Choosing History:
A Study of Manfredo Tafuri's Theorisation
of Architectural History and Architectural History Research

Kiezen voor geschiedenis:
een studie van Manfredo Tafuri's opvatting
van de architectuurgeschiedenis en van het architectuurhistorisch onderzoek

Andrew Leach

UNIVERSITEIT
GENT

Contents

Nederlandstalige Synthese

These

Manfredo Tafuri (Rome 1935-Venetië 1994) was een van de meest invloedrijke en vernieuwende architectuurhistorici van de late twintigste eeuw. Vandaag echter wordt zijn oeuvre vooral geïnterpreteerd vanuit het erg specifieke denkkader van zijn traktaat uit 1973, *Progetto e utopia*. Algemeen beschouwd als de fundamentele referentie voor Marxistische architectuurgeschiedschrijving, heeft deze tekst Tafuri een internationale reputatie bezorgd en bepaalde ze de verdere toekomst van de zogenaamde School van Venetië. Een dergelijke lectuur gaat echter grotendeels voorbij aan Tafuri's wetenschappelijk onderzoek naar de Venetiaanse, Florentijnse en Romeinse Renaissance, dat door een nagenoeg compleet verschillend publiek als belangwekkend wordt beschouwd. Terwijl zijn bibliografie bijna dertig boeken en vele wetenschappelijke referaten en artikelen over de dertiende tot twintigste eeuw omvat, hebben weinig onderzoekers een reële poging gedaan om de bijdrage van Tafuri tot de geschiedenis en de historiografie van architectuur te bepalen, tenzij via de in de jaren 1970 geformuleerde categorieën. Dit proefschrift gaat in op de fundamentele discordantie in deze lectuur van Tafuri's werk, die, zeker binnen een anglo-Amerikaanse context, de neiging vertoont de basiscontinuïteit in zijn bibliografie terzijde te schuiven. Het beargumenteert dat de intellectuele carrière van Tafuri een dertig jaar durend onderzoek vormt naar de instrumenten en taken eigen aan een autonome discipline van architectuurgeschiedenis. We stellen dat hij daarbij, op volhardende wijze, zowel nieuwe analytische instrumenten als deze van gevestigde historische disciplines heeft getest op hun toepasselijkheid voor de historische studie van architectuur. Vertrekkend van Tafuri's 'beslissing' om te opereren in het veld van de geschiedenis, en niet in dat van de architectuurpraktijk, positioneert het proefschrift Tafuri binnen de bredere stromingen van de naoorlogse Europese intellectuele geschiedenis, en wil het tegelijk pleiten voor een samenhangend begrip van de verantwoordelijkheden van de historicus binnen de architectonische cultuur zoals die aanwezig is in het gehele gepubliceerde werk van Tafuri. Het proefschrift onderzoekt daartoe de manier waarop Tafuri's werk getuigt van een kennis van de denkbeelden van Freud, van naoorlogse Marxistische intellectuelen in Italië en elders, van Benjamin, Sartre én van filosofische strategieën die in de jaren '70 en '80 opdoken. Het nagaan van de historische verhouding van Tafuri met deze figuren vormt onderwerp van studie, maar tegelijk {en vooral} worden hier zijn publicaties aan analyse onderworpen om te achterhalen hoe bij Tafuri deze specifieke lecturen, waarin hoogst persoonlijke en openlijk contextuele dimensies elkaar kruisen, een historische 'praktijk' sturen. Het proefschrift beargumenteert dat zijn studies over eigentijdse architecten en historici, zowel als over historische onderwerpen (hier hoofdzakelijk Piranesi en Borromini), de basis vormen van een zoektocht waarbij het potentiële referentiekader continu wordt getoetst om op

die manier de doeleinden en de 'instrumenten' van de historische 'praktijk' scherper te stellen. Het proefschrift schuift met andere woorden als these de voorwaardelijke autonomie van de geschiedenis naar voor: een discipline die verschilt van de architectuur, maar desalniettemin afhankelijk blijft van een architectonische kennis. Tafuri bouwt zijn historische 'praktijk' zo op dat een positie van geïnformeerd antagonisme kan worden behouden, waarbij het zelfverwijzend karakter van het gebruik van geschiedenis binnen de architectuurtheorie, zelfs al is dit gebruik complex en ingewikkeld, voortdurend kritisch wordt bevraagd. Zijn analyse van de instrumenten waarmee een plaats in architectonische cultuur kan worden verzekerd, komt overeen met een strategie van een discipline zonder vorm, die alleen via een zich eigen zijnde 'praktijk' kan ontwikkelen. Het is precies deze benadering, zo besluit dit proefschrift, die voor de lezers van Tafuri diens werk vaak zo ongrijpbaar maakt.

Samenvatting en opbouw

Dit proefschrift gaat in op twee onderling gerelateerde gedachtelijnen bij Manfredo Tafuri. Als eerste wordt zijn theorievorming met betrekking tot het verband tussen het verleden en de representatie ervan als geschiedenis beschouwd; als tweede presenteert het proefschrift een lectuur van Tafuri's idee over de status van de historicus in de architectonische cultuur. Het denken van Tafuri rond deze kwesties is, zo menen we, fluctuerend en voortdurend in evolutie, en bepaalt een intellectuele positie die wordt versterkt door zijn duidelijke terughoudendheid om zijn historische 'praktijk' (zowel de persoonlijke als de geïnstitutionaliseerde in Venetië) een vaste disciplinaire vorm te geven, zelf al is zijn werk door sommigen als modelmatig geïnterpreteerd.

We willen aantonen dat elk van zijn publicaties getuigt van een ononderbroken onderzoek naar de instrumenten en taken eigen aan de figuur van de architectuurhistoricus. Zijn boek *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968) vormt de meest expliciete, vroege reflectie op de disciplinaire vorm van de praktijk van architectuurgeschiedschrijving. Veel van de complexiteit die in het werk van Tafuri wordt waargenomen, is, ons inziens, verbonden met zijn keuze om de interacties tussen historiografie en andere disciplines open te laten. Als vorm van historische 'praktijk', neemt onderzoek een erg belangrijke positie in ten opzichte van het publiceren als praktische neerslag van zijn denken over het verleden en haar representatie.

Om deze these te kunnen ontwikkelen, is het proefschrift opgebouwd uit vier delen. Elk deel gaat in op specifieke voorbeelden uit zijn oeuvre die ons moeten toelaten om beter inzicht te krijgen in de implicaties van zijn uitspraken over het voorwaardelijk-autonoom karakter van de discipline van de architectuurgeschiedenis, alsook in haar voortdurende gevolgen voor de architectonische cultuur. Het basismateriaal voor dit proefschrift wordt geput uit Tafuri's bibliografie eerder dan uit de talloze bronnen die zijn 'erfenis' heeft voortgebracht: secundaire literatuur, gesprekken met studenten, vroegere

collega's of vrienden. Dit is een weloverwogen strategie om zijn werk onafhankelijk van institutionele agenda's in Italië of elders te kunnen benaderen.

Dit proefschrift gaat niet diepgaand in op de monografische studies die de laatste maanden over Tafuri zijn verschenen: het boek van Marco Biraghi, *Progetto di crisi* (2005) of het doctoraal proefschrift van Rixt Hoekstra, 'Building versus *Bildung*' (2005). Tot op zekere hoogte zijn beide bronnen, weliswaar binnen het kader van hun opzet, nuttig maar ze laten Tafuri's geschriften over onderwerpen van voor de twintigste eeuw grotendeels buiten beschouwing. Bovendien is hun inzetbaarheid voor de vragen die ons hier interesseren, erg beperkt. Zo ook behoort een grondige confrontatie met de monografische nummers die *Architecture New York* (1999) en *Casabella* (1995) aan Tafuri wijdden, niet tot de inzet van dit proefschrift, omdat ze beide vooral zijn erfenis voor de architectonische cultuur thematiseren, eerder dan zijn betekenis voor de historische 'praktijk' te ontleden. We vermijden ook doelbewust het testen van onze conclusies tegen het fenomeen van Tafuri's receptie. Dat is een ander fenomeen waar we in de conclusie wel even op zinspelen maar dat we binnen een post-doctoraal onderzoek van naderbij willen bekijken.

Deel I, 'Architecture and History,' introduceert de vraagstelling rond de disciplinaire autonomie van architectuurgeschiedenis ten opzichte van de disciplinariteit van de architectuurpraktijk. De stelling luidt hier dat Tafuri's specifieke biografische keuzes van grote invloed zijn geweest op zijn denken over de disciplinariteit van architectuurgeschiedenis, maar dat de 'criticality', of het 'kritisch vermogen' dat inherent deel uitmaakt van een 'kritisch-historische praktijk', zich ook duidelijk laat aflezen aan de praktijk van Tafuri als architect. Hoofdstuk één bevraagt het waarachtige karakter, als bron voor onderzoek, van het autobiografische verhaal van Tafuri zoals dat in *Architecture New York* werd gepubliceerd. Daarbij wordt Bart Verschaffels essay `Kleine theorie van het portret' (1999) ingezet om de 'overeenkomsten' te traceren tussen enerzijds autobiografie en receptie, en de 'artefacten' van Tafuri's disciplinaire leven. Dit hoofdstuk steunt op de door Luisa Passerini samengestelde mondelinge geschiedenis over Tafuri, op de monografische uitgaven *ANY* en *Casabella* en op gepubliceerde chronologieën en bibliografieën om op die manier een voorlopige biografische schets van zijn theoretische evolutie op te stellen.

Hoofdstuk twee articuleert de historische context voor wat Tafuri (en wij, na hem) als 'keus' voor geschiedenis aanduidt. 'De universitaire' en de naoorlogse economische en politieke scène waarin Tafuri opereerde komen daarbij aan de orde, maar het is ons hier in hoofdzaak te doen om de beperkingen bloot te leggen die aan een praktijk zijn verbonden in een institutionele context'; dit verwerft grotere betekenis na de publicatie van *Piano regolatore generale di Roma* (1962). Hoewel Tafuri's keuze voor de geschiedenis [als discipline] in historisch perspectief wordt geplaatst via contextuele zowel als biografische elementen, wordt er in dit hoofdstuk vooral op gewezen dat een dergelijke tweeledige operatie niet volstaat om zijn overgang van architectonische naar historische 'praktijk' te verklaren. Wij schuiven daarom de idee naar voor dat 'criticality',

of 'kritische inzet' als volgehouden waarde in Tafuri's praktijk een continuïteit laat zien bij diens overgang van een architectuur- naar een historische praktijk en dat deze 'criticality' een inherent kenmerk vormt van hoe Tafuri geschiedenis als discipline opvat. Hoofdstuk twee besluit door de in het eerste hoofdstuk geïntroduceerde problematiek van de biografische representatie terug op te nemen, in het licht van Tafuri's *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*. In deze geschiedenis, zo luidt het argument, wordt door Tafuri een strategische afstand ingebouwd tussen zichzelf en de architectonische 'praktijk'. Zijn eigen, door hem in dit boek geconstrueerde afwezigheid binnen het veld/milieu van de hem eigentijdse architectonische 'praktijk', zij het als actor of als invloedrijk figuur, is ons inziens betekenisvol voor een goed begrip van zijn evoluerende concept van disciplinariteit.

Deel II, 'The Burdens of Memory,' ontleedt de vooronderstellingen van de historische praktijk in de twintigste eeuw door na te gaan hoe Tafuri zich twee debatten eigen heeft gemaakt: dat van de *critica dell'ideologia* van Mario Tronti en de Italiaanse Linkse beweging van de late jaren '60; en de erfenis van Freud, niet alleen in zijn meer algemene gepopulariseerde en intellectuele vorm, maar ook doorheen Tafuri's intieme kennis van de psychoanalytische context. In hoofdstuk drie introduceren we een, naar ons gevoel, noodzakelijke scheiding tussen Tafuri's alom bekende betrokkenheid in socialistische en communistische partijen tijdens de jaren '60-'70 en met de studentenpolitiek in de vroege jaren '60 aan de ene kant en, aan de andere kant, zijn benadering van architectuurtheorie in dezelfde termen als politieke ideologieën in de historische 'praktijk'.

We willen aantonen dat het mogelijk is bij Tafuri een corpus van historisch onderzoek aan te duiden dat handelt over gepolitiseerde architectuur, gaande van Renaissance Venetië, Duitsland onder de Weimar Republiek tot de Vijfjarenplannen van Stalin, alle utopische 'projecten' die architectonische uitdrukking geven aan politieke ideologie. Toch kunnen we ook een veel breder begrip van ideologie bij Tafuri aantreffen, met name op disciplinair niveau, waarin hij architectuurtheorie met een disciplinaire ideologie vergelijkt; door een aanpassen van Tronti's *critica dell'ideologia* aan een *critica dell'ideologia architettonica*, zo luidt onze stelling, vertaalt Tafuri de kenmerken van politiek engagement naar een discursieve functie waarbij de architectuurgeschiedenis een belangrijke rol opneemt binnen de ideologische destabilisatie. De lezer zal in dit verband onze duidelijke weerstand opmerken tegen de idee dat elke studie van dit onderwerp noodzakelijkerwijs door de filter van Tafuri's persoonlijke politieke overtuigingen moet worden bezien.

Het vierde hoofdstuk voegt 'ideologie' en 'geheugen' samen door te beargumenteren dat wanneer getracht wordt beelden die specifiek zijn aan de architectonische cultuur te ondermijnen, het geheugen een obstakel vormt omdat het de reconstructie van diezelfde beelden mogelijk maakt. Dit hoofdstuk suggereert dat Freud binnen Tafuri's referentiekader een belangrijke positie inneemt. Daarbij wordt gewezen op (a) de ervaring van Tafuri ten aanzien van Freudiaanse psychoanalytische praktijk, (b) zijn kennis van Freuds geschriften, en (c) zijn kennisname van een nieuw discours over Freud dat vanaf de jaren '70 opduikt. Onze stelling in dit verband luidt dat Tafuri's benadering

van de praktijk van onderzoek tegenover publicatie, van de status van het historische fragment (in archieven en als artefacten) en de traditionele functie van geschiedschrijven als herinneringsstrategie alle een verband vertonen met de doelstellingen en de processen van de Freudiaanse psychoanalyse. Tezelfdertijd blijft de algemene disciplinaire doelstelling om historische analyse op architectonische theorie toe te passen als ideologie of als beeld, utopisch van aard, intrinsiek aan Tafuri's selectieve toepassing van de Freudiaanse epistemologie op de disciplinaire praktijk van architectuurgeschiedenis. Zijn ontleningen omvatten de dialoog zonder respons, het fragment als aantastend middel en het onvoltooide karakter van analyse.

Waar in deel I het onderscheid wordt aangestipt dat Tafuri maakt tussen architectuur en geschiedenis, toont deel II aan hoe de kenmerken van dat onderscheid voor Tafuri het dwingende karakter van de historische 'praktijk' bepalen. Deel III, op zijn beurt, gaat aan de hand van drie case studies na hoe deze taken en instrumenten werkzaam zijn binnen een model van disciplinaire kennis. In hoofdstuk vijf gaan we in op Tafuri's vroege lezing van Walter Benjamin en van diens essay *Das Kunstwerk* uit 1936 in het bijzonder. Onze interpretatie hiervan luidt dat Tafuri Benjamins schema voor de mate van 'engagement' met de moderne wereld na industrialisatie aanpast naar drie modellen voor 'engagement' met het 'instrumentarium' van de geschiedenis. We willen daarbij aantonen dat binnen deze modellen weliswaar de door hem omschreven operatieve en mimetische figuren behouden blijven, maar dat ze desalniettemin noodzaken om meer aandacht te geven aan een tussenfiguur: diegene die tussen beide in onbeslist blijft. Tafuri breidt de chronologie van Benjamin's schema uit van twee tot zes eeuwen, wat binnen het wereldbeeld van *Das Kunstwerk* de disciplinaire kennis per se problematiseert. Van centraal belang in dit hoofdstuk is het verband tussen het verleden en de historische representatie als probleem eigen aan de historische discipline en de moderne discipline als een apparaat dat dit probleem steeds scherper stelt.

Hoofdstuk zes positioneert Tafuri's historisch 'project' binnen de bredere intellectuele context van het Italiaanse gedachtegoed. Het plaatst zijn ontleding van de discipline en de kennisvoorwaarden in het verlengde van een eigentijdse, zij het bredere bevraging van ideeën, kennisstructuren en historisch bewijsmateriaal in Italië. Door de lectuur van Carlo Ginzburg en Adriano Prosperi werd Tafuri geïntroduceerd in de historiografische strategieën van *microstoria*. Vanaf de late jaren '70 maakt zijn toepassing van hun disciplinaire lessen hem tot een interessant fenomeen van wat later, in de jaren '80, aangemerkt zou worden als *il pensiero debole*. Zoals blijkt uit zijn geschriften van de late jaren '70 en zoals wordt bevestigd door Tafuri's introductie tot diverse van de belangrijke protagonisten van deze beweging—een introductie bewerkstelligd, zo menen we, door Franco Rella—duidt zijn behandeling van deze ideeën noch op een overname die zou impliceren dat Tafuri een louter volgeling van deze ontwikkelingen was, noch op een afwijking ten opzichte van zijn vroegere denkbeelden met betrekking tot discipline, kennis, bewijs en historisch beeld. Terwijl we onderkennen dat de taal van Tafuri's analyses verandert naar aanleiding van deze contacten, net zoals ook zijn referentiekader

wijzigt, blijven zijn nieuwe studies verenigbaar met de basisposities die wij in dit proefschrift tot dusver hebben geschetst.

