asserted by authors with a wide range of theoretical allegiances, from Argan and Moudon to Corona Martínez and Panerai. However, its legitimacy as a mediation between the existing city (or a tradition more generally and abstractly understood) and contemporary design has been much more controversial; Moneo even claimed it would be intellectually impossible for contemporary architects to put themselves in the typological mindset. Furthermore, Tafuri's put-down of Muratori's method had a point: if typology's aim was to overcome the crisis of modern development by building upon the process of becoming of the actual city, why was the breakdown of traditions itself not accepted as a legitimate part of this process? Muratori's outright rejection of this modern breakdown was no different, Tafuri argued, from the modernist rejection of tradition.

To complicate matters further, Muratori's most prominent disciple, Gianfranco Caniggia (1933–87), subscribed quite explicitly to the modernist denunciation of eclecticism as inauthentic and commended the ‘noble aspirations’ of the Modern movement. Muratori's synthesis of an integral fabric of reality to be recomposed by contextual design was thus replaced with an analytical attitude that tried to isolate the ‘structural’ components of urban form while throwing out the ‘recycling of forms cherry picked from the past’ This compromise nevertheless paid off politically, as Caniggia earned Tafuri's respect and Caniggia's own disciples have achieved a prestigious standing in today's scholarly field of urban morphology. Since the last decade of the twentieth century, this 'Italian school of typology' has turned into a continuum ranging from strict adherents of Caniggia's 'modern' identity—Gian Luigi Maffei and Nicola Marzot—to scholars studying eclectic planning as a legitimate step in the typological process—Giuseppe Strappa—to 'soft' traditionalists—Paolo Maretto and Giancarlo Cataldi.

A rift remained, nevertheless, between this academically minded group and another circle of architects that formed under the influence of Aldo Rossi's later work. Starting with the 1979 Teatro del Mondo project in the Venice Biennale, Rossi drifted towards a more figurative take on memory. The scandal generated by this project overshadowed Rossi's consistent stream of exploration into the use of classical details and the more complete reconstruction of a traditionalist idiom in his later works. Though Rossi wrote little from the mid 1970s on, his designs seem to have done away with the notion he previously held, that ‘crisis’ and a fragmented consciousness were the inescapable conditions of modernity. Rossi's work, even considering his written works, never achieved the all encompassing rules and procedures of the Muratorian school. Rossi claimed to leverage ‘memory’ as the current state of the awareness of history in any given context. Because memory is fragmentary, the design resulting from this operation of memory is itself a fragment. At first, the incomplete nature of memory was made palpable through formal abstraction and lack of detailing; later, Rossi incorporates figurative ornament (classical or postmodern). The
abstract identity carried through memory became increasingly supported by figurative elements in Rossi’s later works, setting him firmly apart from the Muratorian school.

Rossi’s example led a younger generation of ‘traditionalists’ or ‘new classicists’ such as Pier Carlo Bontempi and Gabriele Tagliaventi—to break away from the cautious abstraction of the Muratorian school. This movement also claimed adherence to a form of typology, in this case the ‘nameable objects’ put forward by Léon Krier and definite, recognizable urban spaces as formulated by Rob Krier. Their work is outwardly more reminiscent of Italian vernacular and classical traditions than the abstract practice of the Muratorian planners, but another crucial difference shows through on closer inspection. These new traditionalists traded Muratori’s integral re-composition of the historic settlement patterns for an uneasy compromise with mainstream real estate development practices as well as with standard planning regulations. This has given them a larger footprint in the actual built environment, but it came at the cost of debasing the underlying process of traditional typologies. This is not an unconscious distortion, either. Tagliaventi, the most scholarly minded among these new traditionalists, has claimed explicit affiliation to the early twentieth century ‘garden city’ movement as a workable compromise between modern planning practices and traditional urban environments. Moreover, he is wary of Tafuri’s vision of architectural history as entirely detached from the profession of architecture. Tagliaventi’s historical research is characterized by a fiercely disciplinary approach focusing on the ‘tools of the trade’—compositional devices, materials, techniques, and manufacturing. His Tecniche e tecnologie dell’architettura fra eclettismo e storicismo reads less like Tafuri’s books—anthologies permeated by the single purpose of discussing capitalist development since the Renaissance—and more like Rossi’s Architecture of the City: a collection of fragments building up to an underlying ‘typology’ of recurring practices and processes of disciplinary decision-making.

**Conclusion: operativity in historical perspective**

Now, the analysis turns back for a final look at how critical historiography addressed the shortcomings of operativity. By looking at the interaction of historical scholarship and design practice in the work of architects who combine both activities, the theoretical assumptions linking both fields become clear. The typological contradictions between the ‘historic city’ strictly defined—pre-industrial urbanism—and the urban fabric of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries appears as an unresolved conflict in the methods and judgements of ‘modernists’ from the Muratorian school and of traditionalists alike. In Tafuri’s overarching critical scheme, laid out as early as 1968, the distinctions in form and scale between the pre-industrial and post-industrial built environments seemed inconsequential: both were part of a continuous process of developing capitalism, which was more crucially leading to the end of architecture as an effective discipline.

It is true that Tafuri’s initial enmity towards the ‘operative history’ developed by Muratori softened in the 1980s, when the scholarly contributions of planning typology became clear. Nevertheless, the separation between these two methods evidences a fundamental rift in scholarship and practice. History, as understood by Tafuri, is bounded by the fragmentary evidence in sources, and consists of continuous rearrangements of these fragments. This rearrangement is guided by an a priori theory of historical process, which in Tafuri’s programme is the critique of capitalist development. Muratorian planning typology, on the other hand, should be called, more properly, a form of archaeology of the built environment. It is concerned with reconstructing the invisible, structural process between the extant fragments, and does so by assuming a priori that these fragments must be instances of types.

Aldo Rossi took typology into a terrain that had
a less rigorous method. This enabled him and his followers to develop a variety of experimentations along a spectrum ranging from extremely abstract forms celebrating the fragmentary remnants of the traditional city, to extremely figurative renderings of classical forms exploring ways of completing the fragmentary state of the built environment. This variety has resulted in Rossi’s work and legacy being sometimes discounted as inconsistent, superficial, or conservative. This approach all but vanished from academic debates in the twenty-first century, even as it has gained a growing foothold in the development market.

All three stances, Tafuri’s historical critique, Muratori’s operative history, and Rossi’s free-form typology, made relevant points about the nature of reality in architecture and its history. In a sense, Tafuri’s implicit foundational belief that the past does not exist in reality is true: all we have at hand is the whole of surviving fragments of history collapsed onto the present; ascribing some of these fragments to ‘the present’ or ‘the past’ is an operation of memory and critique, however ingrained certain attributions must be for any sort of discourse to be effective. On the other hand, this collapsed state of all of history onto the present is precisely what grants legitimacy to Muratori’s normative claim that the existing city be the starting point of new construction. The role of history is indeed to pull apart this collapsed state into discrete images of aspects or moments in a virtual reconstruction of time; conversely, the role of design is to synthesize this collapsed state by making a fractured accumulation of instances whole and imageable at a single point of intervention.
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