THE SITUATIONAL THEORY OF ARCHITECTURAL TYPOLOGY

Maarten Van Den Driessche – Research Assistent, UGent, VA&S [1]

ABSTRACT

In his book *The Practice of Everyday Life* Michel de Certeau makes a distinction between 'space' and 'place'. He defines a 'place' as: '*L'ordre (quel qu'il soit) selon lequel des éléments sont distribués dans des rapports de coexistence […] Un lieu est donc une configuration instantanée de positions. Il implique une indication de stabilité*'[2] Whereas 'space' is defined as '*l'effet produit par les opérations qui l'orientent, le circonstancient, le temporalisent et l'amènent à fonction en unité polyvalente de programmes conflictuels ou de proximités contractuelles […] A la différence du lieu, il n'a donc ni l'univocité ni la stabilité*'[3] In this paper, I would like to use Michel de Certeau's conceptual apparatus to reflect on the relationship between 'politics' and 'design'.

The designer mainly works on the material qualities of the built artefact. When a designer works on the composition of the plan, on the distribution and dimension of the different rooms in the building, when he invents the structural configuration, when he shapes the façade, opens up the interior of the building or sculpts the exterior form of the building; the designer is not – necessarily – involved with politics or with (political) ideology. His main interest is the art of building, and for instance not the political question. Thus, the designer deals with the notion of 'place' as defined by de Certeau, and with the stability or durability that this notion implies. Referring to post-war rationalism (of Rossi, Grassi and OM Ungers) and to their idea of the architectural type, I argue that this notion of 'place' articulates the architect's autonomous position. The focus on the building and other *material artefacts* such as the urban fabric, the public realm, the appliances and furnishings, as well as the scientific study of the qualities of these artefacts, define architecture as a discipline. This disciplinary focus positions the designer as an 'expert' within the political field.

By confronting the notion of 'place' with the notion of 'space', Michel de Certeau opens up this strict disciplinary definition of architectural typology. He points on the importance of the *architectural event.* As such he shows the importance of everyday life, of the inhabitants using the built fabric, and of the phenomenological ideal of the '*espace vécu*' – the lived space. The subversive users, ideologically and politically reorient the first meaning of the built artefact. Users thus freely reinvent the abstract, geometric space drawn down by the architect. In this initial scheme the architect and architectural knowledge by definition are ideologically suspect.

In this paper I want to contest this typical Marxist dialectic. I want to argue that architecture maintains a more complex relationship to the 'programme' of a building. Some of the provoking thoughts of the rationalist architects cited above are used to show how architectural knowledge (and the research based on the idea of architectural typology) can be an instrument for political action.

'Il existe des genres de discours qui fixent des règles d'enchaînements, et il suffit d'observer pour éviter les différends. – Les genres de déterminent les enjeux, ils soumettent des phrases de régimes différents à une finalité unique : […]. Il ne s'ensuit pas que les différends entre les phrases soient éliminés. A partir de chacune d'elle un autre genre de discours peut l'inscrire dans une autre finalité.'[4]

Jean-François Lyotard

(1)

Design (versus) Non-Design   - Diana Agrest

In an important text from 1974, Agrest used a striking metaphor to describe the relationship between politics and the process of designing.[5] She made a distinction between *Design*: the codes, the techniques and the means typical of architectural practice; and *Non-Design*: other, external phenomena, such as political ideologies, economic processes, social developments and other cultural systems that affect architectural production and thus implicitly affect the designer's thoughts and actions, but that are not considered part of architecture as a discipline.[6]

According to Diana Agrest, theorists and architects use this distinction very consciously, in order to consciously eliminate the external mechanisms affecting building production and consequently, to seal off the knowledge constituting the basis of the discipline. 'Design may be defined as a social practice that functions by a set of socially sanctioned rules and norms – whether implicit or explicit – and therefore is constituted as an institution.'[7] In this way, design could be described as a closed system; not only with regards to culture as a whole, but also in relation to other cultural forms of expression, such as politics, literature, painting, philosophy, natural science, geometry etc. Design, which can be considered both an action of the designer and the resulting product of the labour of designing, is as such marked by a series of conventions. Designs thus are the faithful reproductions of a number of rules that are theoretically articulated in advance, for instance because they were written down in architectural treatises.