Terwijl Deel III nagaat hoe Tafuri zich inlaat met discussies over kennis en discipline, behandelt Deel IV specifiek het `project' als plaats van de disciplinaire 'aarzeling' eigen aan de historicus. Hoofdstuk zeven gaat in op 'de positionering van Borromini en Piranesi bij Tafuri als figuren die praktiseren in het veld tussen de utopische vormen van de opnieuw uitgevonden klassieke traditie (die door Brunelleschi en Alberti werd gestimuleerd) en een kennis van het verleden die tot historische representatie doordringt. Het hoofdstuk volgt de verhouding van Tafuri met Borromini en Piranesi als graadmeter voor de evolutie in zijn denken over het bredere probleem van de historische representatie met betrekking tot het `project' als een fundamenteel utopische constructie. We stellen daarbij dat hun voorbeeld een parallel vormt met Tafuri's eigen pogingen om een model van historische 'praktijk' gestalte te geven dat historische representatie mijdt en toch tegelijkertijd geschiedenis ook vertegenwoordigt. Net zoals Borromini en Piranesi binnen een productieve vorm van architectonische 'praktijk' opereren, is Tafuri's model van de architectuurhistoricus opgespannen tussen een directe kennis van het verleden en de noodzaak om deze kennis te laten neerslaan in een publicatie. Deze twee *progettisti* belichamen met andere woorden één van de primaire moeilijkheden die Tafuri's notie van een historische 'praktijk' in een architectonische cultuur impliceert. Het achtste en laatste hoofdstuk herneemt deze theoretische spanning, tussen verleden en geschiedenis, tussen onderzoek en geschiedenis, tussen schrijven en reflecteren, tussen project en productie, en wel binnen het denkkader van Jean-Paul Sartres existentialistische doctrine zoals dat in parallelle termen door Boris Groys werd ontwikkeld. We stellen een productief onderscheid voor tussen het 'project' als vorm van utopisch bestaan en de documentatie ervan als een manier om dat bovenvermelde bestaan te rechtvaardigen voor de eigentijdse 'wereld'. Dit hoofdstuk plaatst Tafuri's 'project' als het ware buiten ons bereik, en suggereert daarbij dat een lectuur van zijn gepubliceerde oeuvre kan fungeren als een simultane herwinning van Tafuri's individuele determinisme en subjectiviteit met betrekking tot de bredere culturele, intellectuele en politieke fenomenen waarin zijn werk potentieel gesitueerd is. Daarenboven wordt in dit hoofdstuk het argument naar voor geschoven dat Tafuri zich programmatisch intellectueel afzonderde wat tegelijk de basis vormde van een strategie om in samenwerkingsverband historische 'projecten' op te starten (van *La città americana*, 1973, tot *Francesco di Giorgio*, 1993). Op basis van een analyse van zijn bibliografie, zijn we in staat daarbij vier verschillende modellen van intellectuele samenwerking te onderkennen.

Het besluit speelt Tafuri's observatie uit dat zijn leven tussen Venetië en Rome oscilleerde. Wij beschouwen het verschil tussen deze twee steden op twee niveaus. Rome staat daarbij voor een artefact, voor historisch bewijsmateriaal, en Tafuri's verloren 'verleden'; Venetië is, in beide niveaus van de analyse, het beeld. Ons laatste argument positioneert deze twee steden als een disciplinaire dialectische uitwisseling waarin het beeld constant door het fragment wordt geconfronteerd, terwijl het fragment continu

door het beeld wordt ondermijnd. Het argument luidt dat Tafuri's evoluerende begrip van disciplinariteit en haar verschillende en diverse componenten, tot dit eeuwigdurende probleem is terug te voeren, een probleem dat zelf steeds aan verandering onderhevig is en dat dit direct wijst op zijn eigen belichaming van de figuur van de 'historicus' waar hij voor pleit.

Vertaald door Nicole van Ruler en Johan Lagae

ENGLISH SUMMARY

ABSTRACT

Manfredo Tafuri (Rome 1935-Venice 1994) was among the most influential and innovative architectural historians of the late twentieth century, yet today his work is predominantly understood through the very specific lens of his 1973 tract, *Progetto e utopia*. Widely regarded as a fundamental reference for Marxist architectural historiography, it secured Tafuri's international reputation and shaped the future of the so-called Venice School. This scenario, though, essentially ignores his scientific research into the Venetian, Florentine and Roman Renaissance, considered important by an almost completely different audience. While his bibliography contains entries for nearly thirty books and several dozen scientific papers and articles on topics spanning from the thirteenth to the twentieth century, few scholars have made a genuine attempt to treat the breath of Tafuri's contribution to the history and historiography of architecture except through categories laid down in the 1970s. This dissertation addresses a basic discordance in the reading of Tafuri's work that tends to set aside (in an Anglo-American setting above all) fundamental continuities in his bibliography. It argues that Tafuri's intellectual career forms a thirty-year-long investigation into the tools and tasks proper to an autonomous discipline of architectural history, suggesting that he conducted a sustained test of both emergent analytical tools and those of established historical disciplines for their applicability to the historical study of architecture. Commencing from his 'decision' to practice history instead of architecture, it seeks to contextualise Tafuri in the wider currents of post-War European intellectual history, while arguing for a consistent notion of the historian's responsibilities in architectural culture that pervades Tafuri's published work. To these ends, it considers the manner in which Tafuri evidences his readings of Freud, of post-War Marxist intellectuals in Italy and elsewhere, of Benjamin, Sartre and of philosophical strategies emerging in the 1970s and 1980s. While it does attempt the recovery of Tafuri's historical relationship with these figures, it looks to his published writing to understand how specific readings comprising an intersection of highly personal and openly contextual dimensions inform historical practice. To this end, his studies on contemporary architects and historians, as well as on historical subjects (primarily, here, Piranesi and Borromini), inform an ongoing process, it argues, of his testing of potential referents (or, equally, deployment of tested referents) as a fluid refinement of the purposes and the 'tools,' of historical practice. It advances a thesis of history's conditional autonomy: a practice distinct from architecture, but contingent upon an architectural knowledge. Tafuri, the dissertation contends, configures historical practice to maintain a position of informed antagonism, with the self-referentiality of the uses made of history by architectural theory a perpetual target, even if complex and complicated. His analysis of the tools used for securing a place in architectural

culture corresponds to a strategy of discipline without form, elaborated solely through its practice. This device, the dissertation concludes, lies at the heart of the elusiveness often encountered by Tafuri's readers.

Executive Summary

This dissertation is concerned with two interconnected strains of Manfredo Tafuri's thought. It firstly considers his theorisation of the relationship between the past and its representation as history; secondly, it offers a reading of his idea of the historian's status in architectural culture. We regard Tafuri's thinking on these issues as fluid and constantly evolving, a position reinforced by his apparent reluctance to ascribe to his historical practice (both personal and institutionalised, at Venice) a fixed disciplinary form, even though he has been read prescriptively. Each publication, we argue, contains evidence of his continuous analysis of the tools and tasks proper to the figure of the architectural historian. His book *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968) forms his most explicit early reflection upon architectural history's disciplinary form relative to its practices. We suggest that much of the complexity perceived in Tafuri's work is due to his position of leaving historiography and his disciplinary interactions open-ended. As a mode of historical practice, 'research' assumes great importance relative to publication as a practical index of his thinking on the past and its representation.

Towards these ends, we divide the document into four sections. Each considers specific examples from within his *œuvre* that allow us to understand better the implications of his claims for architectural history's conditionally-autonomous disciplinarity and its continuing consequences for architectural culture. Material for this dissertation commences from Tafuri's bibliography rather than from any of the multiple manifestations of his legacy: secondary literature, interviews with students, former colleagues or friends. This is a deliberate strategy to allow consideration of his work independent of institutional agendas in Italy or elsewhere.

The dissertation does not engage seriously with either of the monographic studies on Tafuri published in recent months: Marco Biraghi's book, *Progetto di crisi* (2005) or Rixt Hoekstra's doctoral dissertation, 'Building versus *Bildung*' (2005). Insofar as both sources, while moderately useful in their own terms, largely ignore Tafuri's writing on topics preceding the twentieth century, their capacity to address the questions that concern us here is seriously limited. Nor does the dissertation engage to any large extent with the monographic issues of *Architecture New York* (1999) and *Casabella* (1995), which tend to lay claim upon Tafuri's legacy in architectural culture rather than analyse its significance to historical practice. We also deliberately avoid testing our conclusions against the phenomenon of Tafuri's reception. This is somewhat different to that which we allude to in conclusion, and which we will pursue within a postdoctoral research agenda.

Part I, 'Architecture and History,' introduces the question of architectural history's disciplinary autonomy relative to architecture's disciplinarity. It suggests that Tafuri's biographically specific choices impact substantially upon his consideration of architectural history's disciplinarity, but that nonetheless, 'criticality' as proper to critico-historical practice operates within Tafuri's architectural practice. Chapter One questions the extent to which Tafuri's autobiographical narrative as published in *ANY* comprises a trust-worthy source, indexing Bart Verschaffel's 'Kleine theorie van het Portret' in order to consider the 'resemblance' of autobiography and legacy to the 'artefacts' of Tafuri's disciplinary life. It draws upon Luisa Passerini's oral history of Tafuri, upon the monographic issues of *ANY* and *Casabella* and upon published chronologies and bibliographies to sketch out a provisional biography pertaining to his theoretical evolution.

Chapter Two articulates the historical context for what Tafuri (and we, after him) characterise as a 'choice' for history. This concerns the university and post-war economical and political scene, but it principally pertains to the limitations of practice in institutional terms; this acquires greater significance after the publication of the *Piano Regolatore Generale di Roma* (1962). Yet in historicising Tafuri's choice for history in both contextual and biographical terms, it exposes the inability of either dimension to 'explain' his move from architectural to historical practice. We advance the idea that the persistence of 'criticality' as a value of his practice continues from his *architectural* to *historical* practices and that it is proper to history as Tafuri conceives of it as a discipline. Chapter Two concludes by returning to the difficulty of biographical representation introduced in the first chapter and in *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* (1986). This history, we suggest, exposes a strategic distance imposed by Tafuri between himself and architectural practice, wherein his absence from a contemporaneous field of architectural practice, either as actor or influence, assumes significance for his evolving concept of disciplinarity.

Part II, 'The Burdens of Memory,' undertakes an analysis of the preconditions of historical practice in the twentieth century by looking towards Tafuri's uptake of two debates: the *critica dell'ideologia* of Mario Tronti and the Italian Left of the late 1960s; and the inheritance of Freud in both popular and intellectual use, as well as in Tafuri's intimate knowledge of the analytical setting. Chapter Three introduces a necessary separation between, on one hand, Tafuri's known involvement with socialist and communist parties during the 1960s and 1970s and with student politics in the early 1960s and, on the other, his treatment of architectural theory in the same terms as political ideologies in historical practice. We can point, we demonstrate, to a body of historical research concerned with politicised architectures, from Renaissance Venice to Weimar Germany to Stalin's Five Year Plans, utopian 'projects' that give architectural expression to political ideology. Yet we find also a much broader notion of 'ideology' at a disciplinary level, wherein Tafuri equates, we argue, architectural theory with a disciplinary ideology; in adapting Tronti's *critica dell'ideologia* to a *critica dell'ideologia architettonica*, Tafuri translates the terms of political engagement into a discursive function in which architectural history plays a

major role relative to the task of ideological destabilisation. Readers will note our clear resistance to the idea that any study of this topic must pass through the filter of Tafuri's personal politics.

The fourth chapter conflates 'ideology' and 'memory' by arguing that in setting out to undermine images particular to architectural culture, memory constitutes a burden allowing for the construction of those same images. This chapter turns to (a) Tafuri's experience of Freudian psychoanalytic practice, (b) his close knowledge of Freud's writings, and (c) his awareness of a new discourse on Freud from the 1970s, all of which suggest Freud's importance among his referents. In such terms, Tafuri's approach to the practice of research versus publication, towards the status of the historical fragment (in archives and as artifacts) and the traditional function of history-writing as a mnemonic strategy each strike some chord, we propose, with the objectives and processes of Freudian psychoanalysis. At the same time, the general disciplinary objective of turning historical analysis upon architectural theory as an ideology or as an image, utopian in nature, remains intrinsic to Tafuri's highly selective application of a Freudian epistemology to the disciplinary practice of architectural history. His borrowings include the non-responsive dialogue, the fragment as disruptive device and the interminable character of analysis.

If Part I establishes the distinctions Tafuri draws between architecture and history, Part II demonstrates how the terms of those distinctions determine the imperative of historical practice. Part III, in turn, considers how these tasks and tools operate within a model of disciplinary knowledge through three case studies. In Chapter Five, we consider Tafuri's early reading of Walter Benjamin and especially his 1936 essay *Das Kunstwerk*. We propose that Tafuri adapts Benjamin's schema for degrees of engagement with the modern world after industrialisation to three models for engagement with the 'equipment' of history. These retain, we demonstrate, his operative and mimetic figures, but imply the necessity to accord greater weight to a middle figure: the undecided. Tafuri extends the chronology of Benjamin's scheme from two to six centuries, problematising disciplinary knowledge per se according to the worldview of *Das Kunstwerk*. At stake in this chapter is the relationship between the past and historical representation as a problem proper to an historical discipline and the modern discipline as a device that throws this problem always into relief.

Chapter Six positions Tafuri's historical 'project' within the broader intellectual context of Italian thought. It aligns his investigation of discipline and knowledge conditions with a contemporary, if broader, examination of thought, knowledge structures and historical evidence in Italy. Where Tafuri's reading of Carlo Ginzburg and Adriano Prosperi introduce him to the historiographical strategies of *microctoria*, from the late 1970s, his take-up of their disciplinary lessons renders his an interesting current of a discussion that would, into the 1980s, develop in part as *il pensiero debole*. His writing from the later 1970s, predicated by Tafuri's introduction (we suggest) by Franco Rella to many important protagonists of these developments constitutes an engagement with these ideas that is neither reception, in the sense that would render Tafuri a follower

of these developments, nor a deviation from his earlier thinking about discipline, knowledge, evidence and the historical image. While we acknowledge that the language of Tafuri's analysis changes as a result of these contacts, as do his field of referents, the basic positions we have outlined in this dissertation so far remain consistent.

While Part III considers Tafuri's engagement with debates on knowledge and discipline, Part IV turns specifically to the 'project' as a site of disciplinary 'indecision' proper to the historian. Chapter Seven reflects on Tafuri's positioning of Borromini and Piranesi as practicing between the utopian forms of the reinvented classical tradition (invigorated by Brunelleschi and Alberti) and a knowledge of the past that penetrates historical representation. The chapter traces Tafuri's 'relationship' with Borromini and Piranesi as evidence of his evolving thought on the broader problem of historical representation in relation to 'the project' as a fundamentally utopian construction. Their example, we suggest, parallels Tafuri's own attempts to articulate a model of historical practice that eschews historical representation while at once representing history. Just as both Borromini and Piranesi, we suggest, remain within a productive mode of architectural practice, Tafuri's model of the architectural historian is 'captured' by an unmediated knowledge of the past and the necessity to represent it in publication. These two progettisti thus encapsulate one of the primary difficulties faced by Tafuri's notion of historical practice in architectural culture.

The eighth and final chapter revisits this theoretical tension, between the past and history, research and history, writing and thought, project and production, in terms proffered by Jean-Paul Sartre's existentialist doctrine and developed, in parallel terms, by Boris Groys. It suggests a productive distinction between 'the project' as a form of utopian existence and its documentation as a mode of justifying said existence to the contemporary 'world.' This chapter positions Tafuri's 'project' as beyond our reach, suggesting how a reading of his published œuvre operates as a parallel recovery of Tafuri's individual determinism and subjectivity in relation to the broader cultural, intellectual and political phenomena in which his work is potentially situated. It argues, too, that Tafuri maintained a programmatic intellectual isolation that informs a strategy for collaborative historical 'projects' (ranging from *La città americana,* 1973, to *Francesco di Giorgio*, 1993), and that analysis of his bibliography reveals four distinct models for intellectual collaboration.

The conclusion activates Tafuri's observation that his life 'oscillated' between Venice and Rome. We consider the difference between these two cities on two levels. Rome stands at once for the artefact, historical evidence, and for Tafuri's irrecoverable 'past'; Venice is, in both degrees of analysis, the image. The final argument positions these two cities as a disciplinary dialectical exchange in which the image is constantly confronted by the fragment, the fragment undermined by the image. It suggests that Tafuri's evolving notion of disciplinarity and its different and diverse components consistently takes stock of this perennial problem, which changes constantly and which reflects directly upon his own embodiment of the 'historian' figure for whom he argues.

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to many people, whose generosity, advice and support have made this dissertation not only better informed and equipped to respond to those questions that will inevitably follow, but who have made the research and its reportage feasible when it might not otherwise have been. For brevity's sake, I cannot go too much into specifics; I am certain, furthermore, to omit some people who have been of great assistance. I trust that in both cases I will be excused in the hope that another occasion will allow me to make their contribution better known.

Many of the chapters in this dissertation have drawn benefit from being tested before audiences at conferences, seminars and in lecture series. For facilitating the presentation of my research and helping me expose it to those who have offered valuable commentary and criticism, I thank John Macarthur and Antony Moulis, Gevork Hartoonian and Douglas Lloyd Jenkins, respectively convenors of the 19th (Brisbane, 2002), 20th (Sydney, 2003) and 22nd (Napier, 2005) annual conferences of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand; Sarah Whiting and Timothy Hyde, who invited me to present work at the History and Theory Plus seminars at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design (2001); Graham McIndoe of Victoria University of Wellington (2002); Jean-Louis Genard and Hilde Heynen, who organised *Critical Tools* in the neTHCA series (2003); Scott Drake and Stephen Loo, convenors of the *Architectural Theory Review* 'Travellers' symposium, 'Reviewing Architectural Theory' (2003); Mike Smith of the Wellington Institute of Technology (2003); Kate Linzey and Julieanna Preston of Massey University (2003, 2004); David Vanderburgh, convenor of the 7th Joint Doctoral Seminar in the History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture (KUL, UGent, UCL) at the Université catholique de Louvain (2004); Jane Rendell and Jonathan Hill, convenors of *Critical Architecture* at University College London (2004); Jane Rendell, also, for inviting me to contribute a seminar to The Bartlett's PhD programme (2004); Yves Schoonjans of the Sint Lucas Hogeschool voor Wetenschap en Kunst (2004); Walter Geerts of the Academia Belgica (2004); Teresa Stoppani, convenor of the University of Greenwich's 'Open Studio' lectures (2005); and Suzanne Ewing and Mark Dorian of the University of Edinburgh (2005).

For their assistance, advice and tolerance, I thank the librarians and staff at the Wellington Institute of Technology Learning Resource Centre, particularly Interloans Librarian Craig Turney; the Central and Faculty of Architecture and Design Libraries of Victoria University of Wellington; the Architecture Library of the University of Auckland; the MacMillan Brown Library of the University of Canterbury; from a distance, the libraries of the Universities of Melbourne, New South Wales, Sydney, Queensland, the National Australian University and Monash University; the central library and departmental libraries of the Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura, the Dipartimento di progettazione dell'architettura of the Università IUAV di Venezia; the Biblioteca nazionale centrale di Roma 'Vittore Emmanuelle II'; the libraries of the

To those whom we owe the most, we cannot put enough into words. My introduction to Professor Verschaffel was fortuitous; he has become my mentor and a dear friend.

Katie and Chelsea have made sure that my life, in these years, has remained full. My wife, Ruth, has supported me in ways that she cannot know, and in many ways that she knows all too well. This document is a tribute to her patience, support and editorial prowess.

Sources and Limits

Any present attempt to consider the writing of Manfredo Tafuri, his published books, essays, scientific papers, catalogues and encyclopædia entries, or to site him within specific intellectual, political and historical contexts depends heavily upon the already substantial task of compiling his bibliography. The vast bulk of this effort is shouldered by two collaborative bibliographical projects: Bedon, Beltramini and Croset, in *Casabella*'s special issue 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' (1995); Escolano in *Arquitectura* (1994).

Neither bibliography is complete, but the challenge of starting from the very beginning would be daunting, to say the least, without them. Our own bibliography offers a very few additions and clarifications to these two sources. As there are some minor inconsistencies between their two published bibliographies, including entries brought to my attention by other researchers in this general field, or by former friends, students and colleagues of Tafuri, we here include a full, slightly revised bibliography.

If this initially appears, for those familiar with Tafuri's bibliography, to unnecessarily duplicate those existing references, we include this catalogue in order to synthesise the two principal lists and to address their gaps for those who will work on Tafuri's writing in the future. We are well aware that this revision will simply provoke those who know of other entries that we have missed to step forwards, and welcome their future contribution.

Any attempt to study Tafuri's contribution to the scholarship and teaching of architectural history will experience the frustration of limitations placed upon the access to his private archives: his library, manuscripts, correspondence and other personal papers. For the moment, these effects are unavailable for consultation; this study has not had the benefit of access to Tafuri's library, and thus to marginalia that might account for his reading of certain passages in works cited herein. We thus stress the provisionality of the following arguments. Evidence is vital to research of this nature; when the time comes to revisit this text with better primary sources at our disposal, we anticipate amending many of our thoughts conveyed here.

In the meantime, we must start somewhere, and attending to the body of Tafuri's published works, including the published version of the oral history conducted in 1992 by Luisa Passerini on behalf of the Getty Institute, remains a challenging study with its own complexities. We have not engaged with the archival project in the *Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura* at the *Università IUAV di Venezia*, remaining faithful to the study's initial limits and acknowledging that this archive must be balanced (in time) with the greater bulk of Tafuri's private records. Sustained consideration of the *IUAV* holdings would substantially inform any study considering the relationship between Tafuri's scholarship and his teaching and institutional life. It will doubtless form a book or dissertation in its own right.

Our English spelling consistently follows British rather than American convention. The spelling of any quotations from publications that follow American English are changed to their English equivalents. To the best of our knowledge, this does not alter the meaning of any quotation in any way.

Come si getta pane a una città affamata,
così a Roma bisogna gettare libri di storia.

As one throws bread on a starving city,
one must throw history books on Rome.

Lauro de Bosis, *Storia della mia morte*, 1931

Part One
Architecture and History

CHAPTER I
PORTRAITS IN HISTORY

The contribution of Manfredo Tafuri (Rome 1935-Venice 1994) to the intellectualisation of architecture and its history remains some of the most innovative, intriguing and controversial thinking of the late twentieth century. His emergence during the widespread social and academic unrest of the mid to late 1960s as a thinker of note, saw him simultaneously renowned and distrusted as scholar and critic, both responses enduring until the end of his lifetime and beyond, through into his post-mortem critical fortunes. Tafuri dramatically rethought the historical and theoretical bases upon which we traditionally understand and question architectural works, the processes of their production, and the theoretical borders determining both architectural and critico-historical practices writ large. His analytical strategies were radical in the setting of post-War architectural historiography; he dismissed a plethora of writers and referents whose work up until the 1960s, had informed architectural practice and history, systematically testing a vast number of 'new' figures as to their validity to architectural culture.

Tafuri's most decisive and consequential assertions pertained to the disciplinary debates on architecture, architectural history, and architectural theory, three terms even now contentious. He made an unambiguous, yet complex, defence of the autonomy of architectural history as a critical element within a broader architectural culture wherein the disciplinary and professional manifestations of architectural thinking and practice reside. With this claim, and in contrast to Siegfried Giedion and Rudolf Wittkower (those other giants of post-War historiography), he 'liberated' history and historical practice from its responsibility for maintaining a canon.[1] Instead, he provoked architectural historians to challenge the ideological bases of architectural theory and to rethink architectural theory *as* an ideological system. Therein, he argued, lay an important key to the very identity of the architect as an artistic figure 'emancipated' in the fifteenth century.

His subtle shifts between a particularly competent grasp of the rapidly shifting currents of contemporary and historical thought and an expert elucidation of historical artefacts, render his own work difficult to characterise as either purely philosophical or historiographical. Nonetheless, his articulation of the place of historical knowledge in architectural culture is fundamental to our present conceptualisation of architecture, its theory and practice, and of critico-historical practice and disciplinarity. In wider terms, his thinking on the status of things past within an artistic culture concerned essentially with the 'not yet' offers a provocative point of reference for the more abstract issue of the historian's relationship with the future. In this sense, Tafuri's contribution to the recent history of ideas invites some elaboration and analysis though a systematic

---

[1]   The canonical books to which we refer are Siegfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941); Rudolf Wittkower, *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism* (London: The Warburg Institute, 1949). We would be more accurate in characterizing his encounter with these two books as a sustained conflict.

investigation of his *œuvre*, a daunting undertaking to which we here make a modest, and rather incomplete, contribution.

Of the nearly two dozen books authored, co-authored, edited or co-edited by Tafuri, his 1973 tract *Progetto e utopia* received, by far, the most widespread attention within and beyond architectural culture.[2] Therein, Tafuri offers an indictment of contemporary architectural theory as the barren endpoint of a five-hundred-year-long trajectory extending from Architecture's artistic 'liberation,' its evolution from complete integration in a wide range of institutions—individual, social, religious, economic and political—to its modern status as an isolated practice insulated by self-referential theoretical limits. It was his most widely translated work; editions quickly appeared in English, French, Dutch, German and Spanish.[3] The readers of *Progetto e utopia* in its original setting and in its variously translated forms, and especially in North America and Great Britain, saw its importance in demonstrating the capacity for a Marxist analysis of architectural culture.[4] This book of Tafuri's, above all others, made a contribution to the wider development of Marxist thought after the Second World War; it effectively introduced the capacity and limitations of a Marxist critique of architecture, and thus of architecture as a system subject to economic and social theories in a Marxist tradition.[5]

He initially published the essay in *Contropiano*, a journal since renowned (alongside *Quaderni rossi*) as a late-1960s clearing house for new thinking from the Italian Left, its authors including Massimo Cacciari, Francesco Dal Co, Alberto Asor Rosa and Antonio

---

2   Tafuri, *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973). The booklet first appeared in 1969 as an essay entitled 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79.

3   The book was translated in its entirety into English [*Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigi la Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976)], German [*Kapitalismus und Architektur: Von Corbusier's 'Utopia' zur Trabantenstadt*, trans. Thomas Bandholtz, Nikolaus Kuhnert and Juan Rodriguez-Lores (Hamburg and West Berlin: VSA, 1977)], Dutch [*Ontwerp en utopie: Architektuur en Ontwikkeling van het Kapitalisme*, trans. Umberto S Barbieri, Cees Boekraad, et al. (Nijmegen: Socialistiese Uitgeverij, 1978] and French [*Projet et utopie. De l'avant-garde à la métropole*, trans. Ligia Ravé-Emy (Paris: Dunod, 1979)]. It was included as an essay ('Para una crítica de la ideología arquitectónica,' pp. 13-78) in the tripartite Spanish-language collection by Tafuri, Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co, *De la vanguardia a la metropolis. Crítica radical a la arquitectura* (Barcelona: Gili, 1972). *De la vanguardia a la metropolis* was published in conjunction with the 1972 'Seminar on Urbanism II' at ETS de Arquitectura, Barcelona.

4   The most important manifestation of attention paid to Tafuri's writing in the United States is the book *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984). While this volume included an essay of Tafuri's ('USSR-Berlin, 1922: From Populism to "Constructivist International"'), it also sketched out a 'reading programme' for a community in New York concerned with the Marxist critique of architecture, loosely attached to Peter Eisenman's Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in Manhattan. However, we should not equate the *Architecture Criticism Ideology* group with Eisenman's IAUS; they demonstrate many of the same generational differences as distinguish *Oppositions* (published 1973-1980) from *Assemblage* (1986-2000). It is important to note Fredric Jameson's early claim on Tafuri for the development North American Marxist discourse ('Architecture and the Critique of Ideology,' pp. 51-87), revisited (though in much different terms) much later in his essay 'From Metaphor to Allegory,' *Anything*, ed. Cynthia Davidson (New York: Anyone Corporation; Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2001), pp. 24-36.

5   This line is upheld most fervently by K. Michael Hays, who, although not he does not treat it at length in his own writing, we nonetheless confidently hold responsible for the precise set of politico-theoretical coordinates in A. Krista Sykes, 'The Vicissitudes of Realism: Realism in Architecture in the 1970s,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2004. I refer particularly to her third chapter, 'The Contradictory Realism of Manfredo Tafuri,' pp. 157-246.

Negri.[6] In terms extending well beyond architectural discourse, Tafuri therein restated a broad reassessment of the nature of power, institutions and class structure during Italy's 'long 1968.'[7] The reappearance of 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' as *Progetto e utopia* thus logically marked Tafuri's seminal polemical foray into intellectual and cultural realms outside of architecture (setting aside, for the moment, his closer, though tried, relationship with art historiography, and his public, if youthful, presence in the Roman planning debates of the late 1950s and early 1960s). Yet despite its importance as a contribution to Marxist thought (if largely misunderstood by his architectural public), and more specifically to the Marxist critique of architecture, in its widespread appeal to Tafuri's audiences, the dominance of *Progetto e utopia* in Tafuri's reception in Italy and elsewhere, constrains how we might now understand his relevance to contemporary theoretical debate on architecture.[8] Furthermore, it restricts the available terms with which we can address intellectual relationships Tafuri maintained with his contemporaries, both within architectural culture and without. We can measure this against two manifestations of his 'legacy' in Italian and Anglo-American settings.

❧

The commemorative 'Tafuri' issues of *Casabella* ('Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri,' or 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' 1995) and *Architecture New York* ('Being Manfredo Tafuri,' edited by Ignasi de Solà Morales in 2000) evoke rather different images of our subject.[9] In *Casabella*, editor Vittorio Gregotti reconstructs Tafuri as a polymath; one who comes to approximate his own 'legacy,' this in turn confronting, in death even more than in life, Italian architectural culture: no mean feat. The issue articulates clearly Gregotti's assessment of Tafuri's importance, framing multivalent claims on his critical

5

6   *Contropiano* was published between 1968-1972 under the joint editorship of Alberto Asor Rosa, Massimo Cacciari and Antonio Negri (who left the 'project' after the first issue, but who nonetheless contributed to its editorial direction). Tafuri's four *Contropiano* essays are 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica'; 'Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico,' 1970, no. 2: 241-281; 'Social-democrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar,' 1971, no. 1: 207-223; and 'Austro-Marxismo e città. "Das Rote Wien",' 1971, no. 2: 257-311, later enlarged as the introduction to *Vienna rossa. La politica residenziale nella Vienna socialista* (Milan: Electa, 1980). Tafuri was not alone in using *Contropiano* to open up a Left-wing debate on architecture. Francesco Dal Co, would later co-authored *Architettura contemporanea* with Tafuri (Milan: Electa, 1976), preceded Tafuri as an architectural writer in this setting.—Dal Co, 'Note per la critica dell'architettura moderna. Da Weimar a Dessau,' *Contropiano* 1968, no. 1: 153-171; 'Riscoperta del marxismo e problematica di classe nel movimento studentesco europeo. Rudi Dutschke,' 1968, no. 2: 423-443.

7   We use the term 'long 1968' in agreement with Luisa Passerini, who notes that the phenomenon of student and worker protests, combined with the height of strength experienced by political parties of the *centro-sinistra*, occurred over a much longer timeframe in Italy than in France or the United States.—Passerini, *Autoritratto di gruppo* (Florence: Giunti-Astrea, 1988). Cf. Giuseppe Carlo Marino, *Biografia del Sessantotto. Utopie, conquisti, sbandamenti* (Milan: Bompiani, 2004).

8   Compare, for instance, David Cunningham, 'Architecture as Critical Knowledge,' paper presented to 'Critical Architecture,' The Bartlett and the Architectural Humanities Research Association, London, November 2004.

9   Vittorio Gregotti, ed., 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995); Ignasi de Solà-Morales, ed., 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000).

inheritance. However, compared to the American valuation of Tafuri's life on architectural discourse (embodied in *ANY*), the reflections of *Casabella*'s writers constitute a balanced and thoughtful analysis of his contribution to architectural debate.[10] Giorgio Ciucci, for instance, warns against the selective appropriation of Tafuri's bibliography, pointing towards the predominantly Anglophone tendency to ignore publication sequences in favour of translation sequences, equating the confusing chronology of Tafuri's appearance in English with his own critical intentions.[11] Alberto Asor Rosa explains the central importance to Tafuri of his experiences among the *milieu* of *Contropiano*, both in its own terms and as a precedent to his philological, less obviously politically engaged writing that followed. He thus endorses the exhausted formula of 'two Tafuris': an oft-repeated trajectory of a political Tafuri becoming, in time, a philological Tafuri, with a decisive 'break' occurring in the years around 1980.[12] Francesco Paolo Fiore, in contrast, argues for the unbroken continuity of Tafuri's research (from the early 1960s until the end of his life) into the Venetian, Florentine and Roman Renaissance.[13] Howard Burns echoes these sentiments, stating Tafuri's importance as a scholar of the Renaissance and his invention of a new type of history, aiming to demonstrate, rather than explain, the interconnectedness of architecture with political or social life.[14] Rafael Moneo, too, celebrates above all Tafuri's engagement with the 'Venetian' 'Renaissance,' suggesting that this drew him away from the immediacy of contemporary architecture, comprising a filter through which he could observe "with melancholy" the present, "from afar."[15] In

[10] While the synopses that follow make reference to a number of the essays contained in this special issue of *Casabella*, this is not a summary of the entire issue. Several articles appeared in print already before Tafuri's death, and thus make no claim to 'reflect' on his legacy.—Hélène Lipstadt and Harvey Mendelsohn, 'Tafuri e Le Corbusier' / 'Tafuri and Le Corbusier,' Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 86-93; reduced from their earlier essay 'Philosophy, History, and Autobiography: Manfredo Tafuri and the "Unsurpassed" Lesson of Le Corbusier,' *Assemblage*, no. 22 (1993): 58-103; Joseph Connors, 'Cultura del fittizio' / 'The Culture of the Fictitious,' review of Tafuri's *Ricerca del rinascimento*, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 160-163; reprinted from the review which appeared in *L'indice dei libri del mese*, no. 8 (September 1992): 37-38; English vers., http://www.columbia.edu/~jc65/reviews/tafuri.rev.htm (accessed July 29, 2004); Yves Alain Bois, 'Tafuri nel labirinto' / 'Tafuri in the Labyrinth,' trans. French-Ital. Bruno Pedretti, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 154-159; French essay originally published in *Macula*, nos. 3-4 (1978): 202-206; English essay originally published in *Oppositions*, no. 11 (Winter 1977). Cacciari's 'Quid Tum' is a poignant exception, his funeral oration for the service at Tolentini.—'Quid Tum,' *Domus*, no. 762 (1994): 35-38.

[11] Giorgio Ciucci, 'Gli anni della formazione' / 'The Formative Years,' Engl. trans. Steve Piccolo, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 12-25.

[12] Alberto Asor Rosa, 'Critica dell'ideologia ed esercizio storico' / 'Critique of Ideology and Critical Practice,' Engl. trans. Sebastiano Brandolini, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 28-33.

[13] Francesco Paolo Fiore, 'Autonomia della storia' / 'The Autonomy of History,' Engl. trans. Steve Piccolo, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 102-111.

[14] Howard Burns, 'Tafuri e il Rinascimento' / 'Tafuri and the Renaissance,' Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 114-121. On this point, we agree with Burns; we thus find it odd to discover that the title of the forthcoming English edition of *Ricerca del rinascimento: Principi, città, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1992) is *Interpreting the Renaissance: Princes, Cities, Achitecture*, trans. Daniel Sherer (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, forthcoming 2006).

[15] José Rafael Moneo, 'La Ricerca come lascito' / 'The "Ricerca" as Legacy,' trans. Span.-Ital. Savino D'Amico, Ital.-Engl. Steve Piccolo, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 132-141, quotation from p. 141. In this essay, Moneo emphasises his perception of Tafuri's legacy conveyed also in the 'terza lezione annuale Manfredo Tafuri' (Venice, February 23, 1997), entitled 'Critica e architettura' and recorded as 'Architettura, critica, storia' / 'Architecture, Critics, History,' *Casabella*, no. 653 (1998): 42-51. On Moneo's thinking on the disciplinary nature of architectural criticism, history and theory, informed to a large extent by Tafuri, compare his contribution to the introductory debate in K. Michael Hays and Carol Burns, eds.,

the classroom, argue Andrea Guerra and Cristiano Tessari, Tafuri urged students towards "constant commitment—both scientific and pedagogical, but also civic," forming the basis of a personal rigour he sought to inject even into the most youthful among them to inform their architectural or historical practice.[16] In a 'letter from America,' Joan Ockman secures Tafuri for the East Coast academe, aptly describing the context into which his work was received and assimilated into an Italophilia by eager American audiences, led by Eisenman, Diana Agrest and others, and played out in the pages of *Oppositions*.[17] Ockman projectively argues Tafuri's reciprocated preoccupation with New York, the subject of several of his essays, calling simultaneously for the translation of his writing on the Renaissance to be recognised as a vehicle for reconsidering his image as a politicised theoretician.[18] Ockman demonstrates the distance between Tafuri's view of his work and that maintained by his American readership, appending a letter in which Tafuri admits to finding his 'image' in her book project *Architecture Criticism Ideology* completely alien to his self-perception.[19]

He would likely have found cause to reiterate this admonition in respect to the monographic 'Tafuri' issue of *Architecture New York*, one of the journal's last. De Solà-Morales's number of this infamously self-referential review exposes the distance between Tafuri's 'intentions' and his reception by the North American theory community. There is a gulf that separates a translated edition of an oral history recorded by Luisa Passerini in 1992, running along the top half of each page, from the series of essays below, which assess, again, Tafuri's 'legacy.'[20] While the contributions to *Casabella* in 1995 make a

---

Thinking the Present: Recent American Architecture (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1990).

16 Andrea Guerra and Cristiano Tessari, 'L'insegnamento' / 'The Teaching,' Engl. trans. Steve Piccolo, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 124-129, quotation from p. 129.

17 Joan Ockman, 'Venezia e New York' / 'Venice and New York,' Ital. trans. Cioni Carpi, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 56-71. For a more sustained analysis of Tafuri's reception in the United States from the 1970s, see Diane Y. Ghirardo, 'Manfredo Tafuri and Architectural Theory in the U. S., 1970-2000,' eds. Michael Osman, Adam Ruedig, Matthew Seidel and Lisa Tilney, 'Mining Autonomy,' special issue, *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal*, no. 33 (2002): 38-47.