By laconically confronting the *cricital discourse* of designers such as Alison & Peter Smithson with the way in which they try to shape their own way of thinking in architectural projects, however, Diana Agrest illustrated that neither the innovation nor the critical thinking are to be found in the architectural discipline (Design) itself, but rather seem to originate outside the discipline (Non-Design). The Smithsons, as members of Team X and thus as critics of the architecture of the interbellum period, exposed the ideology which was at the root of the modernist thinking of le Corbusier. Diana Agrest seems to be sympathizing with the discourse of the Smithsons. However, Agrest's very neutral comparison of the 'Golden Lane' project of Alison and Peter Smithson with le Corbusier's design propositions for the *Unités d'Habitation* and for the utopian city *Cité Radieusse*, quickly made clear that in essence, these architectural projects are marked by the same spirit. Because the architectural partners only reacted to le Corbusier's formal codes through the language of architecture, they did not succeed, according to Agrest, in really formulating a critique with their design practice.

Therefore, Agrest doubted whether playing with formal architectural codes can really be interpreted as a critical practice. She refused to accept that critical practice could only exist if the design is exclusively looked at from within the discipline of architecture. By setting limits to the domain of

architecture and thus in a way locking it institutionally, the opportunity of renewing the rules and scanning the boundaries of the field is ignored. This is why, in the second part of her text, Agrest draws attention to the processes that escape from the control of the design and the designer. A truly radical design practice, a design practice that moreover has political weight and that propagates cultural values, according to Agrest can only originate in contexts where the designer is led by these processes: 'The absence of a normative written discourse in non-design, precludes defining it as an institution and makes possible the inscription of sense in a free and highly undetermined way; we are here presented with an aleatory play of meaning.'[8] These processes on which architecture as a discipline has no hold and which Agrest characterized by Non-Design, would give meaning to the built space, more than do the internal control mechanisms of design theory, architectural criticism or the history of art.

Although a lot of observations that lie at the root of Agrest's analysis are still relevant and her conceptual division has proved itself very fruitful for the academic discussion[9], I would like to *invert* the conclusions of her text in this paper. Today, we have reached a point where architecture and design are almost completely dominated by procedures outside of the architectural discipline and the designer's control: the spread of the knowledge economy, political-economical globalization, the birth of a society of the spectacle… To me, investing in architecture as a knowledge discipline and in the history of architecture is the only way to still play a meaningful role as a designer. Specializing in certain well-defined issues seems to be the only way to take a political stand today. However, the point is not to consider the discipline of architecture as a closed, self-referential system – as has been the case under the influence of the (anti-typological) postmodernist debate – but rather to investigate how architecture (Design) links up with processes and events outside its domain (Non-Design); and how a designer can intervene in the political debate (Non-Design) by means of architecture (Design).

(2)

Places (versus) Spaces   - Michel de Certeau

In the same year in which Diana Agrest published the text I mentioned earlier, the French historian and philosopher Michel de Certeau published his book *La culture au Pluriel* (1974). In the final piece of this essay collection, de Certeau presents an analysis more or less similar to Diana Agrest's. He observed the activities of architects and urban developers as an outsider, and just like Agrest, he noticed a discrepancy between the work they do and the processes that eventually affect the architecture or the city.

 [PPT- 'L'urbaniste est incapable d'articuler cette rationalité en béton sur les systèmes culturels, multiples et fluides, qui organisent l'habitation effective des espaces internes (appartements, escaliers, etc.) ou externes (rues, places, etc.) et qui les innervent d'itinéraires innombrables. Il pense et il fabrique une ville vide; il se retire quand surviennent les habitants, comme devant des sauvages qui troubleront les plans élaborés sans eux.'[10]]

In his more theoretical essays, Michel de Certeau also opposed institutions (such as the Church, the State, the University); knowledge disciplines (such as grammar, urban development, history); and the specialized actions (of scientists, technicians and other experts) against the phenomena that escape

the control of these institutions, disciplines and experts.[11] He opposed the design practice ('cette rationalité en béton') against actions and events on which the designer essentially has no grip ('des sauvages qui troubleront les plans élaborés sans eux'). Michel de Certeau's analysis thus show striking similarities to Diana Agrest's text I have discussed earlier. But in contrast with Agrest, de Certeau quite clearly points to a number of *unconscious* – or uncontrollable – forces.