18 Tafuri's writing on New York includes 'La montagna disincantata. Il grattacielo e la City,' *La città Americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal*, eds. Tafuri, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia (Bari: Laterza, 1973), pp. 415-455; '*L'architecture dans le Boudoir*: The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language,' trans. Victor Caliandro, *Oppositions*, no. 3 (1974): 37-67; 'La dialectique de l'absurde. Europe-USA. Les avitars de l'idéologie du gratte-ciel (1918-1974),' *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 178 (March-April 1975): 1-16. '"European Graffitti": Five x Five = Twenty-five,' *Oppositions*, no. 5 (1975): 35-74; '"Neu-Babylon". Das New York der Zwanzigerjahre und die Suche nach dem Amerikanismus,' *Archithese*, no. 20 (1976): 12-24.

19 Ockman, ibid., pp. 46-47. Readers may note an unintentional echo of this paragraph from Anthony Vidler's summary of the same issue in his doctoral study 'Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism, 1930-1975,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Technische Universiteit Delft, 2005, http://www.library.tudelft.nl/delftdiss/pdf/2005/arc_vidler-20051024.pdf (accessed November 15, 2005), p. 163.

20 Tafuri, 'History as Project: An Interview with Manfredo Tafuri,' by Luisa Passerini, Rome, February-March 1992, trans. Denise L. Bratton, de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 10-70. While Tafuri gave a number of interviews from the 1970s onwards, the oral history recorded by Passerini constitutes a rather different kind of reflection, deliberately framed as an unmediated meditation not, through reasons of format, length, etc., matched by shorter interviews. It was undertaken for the Getty series *Interviews with Art Historians, 1991-2002*, the interview tapes and transcripts of the Italian text are held at the Getty Research Library in Los Angeles. Other art historians whose records are kept under the same programme are James S. Ackerman, Giulio Carlo Argan, Paola Barocchi, Michael Baxandall, John Boardman, Jean

self-conscious acknowledgement of their specific debt to Tafuri's research and teaching, the preponderance of Tafuri's 'children' (a characterisation necessarily wrought with text-book implications) in *ANY 25-26* comprises a claim on his inheritance with different consequences. Several writers play out a kind of disciplinary excision, such as Eisenman and Tafuri's former student and colleague Georges Teyssot, both famous victims of Tafuri's pointed and permanent abandonment.[21] These writers 'explain' Tafuri from the position of privileged insight, but paint, as Teyssot admits, mere portraits. However, these portraits, in their political simplicity and in the ease of their 'answers,' reveal less the artifice of their respective encounters (which must, after all, have been profound) than their present-day agendas. Pierluigi Nicolin's essay on Tafuri's relationship with Aldo Rossi reinforces the anglophone historiography of 1960s Italian architectural theory, particularly as played in relation to the IAUS publishing programme.[22] Elevina Calvi asks 'oublier Tafuri?' but her reply, as well as that of de Solà-Morales, lies in the default characterisation of Tafuri's critical programme as inextricable from the political

Brown, Hugo Buchthal, John Coolidge, Jerome M. Edelstein, Nancy Englander, S. Lane Faison, Oleg Grabar, George Heard Hamilton, Evelyn B. Harrison, Francis Haskell, Roxanne Heckscher and William S. Heckscher, Julius Held, Wolfgang Herrmann, Nikolaus Himmelmann, Herbert Hoffmann, Ernst Kitzinger, Elizabeth Kubler and George Kubler, Sherman E. Lee, Phyllis Williams Lehman, Samella S. Lewis, Agnes Mongan, Linda Nochlin, Griselda Pollock, Beatrice Gilman Proske, Colin Renfrew, Brunilde Ridgway, Eduard F. Sekler, Otto Georg von Simson, Craig Hugh Smyth, Leo Steinberg, Homer A. Thompson, Cornelius Clarkson Vermeule, Dietrich Von Bothmer, Kurt Weitzman, Harold Marvin Williams, Margot Wittkower and Otto Wittmann. Most of these histories were conducted by Richard Cándida Smith and Claire Lyons. Other insightful interviews with Tafuri include those held by Françoise Very in *AMC: Architecture mouvement continuité*, no. 39 (June 1976): 64-68; Fulvio Irace in *Domus*, no. 653 (September 1984: 26-28; Richard Ingersoll in *Design Book Review*, no. 9 (Spring 1986): 8-11; and Giacinto Di Petrantionio in *Flash Art*, no. 145 (March-April 1989): 67-71.

21 Peter Eisenman, 'The Wicked Critic,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 66-70; Georges Teyssot and Paul Henneger [interview], 'One Portrait of Tafuri,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 10-16. Teyssot, notably, made an important contribution to the 'Venice School' by facilitating the introduction of Foucault and institutional critique (though we should note that Tafuri was evidently reading Foucault's work from the 1960s).—Teyssot, 'Emil Kaufmann and the Architecture of Reason: Klassizismus and "Revolutionary Architecture",' trans. Christian Hubert, *Oppositions*, no. 13 (Summer 1978): 46-74; 'Eterotopie e storia degli spazi,' *Il dispositivo Foucault*, ed. Franco Rella (Venice: CLUVA, 1977), pp. 23-36. Teyssot, too, introduced as a sustained theme of 'Venetian' attention the French Enlightenment. In this respect, cf. Tafuri, 'Simbolo e ideologia nell'architettura dell'Illuminismo,' *Comunità. Gionale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 124-125 (November-December 1964): 68-80. Eisenman for some time enjoyed Tafuri's critical attention, even if Tafuri could not be accused of endorsing Eisenman's work or that of the so-called 'New York Five.'—Tafuri, *Five Architects NY* (Rome: Officina, 1977). Eisenman's most explicit claim on Tafuri involves his republication of an essay that originally appeared in *Oppositions* in 1977, intended as a critical contribution to Eisenman's book on Giuseppe Terragni, but published independently. Eisenman published the book in 2003 with Tafuri's original essay complete, framing it as a contemporary critical contribution rather than as an historical document from twenty-five years earlier.—Tafuri, 'Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and Mask,' *Guseppe Terragni: Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques*, by Peter Eisenman (New York: Monacelli, 2003), pp. 273-293.

22 Pierluigi Nicolin, 'Tafuri and the Analogous City,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 16-20. The American reception of Tafuri and Rossi occurred as closely connected parallel phenomena, partly due to the close proximity of Rossi's *L'architettura della città* (Padua: Marsilio, 1966) and Tafuri's *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968). In the reception of their English translations, and despite the striking dissonances distinguishing the two books, they were perceived as evidence of an Italian phenomenon self-consciously framing architecture and history in disciplinary terms, implicating the adept handling of theoretical referents largely unfamiliar to an American audience.—Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City*, trans. Diane Ghirardo and Joan Ockman (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1982); Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture,* trans. Giorgio Verrecchia from the 4th (1976) Italian edition (London: Granada, 1980).

objectives of *Contropiano*.[23] Anthony Vidler's is couched in a vocabulary of crisis and disenchantment; Kurt Foster follows a path less followed, but returns to a well-beaten track in dividing Tafuri into early and late periods.[24] Other arguments are equally rhetorical. K. Michael Hays predictably triangulates Tafuri's 'position' according to those of Georg Simmel, Georg (György) Lukács and Fredric Jameson.[25] Mark Wigley less obviously exorcises the Italophilia that inflected his own university years at Auckland, and makes one of the most poignant observations of the issue: "His threat lives on in writing that he no doubt would have hated."[26]

We should acknowledge that our comments portray too abstractly (and, in turn, with too much ease) the difference between a generation capable of claiming first degree knowledge of Tafuri's 'project' and another mediated by mechanisms of reception. Nonetheless, both *Casabella* and *ANY* approximate the 'production' of his intellectual life in its first and second iterations. Both publications belie editorial attempts to thematise Tafuri's consequences for a primary and secondary critical audience, proposing consequences and righting 'wrongs.' Regarded one by one, they offer helpful supplementary material and contextual information that can aid the contemporary reading of Tafuri's published writing. As collections, though, they demonstrate the prevalence of broad 'truths' that, in the last decade and more, have constituted the generally acceptable apparatus for explaining the organisation of Tafuri's *œuvre* and the complexities that become manifest both *within* its recent reception and in studies *concerning* its reception. These include such repetitive, formulaic devices as Tafuri's divisibility into 'early' and 'late' periods, the difficulty of translating his work from Italian being responsible for his poor accessibility elsewhere, the absolute dominance of political factors in his critical

23 Ignasi de Solà-Morales, 'Beyond the Radical Critique: Manfredo Tafuri and Contemporary Architecture,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 56-60; Evelina Calvi, 'Oulblier Tafuri?' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 21-28.

24 Anthony Vidler, 'Disenchanted Histories: The Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 29-36; Kurt Forster, 'No Escape from History, No Reprieve from Utopia, No Nothing: An Addio to the Anxious Historian Manfredo Tafuri,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 61-65. Vidler's essay goes another round as one of three sections of a chapter treating Tafuri's historiography in his doctoral dissertation.—Vidler, 'Historians of the Immediate Present,' pp. 171-177.

25 K. Michael Hays, 'Tafuri's Ghost,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 36-42.

26 Mark Wigley, 'Post-Operative History,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 47-53, quotation from p. 53. This comment belies the importance of Tafuri in the setting of the University of Auckland, where Wigley studied for his PhD in the 1980s. In addition to Wigley's attention to new translations and to Tafuri's contributions to *Oppositions*, fellow PhD student Paul Walker maintained a vivid and explicit interest in his writings, distilled through his own research into an analysis of linguistic discourse on architecture (which took cues, in part, from Tafuri's essay '*L'architecture dans le boudoir*'). In addition, Ross Jenner, who even now lectures at the school, developed a strong interest in the work of Tafuri, his contemporaries and his compatriots. Although committing practically nothing of his thinking on Tafuri to print, Jenner paid close critical attention to his work as it appeared both in English and in Italian. Such phenomena of small groups avidly reading Tafuri's books (and not always, as here, in equal terms) is hardly rare from the mid 1970s through to the late 1980s (as in Delft, for instance, with Umberto Barbieri), yet it adds context to Wigley's recollection in his obituary for *Archis*, of awaiting 'Tafuri's' arrival from over the water.—Wigley, 'Manfredo Tafuri (1935-1994),' *Archis* no. 4 (April 1994): 6-7. Cf. Paul Walker, 'Semiotics and the Discourse of Architecture,' unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Auckland, 1986. Also, Ross Jenner, review of Tafuri's *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Guards and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Barbara Luigi La Penta, *Fabrications: Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, nos. 2-3 (1991): 73-79; 'Tafuri, Manfredo,' *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Italian Culture*, ed. Gino Moliterno (London and New York: Routledge, 2000).

thinking, the interchangeability of the thinking of the key theoreticians of the so-called 'Venice School' (Tafuri, Cacciari, Dal Co), and so on.[27] These constructions have not appeared in a vacuum, we need hardly admit; subscribers to these axioms have already undertaken the onerous task of presenting the evidence that sustains them. Yet tested against Tafuri's *œuvre* itself, they become rapidly apparent as rhetorical positions, easily undermined by the most obvious evidence.[28]

We ought not to suggest that the best course is a ready dismissal of these 'truths' out of hand. The last decade has born witness to a steady and informed set of articles and essays on Tafuri that, while reinforcing basic demarcations like Tafuri the perpetually political or early versus late Tafuri, use such critical devices to offer increasingly nuanced readings that have helped transform the field of Tafuri scholarship from mere hagiography into an increasingly complex disciplinary discourse. Internationally (and outside of Italy), a newer cohort of writers have published well-argued insights into the disciplinary, contextual and interpretative settings available to Tafuri's work; they include Esra Akcan, Gevork Hartoonian, Hilde Heynen, Carla Keyvanian, Daniel Sherer, Panayotis Tournikiotis and Ken Tadashi Oshima.[29] However (and despite their varied origins), commencing (excepting Heynen and Tournikiotis) from the internal debates of the anglophone architectural academe (principally MIT and Columbia University), they fall short of pushing beyond the fundamental limitations sketched out by Tafuri's own generation and by his 'children.'[30] Rather, they describe a general confusion experienced

27   The term 'Venice School' entered popular usage in the 1980s, following an issue of *Architectural Design* of this title. While the issue surveyed the entire range of departments of the *Istituto universitario di architettura di Venezia* (now, the *Università Iuav di Venezia*), the epithet came to quickly stand for the 'school' of critical history in architecture. While not at all the first instance of using 'Venice School' in this manner, Hilde Heynen's usage is a typical characterisation.— Hilde Heynen, 'The Venice School, or the Diagnosis of Negative Thought,' *Design Book Review*, nos. 41-42 (Winter-Spring 2000): 22-39; this essay is an extract from *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999). Cf. Luciano Semerani, ed., 'The Venice School,' special issue, *Architectural Design*, no. 59 (1985).

28   Although he complains (quite rightly, in this case) about the quality of translations, Vidler makes this same point.—Vidler, ibid., pp. 164-165.

29   Esra Akcan, 'Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde,' *Journal of Architecture* 7, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 135-170; Gevork Hartoonian, 'Beyond Historicism: Manfredo Tafuri's Flight,' *Art Criticism* 17, no. 2 (2002): 28-40; Hartoonian, 'Reading Manfredo Tafuri Today' (p. 15) and 'The Project of Modernity: Can Architecture Make It?' (pp. 44-56), *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the University of Sydney Faculty of Architecture* 8, no. 2 (June 2003); Hilde Heynen, *Architecture and Modernity*; Carla Keyvanian, 'Manfredo Tafuri: From the Critique of History to Microhistories,' *Design Issues* 16, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 3-15 (summarising the thesis of her Master's dissertation 'Manfredo Tafuri's Notion of History and Its Methodological Sources: From Walter Benjamin to Roland Barthes,' unpublished MSc thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992); Ken Tadashi Oshima, 'Manfredo Tafuri and Japan: An Incomplete Project,' *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no. 2 (June 2003): 16-29; Daniel Sherer, 'Tafuri's Renaissance: Architecture, Representation, Transgression,' *Assemblage*, no. 28 (1995): 34-45; '*Progetto* e *Ricerca*: Manfredo Tafuri come storico e come critico' / '*Progetto* and *Ricerca*: Manfredo Tafuri as Critic and Historian,' *Zodiac*, no. 15 (March-August 1996): 32-51; 'Un colloquio "inquietante". Manfredo Tafuri e la critica operativa, 1968-1980,' *La critica operativa e l'architettura*, ed. Luca Monica (Milan: Edizioni Unicopli, 2002), pp. 108-120; Panayotis Tournikiotis, *Historiography of Modern Architecture* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999).

30   This is not to say that they are limited to reading Tafuri in English; far from it. However, this few authors alone can be traced directly back to either Columbia University or MIT. There is evidence of attention paid to Tafuri's analysis in the PhD programme at Harvard's Graduate School of Design, but results of this work are very rarely published in explicit terms. One exception is Sykes's PhD and her

by a generation of scholars primarily concerned with one of other of his *œuvres* up to the end of the 1970s. As a whole, recent scholarship has tended to meet, but to probe no further, the apparent incongruity of a research programme announcing its intention to problematise the present by means of the past. This work fails, by and large, to consider as sufficiently theoretical Tafuri's 'later' programme of seeking out complexities proper to the present moment by playing them against the vicissitudes of contemporary knowledge, or his activation of historical fragments found in archives *solely* in their own terms, apparently devoid of an explicit theoretical agenda, Marxist or otherwise.

Marco Biraghi's book *Progetto di crisi* (2005) is the first single-author monograph to take Tafuri as subject; it likewise reinforces many basic critical assumptions about his biography, bibliography and historical practice, elaborating these at length.[31] Biraghi's analysis contradicts the maxim that the poor English translations of Tafuri's work are at the heart of substandard or off-base analyses. His subject is Tafuri's engagement with contemporary architecture, but he attempts little more than a synthesis of Tafuri's writing on those *architetti contemporanei* singled out by Tafuri over the course of many years, in the process enforcing limits upon Tafuri's interaction with the 'present.' He argues for Tafuri's enduring 'contemporaneity' for architecture and architectural theory, a claim implicating both the thesis of *Progetto e utopia* and his treatment of 'contemporaries' as historical subjects. Considering Tafuri as a critic and theoretician of the present, he restricts his own understanding of the thesis of *Progetto e utopia* to the critique of architectural theory relative to socio-political forces. Likewise, his analyses of Tafuri's writing on Louis Kahn (a lengthy reflection, and the first to return to this specific and interesting relationship), Robert Venturi, the New York Five, James Stirling, Aldo Rossi and others consider the validity of Tafuri's argument to specific examples.[32] Read in the most cynical terms, Biraghi's book comprises a lengthy prelude to the final chapter ('Giochi, scherzo e balli') and the Epilogue, wherein he positions Rem Koolhaas's critiques of the city and of architectural form (and architectural theory) as an inheritance, even if problematic, of Tafuri's late 1960s position. He does not acknowledge Tafuri's disciplinarity 'outside' architecture, nor the more personal dimensions of his relationships with contemporary Italian architects, nor the status of his pre-*novecento* historical subjects relative to his own position in architectural culture of the present. Nor, most importantly, does he advance any clear theory of Tafuri's contemporaneity as an historian, a subject we will ourselves address in the following chapter. Insofar as these remain intrinsic, we argue, to his theorisation of the historian's 'place' in architectural culture, *Progetto di crisi* offers little to our present discussion.

---

paper 'Portrait of the Scholar as a Truffle Dog: A Re-evaluation of Vincent Scully,' *Additions to Architectural History: Proceeding of the XIXth Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, eds. John Macarthur and Antony Moulis (Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2002) [cd-rom].

31   Marco Biraghi, *Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Christian Marinotti, 2005).

32   Biraghi may be the *first* to return, but so does Vidler in 'Histories of the Immediate Present.' Sykes (2004) makes some moves in this direction, but through the specific theoretical lens of 'realism,' and as such does not purport to advance an historiographical reading of these relationships.

The only author who writes in both the *Casabella* and *ANY* monographs is Jean-Louis Cohen, who elsewhere calls Tafuri his "master and friend."[33] Cohen distinguishes himself from both companies by seeing Tafuri's contribution to both historical and architectural practice limited neither by discipline nor political motivations.[34] He observes:

> Questioning the reassuring postulates accumulated since the twenties… Tafuri constructed a new ethics of research. Faced with the documentary autarchy of many earlier histories, he imposed a long, regenerative return to the archives; faced with the autistic reiteration of heroic clichés, he innovated in terms of both discourse and project, and practiced an authentic 'deconstruction' (in the Freudian sense) before the term was adopted and defused by the architectural profession.[35]

When Cohen claims Tafuri's work as 'milestones' that will "remain landmarks in the intellectual landscape of the century," he underscores the necessity to divorce his legacy from its entrenchment solely in architectural culture, whereby Tafuri lends his face to such maxims as 'death of architecture' and the 'Marxist critique of architecture' in an unrigorous, ungenerous and ultimately ill-informed reflex.[36] In this dissertation, we thus respond to Cohen's invitation to consider Tafuri's role in the grander sphere of post-1968 intellectual culture and to learn from him something of the practice of architectural history as it informs and learns from debates on knowledge, its ethics relative to 'action,' its relationship to memory and its conditional stability.

❧

It is certainly one thing to argue for Tafuri's place among a canon of post-War European intellectuals, but we must take greater note of his relationship to the broader context of the recent history of ideas. At the serious risk of rehearsing a now well-aired document, it is useful for us to return to the autobiographical account contained in Luisa Passerini's oral historical interview with Tafuri, conducted in Rome during the months of February and March of 1992.[37] In this document, which we shall consider in more abstract

---

33   Jean Louis Cohen, 'The Modern Movement and Urban History,' *The Modern City Facing the Future: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Docomomo Conference, Brasília, Brazil, September 19-22, 2000*, eds., Anna Beatriz Galvão, Alejandra H Muñoz, et al. (Brasília: Universidade Federal da Bahia and Universidade de Brasília, 2004), p. 25.

34   Jean-Louis Cohen, 'Ceci n'est pas une histiore,' French-Ital. trans. Bruno Pedretti; French-Engl. Kenneth Hylton, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 48-53; '"Experimental" Architecture and Radical History,' de Sola Morales, ed., ibid.: 42-47. Compare Cohen's very early assessment of the importance of Tafuri to French architectural culture, in 'The Italophiles at Work,' trans. Brian Holmes [from 'Les italophiles au travail. La coupure entre architectes et intellectuels, ou les enseignements de l'italianophylie,' *In extenso* (1984)], *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), pp. 506-521.

35   Cohen, 'Ceci n'est pas une histiore,' p. 49.

36   Ibid., p. 53.

37   We use the phrase 'well-rehearsed' because the biographical markers of Paserini's history have since appeared, to a greater or lesser degree, in Sykes's, Vidler's (although much less so than the other examples here) and Hoekstra's doctoral dissertations as well as Biraghi's *Progetto di crisi* as providing insightful

terms after treating (and expanding, in part) its content, we observe Tafuri laying out the conditions of his intellectual biography, drawing clear lines connecting himself and the protagonists and currents of a number of important cultural and intellectual developments. Further, he charts out a body of significant thinkers either known to him personally or who were important at a remove to the formation of his ideas and to his intellectual growth. With reference to the easy reception of Passerini's history, we use the word 'rehearsing' for two reasons. Firstly, we can observe that this document has fast become a litmus test to which more recent analyses of Tafuri's work can hold their theories as against a purported 'truth' that necessarily, it seems, is perceived to underpin such a record. Secondly, in using this long interview, commentaries tend not to acknowledge its status as a completely subjective record of Tafuri's 'life' in history. Historiographically, we argue in contrast, it forms an extension to his explicitly methodological writings, in which he argues the 'reasons for history,' as he understood them, autobiographically. In this sense, it is a document bearing different burdens than a regular interview, such as we would otherwise find in architectural and cultural journals.

The oral history is clearly set up with no in-built 'right of response,' given that in 1992 Tafuri already appeared to understand his life expectancy to be short and that he was interviewed under a long-term research project to collect the oral histories of significant art historians for the Getty Institute. In contrast, his earlier (and shorter) interviews appear less to provide 'answers'; intended for immediate consumption (and open to discursive 'negotiation'), they self-consciously account for their rather different role as supplementary to published works, as explanations or 'entrances.' The Passerini history, though, takes Tafuri's own life as subject, also providing openings into his biography, but in the almost certain knowledge that these will be broached after his death. With these caveats, it is possible to reiterate the details of Tafuri's life directly from this record, as he himself understood them to be important to his intellectual development. For the reason that this interview is effectively bound by the limits of Tafuri's *œuvre*, we ask

---

background information. In Hoekstra's case, the dissertation comprises a sustained elaboration of the oral history with very few deviations. We, too, have been guilty of uncritically plundering this source in three essays, though we have substantially revised our reading in this dissertation.—Cf. Leach, 'Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions: Manfredo Tafuri and *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*,' Macarthur and Moulis, eds., ibid.; 'Death in Venice: Tafuri's Life in the Project,' *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no. 1 (2003): 30-43; and 'Making Progress: Tafuri, History and the Psychoanalysis of Society,' *Progress: Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, eds. Maryam Gusheh and Naomi Stead (Sydney: SAHANZ, 2003), pp. 178-182; presented in revised form as 'The Historical Process: Tafuri, Freud and the Methodology of Architectural History,' 7th Joint Doctoral Seminar in Architectural History and Theory, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-neuve, November 2004. In Italy, Passerini has pioneered an innovative (if controversial) approach to oral historiography, concerned as she is with the extra and auto-construction of subjectivities. Her contextual-autobiographical study *Autoritratto di gruppo* is exemplary of this methodology. We note also her important histories of Italy's Fascist era, including *Mussolini immaginario. Storia di una biofgrafia* (Bari: Laterza, 1991). On the issue of subjectivity in oral historiography, see her paper, published online, 'Becoming a Subject in the Time of the Death of the Subject,' presented to 'Body, Gender, Subjectivity: Crossing Borders of Disciplines and Institutions,' Fourth European Feminist Research Conference, Bologna, 2000, http://www.women.it/4thfemconf/lunapark/passerini.htm (accessed September 23, 2004). On this issue, her bibliography, published on the same site, is informative: http://www.women.it/quarta/plenary/CVpasserini.htm (accessed September 23, 2004).

of it the same questions as we pose to Tafuri's other reflections on history, even if its structures are ultimately indebted to Passerini's historiographical practice rather than that of Tafuri's. For the same reason, the paragraphs that follow, insofar as they effectively repeat (and occasionally supplement) his autobiographical reflections, largely set aside critiques of that same account for reasons that we will address in later chapters.

❧

Manfredo Tafuri was born in Rome on November 4, 1935, to Elena Trevi and Simmaco Tafuri.[38] Secular and lower middle-class, Elena Trevi came from a Jewish family, her husband from a Roman Catholic.[39] Both of Tafuri's parents were middle-aged when he was born: his mother over forty, his father, an engineer in the *Ministero dei lavori pubblici*, aged fifty-six or fifty-seven.[40] While Tafuri was not an only child, his two brothers died young, and his mother miscarried a potential third.[41] Barely four years old when Italy entered the Second World War, Tafuri's childhood was overshadowed by the family's efforts to hide his maternal grandmother from the German occupying forces. Sought out by the Germans, she was the one member of Tafuri's family who attempted to connect him to Jewish culture, to teach him Hebrew, for instance. His time spent in hiding, he claimed, undermined his long-term health, contributing to illness later in life, and likely (he implies, and we project) to his somewhat premature death by heart attack at 58 years of age.[42] Despite these negative recollections and consequences of Rome's occupation, he admired the way his father flaunted German authority by surreptitiously sneaking back to their home and listening to radio reports by Fiorello La Guardia. This admiration, though, was tempered by childhood memories of his father dismissing his 'simple' curiosity: "Every time I asked my father if Mussolini was good or bad, a child's question, he laughed but did not answer."[43] Also: "I asked him who he supported on the question of republic versus monarchy, but he wouldn't tell me."[44] The proximity of

---

38 'Manfredo Tafuri,' *Dictionary of Art Historians*, http://www.lib.duke.edu/lilly/artlibry/dah/tafurim.htm (accessed April 14, 2005).

39 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 10, 14

40 Ibid., p. 14.

41 Ibid., p. 15.

42 Ibid., pp. 10, 18. Tafuri too was in hiding: "Whenever there was danger we were hidden behind a fake wall or in a secret wine cellar. I remember it being very humid, and the damage to my lungs has been more apparent in these last few years."—Ibid., p. 18. Bernard Huet noted the cause of Tafuri's death in 'Manfredo Tafuri. Il avait désenchanté le mouvement moderne,' *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 292 (April 1994): 20. Hoekstra offers a touching account of the response, in Venice, to Tafuri's death.—Ibid. p. 8.

43 Tafuri, ibid., p. 19.

44 Ibid., p. 20. Tafuri's relationship is somewhat characteristic of this period and of Tafuri's generation, observes Passerini elsewhere. The following comments, while pertinent, are also symptomatic of a broader cultural issue: "My father did not talk very much, said almost nothing. I silently reproached him later in my life, because if he was listening to Radio London he should have told me. My mother, who was Jewish, was even tempted to become a nun. I had very serious issues with my family, starting in my last years of high school and continuing through university. I silently accused my mother of agnosticism, asserting that the world was sick, and that she only thought about making money and living well. I had the idea that one needed to experience pain, since it is also a part of life. Sometimes I even

Tafuri's home, on the via Giovanni Battista de Rossi, and the Gestapo Headquarters in Villa Massimo (now the Deutsche Akademie Rom) on an adjacent street, made this area in Rome's north-east a key target for allied bombing.[45] Tafuri recalls occasions when Allies severely bombarded the area between his home, the Villa Massimo and the nearby Piazza Bologna, once leaving Tafuri's house standing alone.[46]

Tafuri frames his intellectual education as largely self-motivated. As a teenager, he followed the cultural programme of Radio Italia and bought newly translated books by such writers as Sartre, Camus and Heidegger, as well as those of Italian philosopher Enzo Paci, whom he had heard speak in public and on the radio. The summer of 1952, spent at Forte dei marmi on Italy's northern west coast, may not have been typical for Tafuri, but it describes the kind of *milieu* in which he would immerse himself from them on: the futurist painter Carlo Carrà (whom he 'pestered'), and a small group of likewise teenaged intellectuals, future economist Paolo Leon and Paolo Ceccarelli, who would become dean of the architecture faculties at Venice and Ferrara.[47] Ceccarelli introduced Tafuri to Bruno Zevi's new book *Storia dell'architettura moderna*, which Tafuri flags as his first encounter with architecture: "The book turned out to be fundamental, since I consider this moment to have been very important for my intellectual development."[48] Even as a younger boy, aged twelve or thirteen, Tafuri copied paintings from the Vatican collection and spent time with Leonardo Leoncillo, a sculptor whose studio was in Villa Massimo.[49] In 1953, he graduated early from the Liceo Tasso, despite the lingering anti-Semitism that had made it more difficult for him to start school as a five-year-old (though he did, a year earlier than normal).[50] The intervening years do not rate mention in Passerini's interview; we might project upon Tafuri the typical conditions of post-War life in Rome under Allied occupation, well described elsewhere.[51]

<center>❧</center>

Of Tafuri's education, we encounter three themes in his reflections: his choice to study architecture and his experience of doing so; his philosophical training; and his growing political consciousness and activities. Tafuri may have 'first' become aware of architecture

---

expressed these thoughts to her. In the end, my education was neither Catholic nor Jewish. I had to get all of my religious education on my own. Looking back, I think this was a positive thing."—Ibid., p. 19.

45   Ibid., p. 12.

46   Ibid.

47   Ibid., p. 11.

48   Ibid. He refers to Bruno Zevi, *Storia dell'architettura moderna* (Turin: Einaudi, 1950).

49   Tafuri, ibid., p. 12. Tafuri goes on to describe his disappointment with Leoncillo's participation in Mario Ridolfi's neorealist condominiums: "He did some extravagant Majolica work for the atrium of the buildings, the balconies, and the planters, which are still there. This expressionist production was shocking to me, because I felt very isolated, alienated."—Ibid., p. 13.

50   Ibid. He does not suggest, and we do not ask, how anti-Semitism would have borne directly upon this matter.

51   Paul Ginsborg offers an insightful account of the socio-economic conditions shaping post-War Italian life in *A History of Contemporary Italy: Society and Politics, 1943-1980* (London: Penguin, 1990).

in 1952, through Zevi's *Storia dell'architettura moderna* (though this is a troubling biographical characterisation), but he was exposed early to the kinds of problems that would plague Rome's suburbs for decades hence, partly as a result of post-War reconstruction and partly as a consequence of uncontrolled development from the late 1940s onwards.[52] Intriguingly, he locates his decision to study towards the professional architecture diploma with a choice between philosophy, art and psychoanalysis, among which architecture forms not a middle ground (though this is debatable, of course), but rather a 'fourth way.'[53] Able to read a painting like Picasso's 'Guernica,' Tafuri says that he was drawn in by the idea that one might 'understand' buildings. He added the books of Giulio Carlo Argan to his historical arsenal; Argan, like Zevi, considered buildings in their historical contexts. "I had begun," he said, "to understand that it was possible to read architecture as a human fact, or as a history of human labour and subjective religiosity."[54] He presents his choice to study architecture as one anticipating that some knowledge of history would prove helpful:

> My transition to the study of architecture was more or less conditioned by the thought that, even if I only knew how to draw figures, if I couldn't draw buildings, even so, if history were part of the curriculum, I would be able to understand more by studying history. But instead I suffered a violent shock.[55]

Tafuri began at the architecture faculty in Rome's Valle Giulia in October 1953, immediately facing the reality that the University remained stocked with fascist professors who he would eventually come to oppose. These included Enrico Del Debbio, Ballio Morpurgo and Vincenzo Fasolo.[56] He complained of their lack of interest in teaching, their distance from the classroom, and their reliance on assistants to deliver the curriculum. He also begrudged their prejudice against modern architecture: "The operative principal was that contemporary architecture must not enter the curriculum. It was considered a heresy."[57] The lack of structured debate on contemporary architecture reverberated in the design studios, where the historical study of architecture was superseded by a fixed definition of the architect as an architectonic compositor: "From now on," he quotes Carlo Domenico Rossi, "you must abandon your books. Take your pencil as your only instrument."[58] Responding to this setting, Tafuri joined with a band of students and young graduates, the *Associazione Studenti e Architetti* (*ASEA*), a group

---

52 Although Tafuri made several interventions on this problem in Rome in the late 1950s and early 1960s, he later took this development as an historical subject in his contribution to Federico Zeri, ed., 'Il novecento,' part 2, no. 3, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, vol. VII (Turin: Einaudi, 1982), pp. 425-450, extended and republished as *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* (Turin: Einaudi, 1986).

53 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 15. We will return to his interest in psychoanalysis in Chapter 4.

54 Ibid., p. 16.

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid., p. 17.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

whose activities we will return to in the following chapter.[59] For now, suffice it to say that Tafuri's approach to the conflict between the education he sought and the training he received at Rome in the mid to late 1950s tended away from passive resistance and towards direct action. They first educated themselves outside of the curriculum, turning to Ernesto Nathan Rogers's journal *Casabella-continuità* and to the books of Argan and Zevi.[60] They met each day for discussions at the *birreria Albrecht* ("and since we didn't have any money, we ordered beer, chips and mustard"). Through the historical example of Weimar Germany, elucidated in Argan's *Walter Gropius e la Bauhaus*, they came to understand that "organised groups could contravene the rampant professionalism and the bad habits of builders."[61] They also went on summer road-trips, visiting polemically 'important' sites around Europe.[62]

Returning to the beginning of Tafuri's university studies, he recalls that he was already reading difficult philosophical texts, and among those thinkers to whom he was exposed, socialist philosopher Bruno Widmar was crucial to his education. In particular, Widmar aided Tafuri to make a transition from the relative conservatism he brought with him from a middle-class upbringing, exorcised to an extent through an interest in such popular existentialist writers as Sartre, Heidegger, Husserl and Paci, to the kind of intellectual Marxism that framed a great deal of his thinking and writing in future years.[63] The political and philosophical referents for *ASEA*, and later for Tafuri's atelier collaborations in '*lo studio' Architetti e Urbanisti Associati di Roma* (*AUA*), included Mario Pannunzio's weekly journal *Il mondo*, Salvatore Rebecchini's *L'espresso* and the pragmatism of Antonio Cederna, who campaigned for the proliferation of public parks and a renewed awareness of Italian architectural and environmental heritage, and who convened, for many years, the Roman section of *Italia nostra*.[64] Tafuri's education thus engenders a form of intellectual continuity from philosophy to politics to urban planning that,

---

59   For a brief introduction to the activities of *ASEA* and Tafuri's atelier *Architetti e Urbanisti Associati di Roma*, cf. 'Attività politica e critica degli architetti romani,' *Superfici* 2, no. 5 (April 1962), pp. 42-47.

60   Ernesto Nathan Rogers role as a leading intellectual of his generation is not widely recognised beyond Italy. His thinking on architectural issues at this time is extremely influential, but for now must be represented by reference to his *Editoriali di architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1966).

61   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 20-21; Giulio Carlo Argan, *Walter Gropius e la Bauhaus* (Turin: Einaudi, 1951).

62   Ibid., p. 21. Tafuri notes, for instance, visiting Le Corbusier's newly completed Chappelle Notre Dame Du Haut at Ronchamp (inaugurated 1955).

63   "He conducted his classes in the garden. He taught us Kant to American pragmatism as if it were a single trajectory, in a way that no one with any sense would ever forget. Widmar's Marx was not a revolutionary in the strict sense. He was the Marx you find in the Hegelianism that runs from Kant to the French Revolution."—Ibid., p. 14. Widmar founded the journal *Il protagora* in 1959, writing in the first issue (and perhaps, thus setting the tone for Tafuri's lessons): "La filosofia è essenzialmente filosofia civile, ovvero tensione della ragione a concretamente realizzare nel tempo la sua opera. Non la ragione, quindi, che si compiace del proprio pensiero e del suo divenire, cioè non la ragione autosufficiente che ignora il corso delle cose umane, ma una ragione che si è servita e si serve delle braccia per attuare il suo pensiero e per considerarlo solo in relazione alle opere."—Cited by Fabio Minazzi, 'Le raggioni di *Il protagora*,' *Il protagora. Rivista di filosofia e cultura (fondata nel 1959 da Bruno Widmar)*, 2005, http://www. attitudestudio.jigsnet.com (accessed November 9, 2005).