The oeuvre of Michel de Certeau clearly is indebted to the analysis of Michel Foucault – the notorious fellow-historian to whom Michel de Certeau has numerous references.[12] But unlike Foucault, Michel de Certeau does not in the first place want to tell the story of the Authorities (the monarch or other rulers: the Head of the Church, the Researcher, the Expert, etc.), nor does he want to tell the story of the producers (the legislator and the grammarians, the architects and urban developers, the scientists and technicians); but that of the subordinates: those who consume the already produced cultural products. In order to describe the continuous exchange of forces between the subordinate and the ruler, de Certeau's oeuvre is composed by means of pairs of opposites: the thing vs. its use, writing vs. reading, hard vs. weak, producer vs. consumer, strategies vs. ideas, language (langue) vs. speech (parole), place vs. space, etc. Especially this last pair of opposites – the difference between places ('lieux') and spaces ('espaces') – will require our attention.

It goes without saying that in de Certeau's analysis the second term is invariably favoured. With his criticism on urban development and the urban developer, he distinguished between what he called 'places' and 'spaces'. He defined 'a place' as : 'L'ordre (quel qu'il soit) selon lequel des éléments sont distribués dans des rapports de coexistence […] Un lieu est donc une configuration instantanée de positions. Il implique une indication de stabilité.'[13] A place is invariable. It has a fixed order and has more or less permanent characteristics. 'Le loi du propre y reigne.'[14] de Certeau's definition of space, on the other hand, seems to be pointing more in the direction of a performance logic. He defines space as 'l'effet produit par les opérations qui l'orientent, le circonstancient, le temporalisent et l'amènent à fonction en unité polyvalente de programmes conflictuels ou de proximités contractuelles […] A la différence du lieu, il n'a donc ni l'univocité ni la stabilité'[15] Here, de Certeau clearly has in mind the occupation of space. With reference to Merleau-Ponty, he confronts the geometrical space of the architect with anthropological space ('Espace Anthropologique'), namely space as it is really lived and experienced ('L'Espace Vécu').[16]

The opposition between the two concepts in de Certeau's text which I have quoted before is clear enough. On the one hand, there are the 'hard' entities of 'cet rationalité en béton': the city, the streets, the living towers, the rooms that organize social life, the streets and squares that stage the encounters and regulate traffic. On the other, there are 'weak' entities: simple, everyday actions such as walking, looking, making contact and isolating, sleeping and eating. It is the cultural systems (les systèmes culturels, multiples et fluides) that take possession of space and that – according to de Certeau – almost elude description. This process perhaps is steered by *the plan* of the building, but it does not let *cet rationalité en béton* control it. Living practices, observations, memories of a place after all cannot be caught in figures or a discourse, de Certeau feels, but rather manifest themselves in the stories tied to a specific place, in postures and gestures, in the slow course of time. The infrastructure, the facilities and the objects that designers design are not yet the actions the users of these things perform. The building is not yet a house and anything but a home. The city which is shaped in the drawings and policy documents of the urban developer is not yet the citizen's city. The designer first defines, marks and materializes the places that are subsequently claimed by the

inhabitants. He works with the dead mass of the empty city: '[L'urbaniste, red.] pense et fabrique cette ville vide.'[17] The subject of architecture is the building, the public space, the city – and ultimately not habitation or occupation. In a certain way, the designer always builds in a certain distance to the occupation, which is the building's final destination.