64   Tafuri, ibid., pp. 17, 22. Mario Pannunzio edited 'Il Mondo' between 1949-1966; his own legacy is institutionalised in the Piedmontese 'Centro "Pannunzio".'—Cf. http://www.regione.piemonte.it/cultura/ istituti/pannunz.htm (accessed November 9, 2005).

while dramatically revisited and reconfigured over time, demonstrates his capacity to intellectualise practical issues and to understand the tangible and temporal consequences of philosophical abstractions. The most serious example of this kind of intellectual problematisation is at the heart of the following chapter, which considers the way that Tafuri and his associates engaged in debate on the construction sector in Rome and on the implementation of *piani regolatori* (regulatory plans), while the University turned away to focus on such traditional, and isolating, artistic preoccupations as drawing and architectonic design. Whatever criticisms Tafuri would later level at Argan and, more particularly, at Zevi, the writing of these two figures proved vital to Tafuri's ability to see, at once, the work of architecture *and* that which lay 'beyond' the architectural work. In a construction culture aptly represented, suggests Tafuri, in the film *Le mani sulla città*,[65] the elaboration of such themes as *existenzminimum* and *dasein* from Weimar Germany, as well as the capacity to bring architectural histories to bear upon such broad historical judgements as the demise of European reason, and the dawn of the 'American way of life,' each suggested a form of architectural knowledge reaching beyond the specific economic, technical and ideological conditions of architectural practice as it was then known.[66]

<div align="center">❧</div>

Tafuri's association of political questions with specific institutional structures is manifest in his role in the first faculty occupation at Valle Giulia in 1958, which took issue with the introduction of a state examination for architects. This was not itself the target, he admits: "We were a bit cynical, and we thought we needed to come up with arguments that would stir our ignorant colleagues to action, to stage something that would violently shake up the entire department."[67] They held the university responsible for setting aside its function as a public conscience and as a site of free speech and open debate in the aftermath of Fascism. In effect, the groups to which Tafuri belonged initiated their critique from the specific examples of poor architectural practice and education available to them in Rome at that time, extending it to a general political insight. This, he suggests, was the model of Cederna: "[The] whole world was conceived … as a protest against corrupt building practices from which emerged a political comprehension of the situation."[68] The search, for Tafuri and his colleagues, was for 'weak links,' and in this pursuit they attacked the teaching of Saverio Muratori, whose senior composition classes formed the backbone of the curriculum at Rome, and whose suspicion of anything modern fuelled their critique. "This is the point. He thought that true modernity meant that everything

---

65 Francesco Rosi, dir., *Le mani sulla città* (Warner, 1963).

66 Tafuri, ibid., p. 21. He would later pick these themes up in more explicit terms in his essays 'Social-democrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar' (in *Contropiano*); 'La montagna disincantata. Il grattacielo e la City,' *La città americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal*, by Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia and Tafuri (Bari: Laterza, 1973).

67 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 22.

68 Ibid.

should start all over again."[69] Against such a didactic figure, they extended the notion of *libertà d'insegnamento* to one of *libertà d'apprendimento*. On this basis, the *ASEA* group took part in the 1963 occupation of the *Facoltà*.[70]

Many of Tafuri's generation regarded the University as the last unchallenged stronghold of fascist intellectualism and teaching. Their 1963 sit-in resulted directly in three new faculty appointments: Zevi and Luigi Piccinato from the left-wing faculty at Venice and Ludovico Quaroni from Florence.[71] Yet the group was unsatisfied even with this outcome: "We rejected the idea of recruiting professors who had been important twenty years earlier."[72] Nonetheless, it was under Quaroni that many of the protagonists of *ASEA* and the *AUA*, heavily involved in the action, entered into the university as assistants, among them Tafuri, Sergio Bracco, Giorgio Piccinato and Vieri Quilici.[73] The core members of the three principal groups to which Tafuri belonged in the years spanning his later student years and his early professional life—*ASEA*, *AUA* and the *Gruppo assistenza matricole* (which also included Peppe Castelnuovo, who does not appear to be connected to the other groups)—assumed the stance that architecture occupied a continuum commencing with building or construction, continuing through to the suburb, city and 'territory.'[74] They understood as necessary the politicisation of the city and 'territory,' but assumed always an architectural perspective, either identifying direct solutions or the specific political conditions that would preface solutions. In this sense, they were distinct from many other student and young professional organisations of the early

69 Ibid. Muratori formed a ripe target for Tafuri his colleagues. They mounted (March 21-26, 1960) an exhibition at the Faculty of 'scandalous' projects from his architectonic composition course. With reference to Tafuri's years as a student and in architectural practice (from which we drew this insight), the best synthesis of the literature and context is Federico Rosa, 'Progetto e critica dell'urbanistica moderna. I primi anni di attivita di Manfredo Tafuri, 1959-1968,' unpublished *tesi di laurea*, Università IUAV di Venezia, 2003.—Cf. ibid., p. 101. On Muratori, see Giancarlo Catilda, ed., *Saverio Muratori, architetto (1910-1973). Il pensiero e l'opere* (Florence: Alinea, 1984); Giorgio Piggafetta, *Saverio Muratori. Teorie e progetti* (Venice: Marsilio, 1990).

70 Again, we will consider these events at greater length in the next chapter, but it is important to demonstrate, following Rosa, a small but important discrepancy between Tafuri's recollections to Passerini and the contemporary press. Tafuri, for instance, cites the student action as 60 days in length, whereas the trajectory of press coverage spans 43 days. Within this timeframe, Rosa notes: "La participazione di Tafuri a tale occupazione, per lo meno nelle sue fasi iniziali, è da mettere in dubbio … pioché è accertata la sua presenza tra il 20 marzo e il 3 aprile a *Corso sperimentale di urbanistica* di Arezzo … si produsse una dichiarazione collettiva di solidarietà, agli studenti, datata 21 marzo 1963."—Rosa, ibid., pp. 113-114; Tafuri, ibid., p. 21.

71 Ibid., p. 23.

72 Ibid.

73 The cohort of Quaroni's assistants engaged at an advanced level with contemporary urban issues is described in the seminar and book *La città territorio. Un esperimento didattico sul centro direzione di Centocelle in Roma*, ed. Saul Greco (Bari: Leonardo da Vinci, 1964). While working under Quaroni's direction at the University, Tafuri taught a contemporary architecture course under the title 'La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali'; he would later give a course under the same title at the Universita di Palermo during his tenure there as a professor (1966-1967).—Tafuri, 'La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali,' Corso di composizione architettonica BII, Università degli studi di Roma, 1964-1965.

74 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 24. *La città territorio* encapsulates this view, but another article published in *Casabella-continuità* does so more explicitly.—Piccinato, Quilici and Tafuri ('per lo studio AUA di Roma'), 'La città territorio. Verso una nuova dimensione,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 270 (December 1962), pp. 16-25.

1960s Left, whose ambitions were broader, either implicating global concerns or abstract notions of 'the worker' and the Third World. This basic difference, he said, distinguished the efforts of *ASEA* and *AUA* from (those whom he terms) the 'Catholic communists': Piero Melograni, Michele Valori, Leonardo Benevolo, Arnaldo Bruschi, Mario Maniera-Elia.[75] The *AUA* was primarily concerned with the institutional composition of urban planning debates; they claimed seats at a number of important tables over the course of the early 1960s: in the university, in the committees of the *Istituto nazionale di urbanistica* (*INU*) and *Italia nostra*, and in a number of high profile competitions for *piani regolatori* and organisational plans for historical and new urban centres.[76] They sought to deflect attention away from such high-profile architectural works as the Rome Hilton, drawing discussion towards problems experienced on the city's outskirts: "in the suburbs of Rome, which I visited regularly, rats attacked children, there was pain, misery."[77] Naturally, *AUA* and *ASEA* were not the only groups taking part in these debates; the Roman architectural scene at this moment was awash with polemic, yet it proved ineffective as an instrument of change.[78] "In the end we renounced Rome, in a certain sense, because we believed at that time that it was impossible to change anything."[79]

In 1960, for instance, the year in which Tafuri became *dottore in architettura* with a thesis on the architectural history of Swabian Sicily,[80] the *INU* held a congress to debate the public ownership of undeveloped land. A conflict between Fiorentino Sullo (*DC Ministero dei lavori pubblici*, supported by the *Partito Socialista Italiano, PSI*) and his own Party exposed broader conflicts in the *centro-sinistra*, resulting in Sullo's political isolation. The premises of this conflict deeply informed the debate into which Tafuri and his colleagues entered from that moment onwards: the overriding strength of capitalist mechanisms, the weakness of ideology. The nature of their interventions in this polemic ranged from an engagement in architectural *argomenti* through to protests on the street.

> For us, architecture was such a relative fact that when they alerted us that Raimondo D'Inzeo—known as the colonel with his cavalry—was coming, we took to our scooters. I remember sitting on the back because I have never been able to drive a scooter. We rushed to San Paolo to throw stones at the mounted police. For us it was the same as studying Le Corbusier or Gropius. The same evening we

---

75   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 24. That Tafuri draws this distinction does not mean that these individuals did not interact. The contrary is true: Tafuri and Benevolo had a great deal to do with each other, as Hoekstra explains (ibid., pp. 76-78, 83-93); Mario Maniera-Elia eventually joined Tafuri in Venice as a professor, working together on *La città americana*.

76   Tafuri, for instance, sat on the Roman committees of both *Italia nostra* and the *INU*. The following chapter enumerates the competition activity in which Tafuri was involved with his *AUA* collaborators.

77   Tafuri, ibid., p. 23.

78   Ibid., p. 25.

79   Ibid., p. 23.

80   Guerra and Tessari, ibid., p. 125.

would go to every newspaper and express our outrage, and they would report on our activities with interest.[81]

After the 1962 publication of the *Piano Regolatore Generale di Roma* (*PRG*), the *AUA* perceived the necessity for political party affiliation. They had seen how a lack of Party support undermined Sullo's position, and how a downturn in interest from the Centre and far-Left in solving pragmatic problems of land ownership and development resulted in the abandonment of a socially responsible solution. The group thus joined the *PSI*.[82] They did not seek, at that time, membership of the *Partito Comunista Italiano* (*PCI*) because of its tendency towards abstract *lotte*, but within the *PSI*, Tafuri and his friends found the ideological space wherein to tread the path laid down by the journal *Quaderni rossi*. First published in 1960, within its pages Tafuri would find ready the discourse (to which he would return in Venice) of Mario Tronti.[83] Tafuri regarded this shift in their efforts as a return to his "origins and to the philosophical teachings of Bruno Widmar—a non-Marxist doctrine."[84] They took as a motto that a contemporary Marxist critique involves setting aside even Marx himself, "to do what he has done, that is, to start all over again."[85] Appling this maxim to the criticism of architecture and cities rather than their production, as Muratori had done, Tafuri's target from a very early moment was the relationship between debate and action.[86] Following a militant intellectualism, they claimed to reject all Marxist works published in those years: "We decried them as 'scholastic,' even the most intelligent."[87] Lukács, too, offered Tafuri a model for re-reading the writers who had exerted some form of influence upon his formation up to that date. He experienced *Die Zerstorung der Vernunft* as a call, politically and critically speaking, to return to the *tabula rasa*.[88]

The degree to which Tafuri applied this principle to other spheres of his life, professional as well as personal, remains an open subject. Rhetorically, 'rejection' and 'doubt' pervade his autobiographical account as modes of reaching decisions in a 'crisis' setting. We do not want to force that claim prematurely; for now, we simply note that

---

81   Tafuri, ibid., p. 26.

82   Ibid., pp. 26-27.

83   We make passing reference, here, to the ongoing journal *Lotta comunista*, first published in December 1965. On the subject of coincidences between intellectual Marxism and the 'lotte operaiste' in Italy, we refer to Gail Day's considered essay 'Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism,' *Radical Philosophy*, no. 133 (September-October 2005): 26-38. *Quaderni rossi* was published 1960-1966. Mario Tronti's writing, which comprised for many an intellectual entrance into the *operaista autonomia* debate, is encapsulated in the essays *Operai e capitale* (Turin: Einaudi, 1966).

84   Tafuri, ibid., p. 27.

85   Ibid.

86   We note, of course, the repetition here of Muratori's formula, but we draw an important distinction between architectural and critical production—to which we will return—that makes this repetition sustainable when applied to critical acts.

87   Ibid.

88   Ibid., p. 28. Georg Lukács, *Die Zerstorung der Vernunft: Der Weg des Irrationalismus von Schelling zu Hitler* (Berlin: Aufbau Verlag, 1954); Ital. Ed. *La distruzione della ragione*, trans. Eraldo Arnaud (Turin: Einaudi, 1959).

Tafuri himself characterises the large changes within his life as sudden and acute. Within those examples that he cites, his disciplinary 'rejection' of architecture itself remains the most important for us. Those young architects with whom Tafuri had collaborated until the mid-1960s looked forward to a professional life, many becoming professors in time: "All things considered, they wanted to become architects in order to change the world honestly."[89] Tafuri's attachment to 'architecture' as a professional practice was, it seems, more ambivalent. His early polemical life predicates the idea that any changes to the world would come through political and economic intervention rather than by the kind of actions to which architects had become restricted.

> As the *Comitato dei tecnici socialisti*, we had conducted an autonomous struggle against the botched results of the regulatory plan, in parallel to the campaign of the *AUA*. When the first *centro-sinistra* government revealed itself to be a failure, I had a crisis and didn't feel that I could go on. I remained in the *Partito socialista*, but I couldn't support their position with respect to the regulatory plan for Rome.[90]

The relationship between architectural and political criticism was fundamental at this point, but became quickly entrenched in the model of politicised practice with which he and his writing would be identified for years to come.

<div align="center">⚜</div>

From the end of the 1950s, Tafuri steadily built up a repertoire of essays and scientific papers on architects, buildings and projects spanning from the late middle-ages to the twentieth century. His written work up to the middle 1960s falls into a number of distinct categories. He made several contributions to three encyclopædic projects from this time, for instance: the third revisions to the *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti* in which he wrote entries on several contemporary architects; the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, to which he contributed profiles on architects practicing in Italy in the period since the *Risorgimento*; and later to the *Dizionario enciclopedico di architettura e urbanistica*.[91] These

---

89 Tafuri, ibid.

90 Ibid., p. 29.

91 Tafuri's contribution to these collections are as follows. In the third edition of *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, app. 3 (1949-1960), 2 vols. (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961): 'Architettura,' vol. I, pp. 122-125; 'Gardella, Ignazio,' ibid., p. 699; 'Johnson, Philip,' ibid., p. 890; 'Le Corbusier,' ibid., p. 973; 'Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig,' vol. II, p. 110; 'Ridolfi, Mario,' ibid., p. 610; 'Rietveld, Gerrit Thomas,' ibid., pp. 612-613; 'Saarinen, Eero,' ibid., p. 643; 'Zevi, Bruno,' ibid., p. 1146. In the *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana): 'Aschieri, Pietro,' vol. IV (1962), pp. 375-377; 'Autore, Camillo,' ibid., pp. 608-609; 'Azzurri, Francesco,' ibid., pp. 782-784; 'Banfi, Gian Luigi,' vol. V (1963), pp. 754-755; 'Basile, Ernesto,' vol. VII (1965), pp. 73-74; 'Basile, Giovanni,' ibid., pp. 81-82; 'Berlam, Arduino,' vol. IX (1967), pp. 110-111; 'Berlam, Giovanni,' ibid., p. 111; 'Berlam, Ruggero,' ibid., pp. 111-112; 'Bianchi, Salvatore,' vol. X (1968), pp. 174-175. Cf. also 'Bizzacheri (Bizzacari, Bizzocheri, Bizacarri), Carlo Francesco,' ibid., pp. 737-738; 'Breccioli (Famiglia),' vol. XIV (1972), pp. 93-94; 'Buratti, Carlo,' vol. XV (1972), pp. 389-391; 'Capriani, Francesco, detto Francesco da Volterra,' vol. XIX (1976), pp. 189-195; 'Antonio Del Grande,' vol. XXXVI (1988), pp. 617-623. In the *Dizionario enciclopedico di architettura e urbanistica*, ed. Paolo

constitute, bibliographically, Tafuri's participation in a broader reassessment of Italian culture in the post-fascist era, as well as an attempt—whether strategic or not—to build up a body of scientific writing, based on archival research, literary surveys and analytical syntheses of familiar *œuvres*. They present a substantially less engaged (positivist, even) body of works than Tafuri's contemporaneous written participation in contemporary cultural debates, best represented by his writing, or co-authorship, of articles in *Casabella-continuità*,[92] *Comunità*,[93] *Urbanistica* (journal of the *INU*),[94] *Italia nostra* (journal of *Italia nostra*),[95] in the more modest reviews *Superfici* and *Argomenti di architettura*, in Zevi's *Architettura. Cronache e storia*[96] and in a range of newspapers and journals, most regularly in *Paese sera*.[97] In such settings, he writes: on Rome's via Nazionale as the city's first 'modern' street; on the historical bases for *Italia nostra*'s efforts to resist certain measures in the *PRG*; on examples of good urbanism (or warning of bad) offered by such cities as Tokyo, Helsinki, Tel Aviv and New York; on the emergence of an 'industrial landscape'; and on the so-called 'Roman School' of his own moment. He also keeps a close eye on new architecture books, diligently recording his observations and criticisms in the popular press.[98] His contribution to the 'corso parallelo' at Valle Giulia in 1962 resulted

---

Portoghesi vol. III (Rome: Istituto Editoriale Romano, 1969): 'Rinascimento,' pp. 173-232; 'Manierismo,' p. 474.

[92] Tafuri, 'Studi e ipotesi di lavoro per il sistema direzionale di Roma,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 264 (June 1962): 27-63; 'Razionalismo, critico e nuovo utopismo,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 293 (November 1964): 20-42. Tafuri, Giorgio Piccinato and Vieri Quilici, 'La città territorio. Verso una nuova dimensione,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 270 (December 1962): 16-25; Tafuri and Enrico Fattinnanzi, 'Un'ipotesi per la città-territorio di Roma. Strutture produttive e direzionali nel comprensorio pontino,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 274 (April 1963): 26-37.

[93] Tafuri, 'Problemi d'urbanistica. Le origine dell'urbanistica moderna,' *Comunità. Gionale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 112 (August-September 1963): 46-53.

[94] Tafuri, 'La prima strada di Roma moderna: Via Nazionale,' *Urbanistica*, no. 27 (1959): 95-109; 'Il problema dei parchi pubblici in Roma e l'azione di "Italia nostra",' *Urbanistica*, no. 34 (1961): 105-112; Tafuri and Piccinato, 'Helsinki,' *Urbanistica*, no. 33 (1961): 88-104.

[95] Tafuri, 'I lavori di attuazione del P. R. di Roma,' *Italia nostra. Bollettino dell'Associazione nazionale 'Italia nostra' per la tutta del patrimonio o artistico e naturale*, no. 18 (1960): 6-11; 'Il codice dell'urbanistica ed i piani risanamento conservation,' *Italia nostra*, no. 21 (1961): 13-17; 'Il paesaggio industriale,' *Italia nostra*, no. 27 (1962): 1-5.

[96] Tafuri, 'La vicenda architettonica romana, 1945-1961,' *Superfici* 2, no. 5 (April 1962): 20-41; 'Un piano per Tokyo e le nuove problematiche dell'urbanistica contemporanea,' *Argomenti di architettura*, no. 4 (December 1961): 70-77; 'Recente attività dello studio romano "Architetti e Ingegneri",' *L'architettura, cronache e soria*, no. 93 (July 1963): 150-169.