However, as an outsider, de Certeau, being anything but an architect, to a large extent ignores the singularity of the design. Essentially, the design is the moment in which buildings are being invented. The time of the designing process is that important period in the existence of a building in which the buildings *are not yet* realized, but still *have to be* realized. It is the practice in which buildings are shaped and in which the city – or better: the urban facts are fabricated. But it is also the period in which the things that are usually considered fixed – the materialization, the construction, the location of a building and the fixed characteristics of places – momentarily still are subject to change. Design practice essentially is a process and an event that does not completely fit into de Certeau's *dualistic* logic. In the designer's imagination, an unsteady balance between what exists and what is new, between weak and hard, between unconscious motives and conscious intentions, has to be sought over and over again. The design is the moment in which places ('lieux') briefly become spaces ('espace'), in order to eventually, in the realization of the building, transform into a place again.

(3)

Form (versus) Function   - Neo-Rationalism

A third voice, finally, we encounter in the theoretical writings of writing architects such as Aldo Rossi, Giorgio Grassi and Oswald Mathias Ungers. With the rise of the so-called neo-rationalist movement in architecture (to which these three designers belong) the debate on the meaning of design practice and on the foundations of architecture was renewed. Originally, the discussion was started by a group of young architects that gathered in Italy around Ernesto Rogers and the architectural magazine *Casabella*, but relatively quickly, the discussion spread internationally under the influence of amongst other things the magazine *Oppositions*.[18]

After World War II, architecture was put in the shade and since then, design practice only could legitimate itself, or so it seemed, through other disciplines. Talking about architecture was politicised, psychologised, anthropologised, economised, historicised; architecture itself, however, was hardly ever subject of discussion. Architects such as Aldo Rossi, Girgio Grassi or Oswald Mathias Ungers, however, reclaimed attention to architecture proper: to the study of historical buildings, the analysis of composition rules, the application of empirical research methods, the history of architecture and the métier of building itself.

In the introduction to *Architettura della Città*, Aldo Rossi distinguishes two methods of researching the city and city architecture: '*In the first, the city is derived from the analysis of the political, social and economic system and is approached from the perspective of these disciplines. The second perspective is more that of architecture and geography. I start from the second perspective, but also take into account the results of the first system.*'[19] Rossi will ask for attention for the geographic, topographic and historical individuality of cities and street patterns. He will stress that the meaning of architecture lies in the form and in the architectural elements (the loggias, galleries, towers, squares and fountains) that have been handed down to us. Rossi's typological way of thinking starts

from the hypothesis that the meaning of a window, a door, a room, has not really changed. The architect is aware that each window, each door, each room he designs is part of architectural history. He realizes that in each new window, the meaning of other, older windows, gates and rooms resonates. According to Rossi, the point of architecture was to *construct* new buildings and new meaningful contents on the basis of the things that are given: the given topography, the history of the city, the instruments of the discipline.

Giorgio Grassi stressed the nature of architecture as a craft, as a system of rules for the composition and ordering of elements; rules that in the course of the discipline's history had been put to the test continuously. On the basis of historical examples of buildings, he stated that the shape of buildings in essence has not changed much. Although these buildings once were the expression of a collective will, this would have disappeared to a large extent due to modernity and individualization. Nevertheless, the architect still could draw on the constructions and methods from the past to shape new buildings. Methodological analyses of cities and building typologies prove that essentially, in architecture always the same problems are at stake. Because the designer does no longer have to take an ideological stance, but – like the modern scientist – merely is a neutral observer, the design process could be freed from the will of the designer.[20]

After Oswald Mathias Ungers, in a lecture in 1963, had portrayed the architect as a nonentity and had, in this world of economists, technicians, sociologists and other building specialists, seemingly silenced architecture, he stated: 'Wogegen ich mich aber wehre, ist die Überbewertung dieser Faktoren und die daraus resultierende allseitige Zweckerfülling, die zum alleinseligmachenden Inhalt des Planens und Bauens erklärt werden soll. Im Grunde is die Zweckgesinnung *unarchitektonisch* un enthält keinen einzigen Bildungsantrieb.'[21] The problems the economist, the sociologist and the technician present us with, are as such not architectural. According to Ungers, the task of the architect is to translate the architectural programs in architectural shapes, to *shape* ideas. The problems these specialists point to are very real and have to be taken into account by the designer, but they are not part of the discipline.

The claim that architecture should find its material in itself, thus initially offered the possibility to escape from the external influences of sociological concerns, technological developments and economic questions. But fighting architectural autonomy had its price, too. Initially, Grassi, Rossi and Ungers all dissociated the *shape* of buildings from their *function.* In his classes at the University of Berlin, Ungers will show that one and the same institutional program (the Museum) can lead to an enormous variety of possible architectural shapes. Rossi stated that in a lot of cities large buildings or whole complexes of buildings exist that take up a substantial part of the city, but that only rarely have preserved their original function. Certain historical squares do no longer function as they once did. A lot of buildings have lost their ceremonial and thus representative value. In a number of important extracts from *Architettura della Città*, Aldo Rossi points towards the discrepancy between shape and function. In an important paragraph, entitled 'Critique on naïve functionalism', that is generally read very superficially, the architect expressed it as follows: 'What I reject is *exclusively* an uncritical notion of functionalism, dictated by a naïve empiricism according to which the functions determine the shapes and as such also unequivocally the architecture itself.'[22] That is why he opposes a building's architectural shape and its function. According to Rossi, the shape of a building is more permanent and has a longer lifespan than the programs inscribed in the buildings.

By dissociating the meaning of architecture from its function and therefore from the destination of the building like this, the authors were able to focus on architecture proper. The task of the architect is now to shape buildings. They (apparently) no longer have to concern themselves with the program, the destination and other phenomena affecting architecture. Where Agrest and de Certeau minimised the importance of the architectural shape by pointing to the phenomena escaping the designer's control, Rossi, Grassi and Ungers seem to skip that which affects architecture from the outside completely in order to fully concentrate on the phenomenon of the city, the buildings and the process of building itself. We could even state that these architects remained deaf to political, economical and technological questions; or that they simply avoided the question of livableness under the veil of architectural autonomy, as a number of 'critics' claimed, following in Agrest's footsteps.

This, however, contradicts with a number of theses of the afore-mentioned architects. 'Sicherlich tauchen bei der Organisation eines Bauwerkes die mannigfaltigsten Probleme auf und ich bestreite nicht, daß wirtschaftliche Bedingungen, soziologische Erkenntnisse und konstruktive Forderungen berücksichtigt werden müssen. Sie sind reale Faktoren, an die das Bauen gebunden ist.' And just as little as Ungers wanted to ignore the reality of the scientific, sociological or technological innovations, do the many notes and asides of Rossi (the theoretician and writer) make clear that Rossi (the designer) was not insensible to the phenomenon of living: 'The housing block of Belo Horizonte is full of life and warmth, full of the warmth of life; it repeats the rhythm of baroque churches, which is to say, it made the events possible, and that was and still is an aspect of architecture: not the beauty, not the mosque of Bursa, where I lost myself, but the continuation of the *insula,* the space of the people.'[23]

(5)

The building as pseudo-object   - a situational theory of architectural typology

The three theoretical frameworks and the pairs of opposites I have discussed, to a certain extent are 'arbitrary', of course. Just as any text or theory trying to subject the design practice to a certain system and to fixed rules, they do wrong by the 'reality' of designing itself: a practice which, like any other practice too – as both Michel de Certeau, Diana Agrest and Stan Allen clearly argument – can never be completely described by theoretical models or determined by a strict definition of the discipline. The pairs of opposites indeed are *arbitrary* and the distinctions they make *artificial.* However, they do clarify what is the *task* of the designer; and in my opinion, they also indicate where his responsibility as a designer ends.

I believe that architecture has a certain autonomy with regards to its *means.* It is in its means that architecture distinguishes itself from other disciplines: the exact and applied sciences, politics, economy and history. The building consists of a number of materials and facilities, building elements and constructive systems, plan figures and spatial dispositions. Admittedly, these means can be applied with a certain intention, for example to represent a political ideology or to obtain a number of economic imperatives, to give a foundation to a certain program or to meet functional requirements. But the quality of architecture can only be read from the way in which the architectural means 'work' and 'fit' by themselves. Building elements form a structure. This structure

and the building skin define the materiality and the tectonic qualities of buildings. The building takes position in the landscape. It determines the environment and sets apart an enclosed area.