[97] See, for instance, Tafuri, 'Intervista sul piano regolare di Roma,' *Casabella continuità*, no. 279 (September 1963): 45, republished from *Paese sera*, May 5-6, 1962. Also, 'Attualità del Palladio,' review of *Palladio*, by P. Rane, *Paese sera*, June 5-6, 1962; 'L'avventura del Barocco a Roma,' review of *Roma barocca. Storia di una civiltà architettonica*, by Paolo Portoghesi, *Paese sera*, January 20, 1967, libri, iii; 'Bernini e il barocco,' review of *Bernini*, by H. Hibbard and *Una introduzione al gran teatro del Barocco*, by M. Fagiolo dell'Arco, *Paese sera*, June 2, 1967, libri, ii; 'Il barocco in Boemia,' review of *K. I. Dietzenhifer e il Barocco boemo*, by Christian Norburg-Shulz, *Paese sera*, June 22, 1968, libri, iv; 'È il momento del barocco,' review of *Le metamorfosi del barocco*, by A. Grisleri, *Paese sera*, July 22, 1968, libri, iii; 'Michelangelo e il suo tempo,' review of *L'architettura di Michelangelo*, by James S. Ackerman, *Paese sera*, December 22, 1968, libri, ii.

[98] Besides the examples from *Paese sera* noted above, cf. Tafuri, 'Architettura e socialismo nel pensiero di William Morris,' review of *Architettura e socialismo*, ed. Mario Manieri-Elia, *Casabella-continuità*, no. 280 (October 1963): 35-39.

in the forum 'La città territorio,' published under the same title in 1964.[99] A third body of writing expresses his interest in the critical potential of a philological historiography, present in his *tesi di laurea* but elaborated in scientific articles in the *Quaderni* of the Roman *Istituto di storia dell'architettura*. Therein, he documented studies on the Baroque commune of San Gregorio da Sassola, on the Palazzo dei Duchi of San Stefano, and on the problem of symbolism in Enlightenment architectural 'projects' (the latter in *Comunità*).[100] Many of these articles based their conclusions upon research in Rome's State Archives under the guidance of the chief archivist, to whom (though he does not give a name, to our knowledge) he attributes his education as a researcher.[101]

Increasingly active (though by no means famous) as an architectural critic, historian and cultural commentator, Tafuri became more and more visible in Roman and Italian architectural culture. Both Quaroni and Rogers acknowledged his writing, each offering him the opportunity to work closely in collaboration. Tafuri claims that Quaroni was struck by his synthesis of the development of Italian architecture in the post-War period up to 1961, inviting him to edit an anthology of Quaroni's writings on architecture.[102] Instead, Tafuri wrote *on* Quaroni, considering his position in the development of Italian architecture from fascist to post-War periods.[103] He later characterised it as a long interview with a substantial bibliography; it was extremely unusual in being a monograph on a living architect, but more so in using Quaroni's professional life as the index for another discussion on urban planning.[104] The book was Tafuri's first, and one of two that he published in 1964. (The second was a study on Japanese modernism, timely for coinciding with the Tokyo Olympic Games.) *Architettura moderna in giappone* was part of a new book series by the editorial house Capelli, who published several small studies by members of the *AUA* group.[105] His interactions with Quaroni had enduring

99   Cf. n73 of this chapter.

100 Tafuri, 'L'ampiamento barocco del Comune di S. Gregorio da Sassola,' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, nos. 31-48 (1959-1961): 269-380; Tafuri and Lidia Soprani, 'Problemi di critica e problemi di datazione in due monumenti taorminesi: Il palazzo dei duchi di S. Stefano e la "Badia vecchia,",' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, no. 51 (1962): 1-12; Tafuri, 'Una precisazione sui disegni del Dos Santos per il complesso dei trinitari in via Condotti,' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, nos. 62-66 (1964): 26; Tafuri, 'Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna. Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche,' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, nos. 79-84 (1967): 85-107.

101 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 38.

102 Ibid., pp. 29-30. The article to which Tafuri refers is likely to be 'La vicenda architettonica romana, 1945-1961' (*Superfici*, 1962).

103 Tafuri, *Ludovico Quaroni e lo sviluppo dell'architettura moderna in Italia* (Florence: Edizioni di comunità, 1964). Tafuri published the first chapter as 'Ludovico Quaroni e la cultura architettonica italiana,' *Zodiac*, no. 11 (1963): 130-145.

104 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 29-30. In response to this comment, Passerini observes, "In that sense, you invented oral history." Given Passerini's 'ownership' of this field in Italy, it is an unusual interjection.—Passerini in Tafuri, ibid., p. 30.

105 Tafuri, *L'architettura moderna in giappone* (Bologna: Cappelli, 1964). In an advertisement included in this book, Cappelli announces four other titles in a series edited by Leonardo Benevolo, entitled 'L'architettura contemporanea.' Besides Tafuri's study on Japan, they include Stefano Ray, *L'architettura moderna nel paesi scandinavi*; Giorgio Piccinato, *L'architettura contemporanea in Francia*; Vieri Quilici, *Architettura sovietica contemporanea*; and Giovanni Klaus Koenig, *Architettura tedesca del secondo dopoguerra* (all published in 1965). Benevolo was already well known for his book *Storia dell'architettura moderna* (Bari: Laterza, 1960).

consequences; he became his assistant from 1964, and taught courses on his behalf in nineteenth and twentieth century architectural history at Rome.[106] Rogers, director of *Casabella-continuità*, likewise sought him out, exchanging the teaching of his course in the history of art and architecture at Milan for room and board at Rogers's home.[107] This year, 1964, was thus pivotal for a number of reasons: his two first books published and his teaching formalised at two important, if somewhat different, architecture faculties. However, while he began 1964 as an architect, he finished it an historian, radically 'rejecting' (to utilise his characterisation, as we shall see) his architectural discipline, adopting a new practice as an architectural historian.

It is important to recall that by 1964, Tafuri had enjoyed a sustained exposure to historical education through the classes and writings of Argan, had submitted an historical thesis for his *laurea* (rather than a design project), and had pursued this interest over the preceding four years through archival and comparative historical studies on architects over a range of topics dating from the thirteenth century onwards. However, his decision to chose this field of study over that of his basic university education implies, as the next chapter argues, a broader judgement about the capacity of architects to enact significant world change, given the predominant role of discourse in framing the values of architectural practice. His (self-defined) 'rejection' of architecture came close at the heels of his visit to *Michelangelo architetto*, an exhibition curated in 1964 by Paolo Portoghesi and Bruno Zevi.[108] Tafuri observed that the historical judgements offered by Zevi, as the exhibition's senior polemicist, reinforced his *Democrazia-cristiana* (*DC*) line, 'endorsing' organic expressionist architecture as proper to the kind of society envisioned by the Italian *centro-sinistra*.[109] Michelangelo's 'mannerist' example 'proved' the validity of expressive form, proof in turn of the importance of such models as the metabolists, Frank Lloyd Wright, Eric Mendelsohn and other exemplars of this vein of practice. Zevi's historiographical depiction of Michelangelo as an artist whose intelligence surpassed that of the populus, able to conceive of artistic solutions to cultural problems, elaborated a structure imposed by Zevi, among others, upon the urban planning debates in which the *INU* was at the centre. "Michelangelo was presented on a par with the contemporary architect Eric Mendelsohn, as if to say that it is the task of the intellectual—not the masses—to cry out against the pain of the human condition. The protests of the masses,

---

[106] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 30.

[107] Ibid.

[108] Zevi and Portoghesi, eds., *Michelangelo architetto* (Turin: Einaudi, 1964). Tafuri focuses on Zevi's contribution to the exhibition's historiography, which is well represented in the essay 'Michelangelo e non-finito architettonica,' republished in Zevi, *Pretesti di critica architettonica* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983), pp. 51-95.

[109] It is difficult to reduce Zevi's contribution to these debates to a footnote, but we can at least point towards a number of useful indices. They include the multi-volume summary of Zevi's articles in *Architettura. Cronache e storia*, entitled *Cronache di architettura*, 24 vols. (Bari: Laterza, 1978); as well as *Saper vedere l'architettura. Saggi sull'interpretazione spaziale dell'architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1948); *Architettura e storiografia* (Milan: Tamburini, 1951); *Poetica nell'architettura neoplastica* (Milan: Tamburini, 1953); *Il linguaggio moderno dell'architettura. Guida al codice anticlassico* (Turin: Einaudi, 1973); and *Storia dell'architettura moderna*, noted above.

by contrast, were repellent."[110] Tafuri dramatically sums up his response to these confusions of architecture and historiography that, as we shall see, are fundamental to this dissertation:

> From a subjective view, you could say that I resolved my destiny in one night… One tragic night I was miserable because I had to decide between practice and history. I remember I was sweating, walking around, felt ill, had a fever. At the end, in the morning, I had decided, and that was it! I gave up all the tools of architecture and determined to dedicate myself entirely to history. What kind of history I didn't know, but I knew at that moment that it should be history.[111]

Tafuri's historical practice continued in earnest from this point. From the end of 1964, he published a number of now important articles on Louis Kahn, Ernst May, and the Enlightenment that would reappear, thinly disguised, in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968).[112] In 1965, he wrote on Amiens Cathedral for the series *Forma e colore*.[113] He continued his interest in Baroque and Enlightenment architecture, composing articles on the gardens at Villa Trissino in the Veneto and on Borromini's 'experience' of history, an important theme to which we will return in a later chapter.[114] He also launched a campaign to differentiate himself from the major historians of his moment—Argan, Portoghesi and Zevi—and thereby claim a place at the table of contemporary historiography. Between 1964 and 1966, he continued to move between his teaching with Rogers in Milan and with Quaroni in Rome. Tafuri recalls that Rogers promoted his application for a professorial position at Milan, a post for which Tafuri was unqualified on several counts.[115] Nonetheless, he prepared by writing *L'architettura del Manierismo nel '500 europeo*, a book he later claims to have regretted publishing.[116] Tafuri did not come out publicly against the ideological stance described in Portoghesi's and Zevi's

---

[110] Tafuri, ibid., p. 31.

[111] Ibid., pp. 30-31.

[112] Tafuri, 'Ernst May e l'urbanistica razionalista,' *Comunità*, no. 123 (October 1964): 66-80; 'Simbolo e ideologia nell'architettura dell'Illuminismo,' *Comunità*, no. 124-125 (November-December 1964): 68-80; 'Storicità di Louis Kahn,' *Comunità*, no. 117 (February 1964): 38-49.

[113] Tafuri, *La cattedrale di Amiens*, monographic issue, *Forma e colore*, no. 25 (Florence: Sadea and Sansoni, 1965). The richly illustrated essay reappeared as a chapter in *Le grandi cattedrali gotiche* (Florence: Sadea, 1968), pp. 25-32.

[114] Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' *Comunità*, no. 129 (April 1965): 42-63, reprinted as 'Borromini e l'esperiza della storia,' 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA,' ed. Tafuri (Venice: IUAV Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, 1979), pp. 9-30; 'Simbolo e ideologia nell architettura dell'Illuminismo,' *Comunità*, no. 123 (November 1964): 68-85; 'La poetica borrominiana. Mito, simbolo e ragione,' *Palatino* X, nos. 3-4 (1966): 184-193; 'La lezione di Michelangelo,' *Comunità*, no. 126 (January 1965): 52-69; 'Il parco della Villa Trissino a Trissino e l'opera di Francesco Muttoni,' *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 114 (April 1965): 833-841.

[115] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 33.

[116] Tafuri, *L'architettura del Manierismo nel '500 europeo* (Rome: Officina, 1966). To expand his opinion of this publication: "I assembled everything I had thought or written on a theme that seemed to be in vogue at the time: mannerism. Now I would not know what the word *mannerism* means, but at the time I thought I knew. Anyway, I put everything together and published this horrible book …. It was totally premature; I did it only for the sake of the job."—Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 33.

exhibition until 1965, although he did submit a cutting review in *Paese sera* reflecting a widespread negative response in the popular and architectural press during 1964.[117] Zevi sat, alongside Guglielmo de Angelis d'Ossat, on the search committee for the Milan position, which went to Portoghesi. Given his history with Zevi, the outcome was unsurprising.[118] Two more places opened up after this competition, one bearing the name of Leonardo Benevolo, who had made a decisive contribution to architectural scholarship with his *Storia dell'architettura moderna*: an echo of Zevi's earlier study, but a demonstration of socialised historiography.[119] Zevi, anxious to avoid awarding a position to the fascist professor Furio Fasolo, gave the professorship to Tafuri over Benevolo (in a political manœuvre that we have yet to understand). Tafuri says that this decision weighed heavily upon his conscience for being a clear manifestation of Zevi's machinations rather than intellectual or academic merit.[120]

However, he was, consequently, now a professor, and began an eighteen-month fixed-term role at Palermo in preparation for a permanent position at Venice. At Palermo, Tafuri taught the courses that he had delivered in Rome for Quaroni, and set to work on a sustained examination (a 'profession') of his own discipline, which as a book would secure his appointment to Venice.[121] In his personal life, he notes, he had entered a depression over finding himself a pawn in Zevi's power games, and beating to a professorial post someone whom, he thought, deserved it more.[122] He began a course of psychoanalysis at the *Società italiana di psicanalisi*, which lasted three and a half years.[123] At the same time, he also became more active in the political *milieu* surrounding the Venetian review *Angelus Novus* (1964-1974). The very young Massimo Cacciari and Cesare De Michelis (elder brother of Tafuri's future colleague Marco De Michelis who later published some of Tafuri's books as editor of Marsilio) had formed a 'Benjaminian' journal that drew together cultural analysis with political, or ideological, critique. In the same setting, Tafuri found himself 'inspired' by such thinkers as Mario Tronti, Alberto Asor Rosa "and the group connected with Raniero Panzieri [who had died in 1964]"[124] He identified a 'bridge' built between Rome and Venice, connecting the projects of *Quaderni rossi* and *Contropiano*. Beginning from their model, questioning entire thought systems, he began a study on the constitution of history, "how the history of a particular

---

[117] Tafuri, 'La mostra (incubo) di Michelangelo,' *Paese sera*, February 29, 1964, libri, i.

[118] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 33-34.

[119] While referenced above, it is worth reiterating the dialogue between these two books, Zevi's published in 1950, Benevolo's in 1960.

[120] Tafuri, ibid., pp. 34-35. We ought to point out, in passing, the importance that Hoekstra also places on Tafuri's relationship with Zevi.—Hoekstra, ibid., pp. 76-78, 94-99.

[121] Tafuri's course at Rome was entitled 'La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali.' His course at Palermo took the same title; we imagine that its content was subject to few changes.

[122] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 35.

[123] Ibid., pp. 35-36.

[124] Ibid., p. 36. Panzieri left a legacy of writings in *Quaderni rossi* on the worker struggle. As a trajectory, Panzieri's writing in this jounal found an afterlife in the groups *Potere operaio* and *Autonomia operaia*, both dominated by the polemic of Antonio Negri.

discipline could become … *histoire à part entière*."[125] He regards as parallel the work he was conducting on the discipline of architectural history and his time in psychoanalysis: "While psychoanalysis was clearing my head, these questions moved me to clarify my thinking in general."[126] These years of personal and disciplinary self-reflection resulted in two significant outcomes for Tafuri: the publication of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and his assumption of the chairmanship of the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* at the *Istituto universitario di architettura di Venezia* (IUAV), a faculty then led by Giuseppe Samonà.

☘

Tafuri had been addressing the 'question' of history for some time before publishing *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, writing a number of articles testing both the general thesis of the book and the propriety of specific examples to his case. Nonetheless, where those other writings simply *implied* questions relating to the disciplinarity of architectural history, as well as to its practices and methods, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is the most profound and inquisitive study on these issues conducted within the first decade from the end of Tafuri's studies. We would be mistaken to regard this book as the *first* of his serious, theoretically activated writings and to ignore his earlier polemics. Equally, it would be erroneous to dismiss *Ludovico Quaroni* and *L'architettura del Manierismo* as not posing theoretical questions pertaining to disciplinarity. However, the coincidence of this book's publication with Tafuri's new position at Venice suggests its overriding importance in the launch of an historiographical programme, a suggestion to which we may add the further evidence of his appointing a number of energetic and even younger assistants. Tafuri himself was only thirty-two years old at the start of the 1968-69 academic year. His assistants would assume an important future role in the *Istituto*, among them numbering Marco De Michelis, Francesco Dal Co, and (from Rome) Giorgio Ciucci, Giuseppe Miano and Mario Manieri-Elia.

In *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, Tafuri conducted a revisionist examination of critical and historical practices in the wider setting of contemporary architecture. The figure cast therein of the architectural historian—or at least the shadow cast by the types of questions that he suggests the historian might ask—corresponded directly to the theoretical and historiographical imperatives of his *Istituto*, indexing the ambitions of his own historical practice. In this book we find: (1) a judgement that the trajectory of architectural theory in a long modernity 'eclipses' the direct access architects have to historical knowledge, implying its dislocation from 'real' conditions of economics, politics, etc.; (2) an observation that critico-analytical traditions persevere within architectural culture despite the translation of history into a 'productive' device (such as architectural theory); (3) a declaration that these traditions insufficiently catered to the challenge of the present moment, characterised in turn as a crisis state; (4) a pointedly critical

---

[125] Tafuri, ibid.

[126] Ibid.

analysis of the dominant strategies of post-War architectural historiography, especially in Italy; (5) a reflection upon the turns of events overseeing the transition of critical principles proper to the so-called 'Vienna School' into the means of *injecting* meaning into architectural production through an architectonic dalliance with linguistic theory; (6) a manifesto for the tools and tasks (though not the disciplinary form) of historical practice as he understood and institutionalised them at Venice and as he implemented them in his own practice, at times *beyond* Venice.

It is very important that Tafuri shies away from defining the 'proper' disciplinary form of architectural history. Rather than establishing an historiographical model, Tafuri argues *against* the formalisation of knowledge and critical method, and thus against the closing down of the experimental phases of disciplinary formation. He observes that the Vienna School's call for a 'rigorous study of art,' for instance, built an edifice that undermined *precisely* that kind of well-intentioned rigour announced by its authors. Arguing for an *ethics,* rather than form of practice, of research (as Cohen importantly observes), Tafuri establishes the bases for a disciplinary enquiry capable of *undermining* form and fixed method through the mechanisms of the *same* historical practices that build and test the disciplinary corpus of historical knowledge. The final chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* thus occupies the place of a founding document of the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* at Venice under Tafuri's chairmanship. The collaborative book projects *La città americana* (1973) and *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS 1917-1937* (1971), as well as their longer-term project on Weimar Germany, actively demonstrate the possibilities of this practice as an institutionalised corollary to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, even if Tafuri himself sets about to publicly (if unsuccessfully) undermine this particular 'image' of the 'Venice School' as an extension of this same principle of 'open disciplinarity.'[127] This image fixes upon a clear correlation between Tafuri's public existence as an architectural historian and the historiographical practices assumed by the 'Venice School.' He maintained an historical practice outside the parameters of the programme at Venice, with its heavy focus on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The results of his efforts includes the studies *L'architettura dell'umanesimo* (1969) and *Via Giulia* (1973, with Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro) from *within* the 'period' of the quintessential 'Venice School.'[128] These books demonstrate an early and crucial eagerness to test the limits of historical practice undertaken in the *Istituto* while advancing a more

---

[127] In addition, and even earlier, Tafuri's 1966 lecture 'Le strutture del linguaggio nella storia dell'architettura moderna'—*Teorie e storia della progettazione architettonica* (Bari: Dedalo, 1968)—articulates one of the principle arguments of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*: the historian's responsibilities towards the conflagration of the theoretical premises for practice with the inherently ideological dimensions of language. He would return to this theme with reference to the American case in his 1974 lecture at Princeton University, later published in *Oppositions* as '*L'architecture dans le boudoir.*'

[128] Tafuri, *L'architettura dell'umanesimo* (Bari: Laterza, 1969); Tafuri, Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro, *Via Giulia. Una utopia urbanistica del '500* (Rome: Casa editrice stabilimento Aristide Staderini, 1973). While Spezzaferro was in Venice, he is not associated with the 'project' of the 'Venice School,' and thus we also treat 'Venice' metaphorically as an attitude towards research. We return to this idea at length in conclusion

nuanced approach to the kinds of historical studies that he published in the Roman *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* throughout the 1960s.