We could say that the drive of architecture 'stops' at the control of its means. But this hypothesis – which some theoreticians defend in the name of architectural autonomy – poses a problem. When we approach the objects and artefacts merely from architecture and from the design, we inevitably pass by the possible meanings and the stratifications of the artefact itself, as is clear from the following quote from Michel Serres: [PTT: 'Je n'ai jamais seul, rapport à un objet. Mon attention, ma perception, ma connaissance sont plongées dans un ensemble social et culturel. Une théorie du connaître où le sujet, monade, a relation à son objet, passif ou actif, est une utopie vaine. L'objet se constitue dans et par les relations du groupe. Le sujet de l'objet, toujours est multiple.'[24]] As in the rest of his oeuvre, Michel Serres shows in this quote that artefacts, actions and social constructions never occur in a 'pure' state, but are always characterized by 'mixing'. Objects never exist on their own. Things have meaning but to the extent in which they – even if only in the margins – *take part in* our perception. The meanings of objects change according to the situation in which they are considered. Naturally, this does not only go for utensils or instruments, but also for architecture and buildings; and I again quote from Grassi: 'The attention is thus drawn to the ties connecting architecture with daily practice: for example the 'institutional' character of buildings and their shapes, as well as the emphasis on the 'evocative' character of architecture.' [25]

The architect designs buildings with the help of the means he has at his disposal as an architect. With these means, he shapes ideas and expectations one has of the building. Architecture is the result of a design process, and is situated *between* 'destination' and 'occupation'. In the design, a transformation takes place: one language (ideas, expectations, visions) is translated into another language (space, form, matter), after which the first language becomes meaningful again at the time the building is occupied (appropriation, identification).[26] In the design, choices are always made that permanently define the durable characteristics of the building.

By drawing attention to the influence of living and occupation, Michel de Certeau showed that buildings stage, frame and organize the events taking place in them. The hole in the wall directs our perception. Doors as well as the routes through the building steer our actions and guide our behaviour. The dimensions of the space determine how bodies will occupy it and how they will relate to one another within that space. The physical boundaries that are set can also become an institutional framework, when certain social obligations are projected on the defined space: streets guide traffic and are subject to its rules, a school is there for learning, in a museum all work on display is 'Art'. From this point of view, buildings are never merely buildings, artefacts, things, but always link up with the institutional regime common to the building, with the bodies occupying the buildings, and the institutions claiming the buildings. Moreover, this mixing does not only start with the perception of a building after its completion or with the use one makes of a building, but it starts already with the ideas, expectations and requirements projected in the building beforehand. Even the provisions that preceded the building process are connected to the architectonic question. In other words, the architectonic thinking cannot be dissociated from the tissue preceding the materiality of the building.

Buildings are always realized with a meaning, with certain intentions and expectations. These intentions are in fact the result of a political will. Therefore, it is quite probable that the realized

building represents the political ideals at the base of the design assignment. The meaning of theatre architecture, museum architecture, school architecture or prison architecture in the end does not lie in the shape of the buildings, but just as much in the way the buildings are the expression of an institutional program. Once these buildings have been realized, they are the foundation of the activities and events which take place in them. The buildings embody a performance logic or an institutional regime.

A situational theory of architectural typology takes into account the *specificity* of the architecture (in fact, one makes an abstraction of a series of phenomena linked to the building) without limiting architectonical thinking solely to its means. Because the design is the expression of specific intentions and a preview of the future use, the design question always goes beyond the field in which the design itself is active. In this way, every design question is fundamentally entwined with subjects that are – strictly spoken – outside its domains. Examples include political issues and political ideology, new important social developments or technical inventions, the demands of specific institutions occupying the space. But just as much, the design question is interconnected with the *apolitical logic* inherent to the most elementary actions, longings and pleasures of the future users.

[1]

[2] MdC, IdQ vol 1, p. 172

[3] Ibidem, p. 172

[4] J.F. Lyotard, Le Différend, Paris: Editions Minuit, pp.51-52

[5] See: Diana Agrest 'Design vs. Non-Design' in: K.M. Hays (2000) *Oppositions Reader.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, pp. xx-xx (in what follows abbreviated as *D/n-D*); this paper was presented at the First International Congress of Semiotic Studies, Milan, July 1974. Originally, the text was published in *Oppositions 6* (Fall, 1976)

[6] A similar, more up-to-date comparison is at the base of a more recent essay by Stan Allen: S. Allen (2000) 'Practice vs. Project', in: S. Allen *Practice: architecture, technique and representation.* London/New York: Routledge

[7] Agrest, D/n-D, p. 343

[8] Agrest, D/n-D, p. 343

[9] See e.g.: K.M. Hays (2000) 'The oppositions of Autonomy and History' in : Hays (red.) *Oppositions Reader.* pp. ix-x

[10] M. de Certeau (1974) 'Des Espaces et des pratiques' in : MdC *La Culture au Pluriel,* o.c., pp. 205-222.

[11] In this text, I also refer to de Certeau's book on everyday life: M. de Certeau *l'Invention du Quotidien. Vol.1. Arts de faire*. Paris: Editions Gallimard (IdQ vol 1); see also: Van Den Driessche Maarten (2000) '*Verblijven in het alledaagse. Henri Lefebvre vs. Michel de Certeau.*' [Unpublished Master Thesis, Ghent University]

[12] Apart from Freud and Wittgenstein, Michel Foucault is one of the most important authors to whom Michel de Certeau will refer in his book on everyday life. The oeuvre of Foucault can be considered as complimentary to that of de Certeau. MdC, IdQ vol 1, xxxix, xl, 71, pp. 75-82, 92, 97-100, 117, 119, 121, 146. However, other works by Certeau refer to Foucault too, such as *Histoire et Psychoanalyse* and *l'Ecriture de l'histoire*.

[13] MdC, IdQ vol 1, p. 172

[14] MdC, IdQ vol 1, p. 172

[15] MdC, IdQ vol 1, p. 172

[16] MdC, IdQ vol 1, pp. 172-173; M. Merleau-Ponty (1945) *Phénoménologie de la perception.* Paris: Editions Gallimard, pp. 281-344 ; H. Lefebvre (1974/2000) *La production de l'espace.* Paris: Anthropos; G. Perec *Espèces d'Espace.* Paris: Editions Galilée

[17] MdC, o.c., p. 205

[18] In 1962, Giulio Carlo Argan published his 'Sul concetto di tipologia architettonica' in a *Festschrift* for Hans Sedlmeyr. As a provisional endpoint, I take the moment when Charles Jecks published *the Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (1977), a book that has given the architectural debate a completely different turn. Around this time, *Architettura della Città* (1966) by Aldo Rossi and 'La Construzione logica dell'architettura' (1967) by Giorgio Grassi are published and OM Ungers taught his 'Architekturlehre' (1964-1965).

[19] A. Rossi, *AdC*, p. 18

[20] G.Grassi, 'Avant-Garde and Continuity In: K.M. Hays (2000) *Oppositions Reader*. New York: Princeton Architectural press, pp. xx

[21] OM Ungers, *A BV*, pp. 31-32

[22] A. Rossi, *AdC*, p. 38

[23] A. Rossi, WA, p. 90

[24] 'Le collectif, inversement, ne parvient pas à se former sans que circule en lui cet élément ce que j'ai nommé *quasi-objet*, la balle dans l'équipe, le calumet de la paix parmi les ennemis parvenus enfin à l'accord, le verre commun au festin, où l'on boit, à la cène unanime, la petite monnaie au marché. Il faut cette circulation pour que le multiple, distribué, se fasse collectif. Ce n'est pas un contrat qui le constitue, nous ne savons pas où il se trouve écrite, ce n'est pas une volonté, nous n'en trouvons jamais le sujet, c'est un jeton qui court de corps en corps, tout simplement. Il n'y a pas d'objet sans collectif, il n'ya pas de collectif humain sans objet.' (Serres, *Rome*, pp. 128-129)

[25] G Grassi LCA, p. 34

[26] 'What connects thinking to imagination, imagination to drawing, drawing to building, and building to our eyes is projection in one guise or another, or processes that we have chosen to model on projection. All are zones of instability' (p. xxxi) R. Evans (1995) *The projective cast: Architecture and its three geometries.* Cambridge (Mass.) MIT press.