This latter research and publication tends less to be inflected with the language of the *movimento operaio*, which does pervade a substantial amount of his writing during the late 1960s and early 1970s.[129] *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* admits the discursive momentum of *Contropiano*, even if it remains impossible—though several have tried—to explain this book solely in terms of a political agenda. Tafuri was not involved in *Contropiano* from the very beginning (though his assistant Dal Co contributed an article to the first issue in 1968). He joined the editorial board from 1969, remaining involved until the journal's 'completion' (1972), writing several important articles over this short time that position architectural knowledge as ideology, a central idea in Tafuri's reflections on architectural historical practice and one to which we will later revisit. Through *Contropiano*, he was in close contact with a number of important philosophers and political thinkers of the Left. In many crucial respects, it is possible to regard (as Alberto Asor Rosa suggests) one strain of the work undertaken in Venice in the years from the late 1960s to the mid-1970s as heavily informed by the politicised cultural analyses of *Contropiano*. However, to subject the entirety of Tafuri's written work during this time as evidence of this same engagement, as Rosa attempts to do, is a serious error. It appears, for instance, that his involvement with the student protests of *sessantotto* was much 'lighter' than his preserve in the debates and occupation in Rome several years earlier. It is also difficult to perceive in Tafuri's writing the solidarity claimed by students with the *operaisti* spoken of by Patrizia Lombardo when reflecting on the climate of Venice in 1968.[130] Tafuri recalls:

> I would say that we {a small group—Cacciari, Marco De Michelis and myself} thought very hard about the issues. I would say that our approach was cold, indifferent. We affected this great indifference in order to discover where we could

---

[129] Besides his engagement with *Contropiano*, we note the title of Tafuri's presentation to the 1972 *Convegno sul centro urbano*, 'Le questione dei grandi centri urbani nella strategia del movimento operaio,' *Atti del Convegno sul centro urbano* (Florence: Casa del popolo Michelangelo Buonarroti di Firenze, CLUSF, 1972), pp. 11-21, 47-23, 111-113. In *Contropiano*, doubtlessly his most naked Marxist missive is the essay 'Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico,' 1970, no. 2: 241-281.

[130] Patrizia Lombardo, 'Introduction: The Philosophy of the City,' *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*, by Massimo Cacciari, trans. Stephen Sartorelli (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993), pp. ix-lviii. In making this point, we wish to signal Tafuri's intellectual approach to the problem of the worker, concerned less with direct action (by this point), than with understanding and exposing, precisely through historical research, the underlying causes of contemporary problems. As evidence of his involvement with the 'struggle' at this moment, consider his 'engaged' writing in *Contropiano*, his claim for the subjectivity to economic and political forces of contemporary Italian architecture and urban environments, 'Design and Technological Utopia,' *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape; Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*, ed. Emilio Ambasz (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972), pp. 388-404; also, his essay in the 'Venice School' issue of the French journal *VH101*, 'URSS/Berlin, 1922. Du populisme a l'Internationale constructiviste,' *VH101*, nos. 7-8 (1972): 53-87; see, too, his profile of Hans Schmidt, 'Ein "radicaler" architect,' *Werk*, no. 10 (1972): 132. Within this body of referents, the 'Venice' project on the Soviet city belies a more complex relationship between left-wing ideologies and ideological subjects of historical study.—Tafuri, ed., *Socialismo, città, architettura, URSS 1917-1937. Il contributo degli architetti europei* (Rome: Officina, 1971).

be useful. In general, if we carried the critique of ideology to its logical conclusion, the *Democrazia cristiana* and the *Partito comunista* came to be the same thing.[131]

For Tafuri as well as for many of this group, Tronti's 'critica dell'ideologia' comprised a catch-cry for a form of institutional analysis seeking to look *through* political rhetoric to extract concrete points of reference.[132] In strictly political terms, they conducted a critique of the Left, especially of the crippling effects of ideology in the prevention of realising the *PCI*'s broader goals. The capitalist system was also a target, insofar as it afforded less complexity (also, less complicity) than the relationship of rhetoric to concrete goals in the *PCI*, which they basically endorsed (and in which they thus implicated themselves, opening up a more complicated critical issue) despite its obfuscation of the future with an impenetrable language.

> Then there was the central importance of the factory, and therefore of the working man, and also of the worker as a subject. In fact, at a certain point we asked who was this subject to whom the ideal of social and urban justice refers? Those most in need, no? Or so it seemed to us. The emphasis on these facts was the beginning.[133]

We do not intend to suggest that Tafuri was disengaged from party politics during this time. He had joined the *PSI* in 1962, in which he belonged to the *Centro dei Tecnici Socialisti* (*CTS*). In 1964 he became a member of the *Partito Socialista Italiano Unità Proletaria* (*PSIUP*), even running for a communal seat in Rome in 1966 as a *PSIUP* candidate (winning though, just 2% of the vote).[134] Though he remained a Party member for at least two years, he says that he "left almost immediately because they were talking about Cuba, China, and the Third World, and I was irritated … my problem was the suburbs."[135]

He sought to enact a critique of the ideological thought "which has embedded itself in the history of architecture and the history of art in general."[136] This was one theme of 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' (1969) and *Progetto e utopia* (1973), mirroring Tronti's 'critique of ideology' in an exposé of architectural theory as an ideological system burdening architectural practice. A preoccupation with architectural history's inbuilt hegemonies and with the uses made of history by architectural theory, and also the university itself as an institutional site of these value systems, underscores

---

131   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 42-43. In fact, later in this interview, Tafuri claims that the virtual equivalence of the *PCI* and the *DC* led the group to seriously debate which one to join. "One tragic night we decided to enrol in the *Partito comunista* after weighing the possibility of joining the *Democrazia Cristiana*. Those who don't have ideology don't have such problems."—Ibid., p. 55.

132   This call pervades Tronti's collected essays, *Operai e capitale*, esp. 'Critica dell'ideologia,' pp. 152-159.

133   Tafuri, ibid., p. 32.

134   Federico Rosa, ibid., p. 209.

135   Tafuri, ibid., p. 33.

136   Ibid., p. 32.

the decision of Tafuri and his colleagues to form a University cell of the *PCI* after 1968: "We maintained that we should begin at the university and not depart from it."[137] Their principal concerns, with intellectual work rather than the *movimento operai*, effectively deviated from the mainstream preoccupation of students and unions with emergent communist societies.

While doubtless important, the *Contropiano* community did not completely circumscribe Tafuri's intellectual associations. Indeed, he recalls feeling a "strong bond" with Umberto Eco, Franco Fortini and others in *Gruppo '63*.[138] He participated in a number of meetings concerned with the contemporary arts during the late 1960s. These, he recalls, gravitated towards a concern with the position of the 'viewer' relative to the degree of engagement an artist could legitimately provoke, "how art distorts the subject, and how it renders historicisation impossible."[139] Reflecting on this debate with his own discipline in mind, Tafuri began asking how far historical practice could inform political or cultural engagement, "how to effect what was essentially a cultural operation ... using the tools specific to the discipline of history and maintaining as much philological accuracy as possible."[140] He recognised that there was little remaining (in Italy, at least) of a 'traditional' philological historiography; any stance positioning historiographical practices as 'cultural operations' needed instantly to contend with Eco's assertion that all cultural production was essentially subjective, this a central tenet of the *opera aperta*.[141] Even the historians from whom Tafuri had learned a great deal, Argan and Zevi, had taken up an engaged historiography to the sacrifice of primary research sources: "The fact is that neither students of Zevi nor those of Argan ever set foot in an archive."[142] Tafuri accused them of confusing primary and secondary materials, rendering dates and documents unimportant, chronologies untrustworthy. Tafuri in contrast, positions his own education in philological method as largely self-taught, rejecting the methods of his disciplinary 'fathers' as ultimately servile to architectural practice to the detriment of a 'pure' historical research. His criticism of *la critica operativa* commences from this observation: that engaged history homogenises and represents the past, fashioning history as a justification for specific futures conceived in the present.

> So I fought against the attitude of the critic who gets inside the work or who submits to the work. I fought against those who were trying to bend the will of the work, to enter the work as an open construction, because they became so involved

---

[137] Ibid., p. 42.

[138] Ibid., p. 37. "Fortini had organised a conference in Venice called 'Candidi come serpenti.' It was fundamental, together with the articles 'Fine dell'antifascismo,' and 'Verifica dei potere.' The situation in those years, 1966 and 1967, made manifest Panzieri's insistence that starting all over again called for an enormous work of destruction."—Ibid. An interesting moment of intersection of a range of Tafuri's cultural referents is the 1967 conference *Strutture ambientali. Dagli atti del 17° convegno internazionale Artisti, Critici e Studiosi d'arte*, ed. Ezio Gianotte (Bologna: Capelli, 1969).

[139] Tafuri, ibid., p. 38.

[140] Ibid.

[141] Ibid.; Umberto Eco, *Opera aperta* (Milan: Bompiani, 1962).

[142] Tafuri, ibid.

that they had no historical detachment—neither from the work itself, nor from the meaning of the work.[143]

For Tafuri, this historical detachment exemplifies the historian's capacity to simultaneously love and hate their subject.[144] This attitude, he suggests, belongs properly to Benjamin's 'destructive character,' positioning himself always at an intersection, uncertain.[145] He identifies with Benjamin's "tragic and strained," 'Jewish' view of modernity. For this reason, he suggests, the group at Venice maintained a clear distance from *Gruppo '63* and their discourse on media and information science.[146]

❧

Regarding *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* solely as an expression of these ideological and cultural concerns undermines its fundamental importance for our view of it as a document calling for the revision of the architectural historian's tools and disciplinary imperatives. Bearing this in mind, we note Tafuri's attention to the famous twentieth century development of French historiography, from the revisionist examples of *Annales* scholars Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre (known by "no one, not a single colleague, *really no one* in Italy"[147]) to the institutional critique of Michel Foucault. He looks, also, to the 'Vienna School' declarations of Hans Sedlmayer and other 'rigorist' disciples of Alois Riegl, as well as to the Italian historiographer Delio Cantimori.[148]

> They [the *Annales* scholars] had really been a shock for me in terms of the history of mentalities, the history of inventions, the construction of an historiographic problem. These, then, were the things that initially interested me, the things that inspired my preoccupation with what someone called 'the problem of method.'[149]

---

[143] Ibid., p. 39.

[144] Ibid., p. 40.

[145] Ibid.

[146] Ibid., p. 41.

[147] Ibid., p. 43. Their work would famously come to widespread attention in Italy through the translation of the anthology *Faire de l'histoire*, 3 vols., ed. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1974); Ital. trans. Isolina Mariani, *Fare storia. Temi e metodi della nuova storiografia* (Turin : Einaudi, 1981). Bloch and Febvre edited the journal *Annales d'histoire economique et social*, published since 1929 and later called *Annales. Économies, sociétés, civilisations*. The *Annales* tradition is the subject of Peter Burke's fascinating study, *The French Historical Revolution: The* Annales *School, 1929-1989* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

[148] Our principal reference on the Vienna School is Christopher S. Wood, ed., *Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2003). Richard Kimball, too, offers an interesting (if slightly journalistic) reading of Hans Sedlmayr's *Verlust der Mitte* in his piece 'Art in Crisis,' *The New Criterion* 24 (December 2005), p. 3, published online at http://newcriterion.com/archives/24/12/art-in-crisis/ (accessed December 9, 2005). On Cantimori, consult the recently published study by Gennaro Sasso, *Delio Cantimori. Filosofia e storiografia* (Pisa: Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, 2005).

[149] Tafuri, ibid.

We perceive, in this moment, that Tafuri's most significant contribution to the field of architectural historiography was his articulation of the terms of the discipline's *conditional* autonomy. He did not press this point in the pages of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*; rather, it is modelled in the very formulation of the *Istituto*. The autonomy of architectural history from architectural production, tempered by its keen knowledge *of* this production (not simply theoretical knowledge, but also of its technological, social, economic and political constraints, *as well as* its determination by theoretical constructs) required Tafuri's 'ideal' architectural historian to have an architectural knowledge equivalent to that of the architect. The historian, in other words, must share the body of knowledge proper to the architect, while engaging it with quite different aims and devices. Beginning with the core group of De Michelis, Dal Co, Ciucci, and Manieri-Elia, he attracted a company of historians able to think through the rigours and problems of the discipline and of disciplinarity itself, all the while remaining busy, first and foremost, with historical *practice*. Their expertise derived from an advanced architectural knowledge. However, rather than explaining work in terms of production or 'meaning,' they developed "specifically historiographical problems."[150]

Within a short time, (Tafuri suggests) he had secured enough power both within the institute and the wider faculty to push this work to the fore of *IUAV*'s research preoccupations. "We started to mount projects based on historical problems that were heavily involved with the present; we were doing real history, and the present was our task."[151] Eschewing responsibility for instigating change in the present in favour of provoking a confrontation between the present and its 'inheritance,' they took the firm stand that "criticism was criticism; that's all." They located the chief responsibility of critico-historical analysis as the publication of historical research. "If the critic succeeds, it is useful; if not, it isn't."[152] As chair of the *Istituto*, Tafuri attempted to experiment with different disciplinary models, remaining open to new (foreign as well as traditional) analytical strategies, consistently introducing fresh perspectives and challenging dimensions into historical problems and their 'exposure.' This extended into the realm of formal institutional experiments, including (he recalls) a proposal to amalgamate the history departments of *IUAV* and the *Università di Venezia 'Ca' Foscari'* in order to test historical specialisations (military history, art history, naval history, history of science, etc.) with the tools and imperatives of other subdivisions of historical practice.[153] "Traditionalists," he observes, "have always recognised crossing the boundary between one discipline and another as 'trespassing,' when in reality it is the basis of research."[154] While this attempt failed, it demonstrates his interest in the institutional correlations to 'pure' disciplinary exploration; it further describes the institutional impurity of intellectual work.

---

[150] Ibid., p. 44.
[151] Ibid.
[152] Ibid., p. 45.
[153] Ibid., pp. 46-47.
[154] Ibid., p. 47.

The *Istituto*'s research programme reflected this preoccupation, as a subject, with the interactions that occur between disciplines and institutions. Three major research projects launched at the end of the 1960s addressed the place of architecture in the ideological settings of Weimar Germany, the Soviet Union, and the United States. Each example implicated different kinds of historical material and secondary sources, and required vastly different approaches to the subject matter itself. For instance, they conducted their study on the American City—a collaboration by Tafuri, Ciucci, Dal Co and Manieri-Elia—largely at great distance from their target, each working in Venice, the research supplemented by visits by Dal Co and his wife to the United States and by close relationships with key libraries. Their study of the Soviet Five Year Plans, again led by Tafuri (including a much larger number of collaborators), tapped into sources east of the Iron Curtain; however, it directly affected their standing in the *PCI*. The Party expelled one of their team, economist Rita di Leo, for publishing views that confronted the Party line with documentation encountered during her historical research on the USSR.[155] The research group sought out those Germans who had travelled to Moscow in the 1930s, including Hans Schmidt and Kurt Junghanns, trying to confront Soviet ideology with personal accounts and documentation.[156] Their work on Soviet Russia was a "first manifestation." Tafuri admits to having a lot left to learn in publishing the results. "When I think back to that time, it seems to me that we did intelligent things but they called for a refinement that we simply didn't possess: we were heavy handed and a little rough."[157] Overall, they did not seek to reconcile these three different ideological systems within one theory of architectural or political ideology, but to understand the historical differences that implied diverse results each time.

Likewise their analyses of the American city: "If the Soviet Union had served its destiny from the start by rigidly imposing the Five-Year Plan, how had this other huge system been built?"[158] They found, in their four-pronged approach to the 'problem' of the plan, that architectural thought occupied an untenable position in a free market setting. Architects, Tafuri observed, were reduced to the design of façades within a city form determined by *laisser faire* entrepreneurship: not simply at an architectural scale, but also at an economic scale.

> That was the real objective, because the New Deal appeared to be the application of a plan, but there was a concrete reality in the newly built cities, in the fact of architecture, which was linked to huge utopian planning enterprises like Rockefeller Centre, in which the scale of the entire city was altered.[159]

---

155 Ibid., pp. 55-56.

156 Ibid., p. 56. On Hans Schmidt, cf. *ABC: Contributions on Building, 1924-1928*, ed. Mart Stam, Schmidt, El Lissitzky, et al., comp. Claude Lichtenstein, Okatar Macel, Jorg Stuzebecker, et al. (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996). We can gain some insight into Kurt Junghann's work through his study *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938* (Leipzig: E. A. Seeman, 1998).

157 Tafuri, ibid.

158 Ibid.

159 Ibid.

This posed a completely different problem that those of the Soviet Union and of Weimar Germany, one prompting Tafuri's reflection upon architecture in post-War Italy.

> There was a need for American architects of that kind here, or at least someone other than the ideologically minded Germans, who asserted, 'Only in Russia is it possible to do planning; in Germany, nothing is possible; let's go to Russia!' Those working in America would have been totally ruined because it was a question of millions of dollars.[160]

In consistently posing such questions, testing the broad thesis of the increasingly widely read *Progetto e utopia*, Tafuri was quickly perceived as pursuing, in his work within the *Istituto* at least, a revisionist history in the Marxist tradition—a reassessment of contemporary architecture exposing ideology as fatally flawed, and a judgement of the modern movement as ultimately subservient to the mechanisms of capitalist production. "[We] established a solid language in which we understood one another very well … from 1968 to about 1976."[161] Besides maintaining a vivid interest the grand projects of the United States, Germany and the Soviet Union, in which the guiding principles of architectural production were no longer (historically) proper to architecture itself, no longer informed by architectural theory, they extended their research to account for the development of thought systems in architecture *per se*, in the 'rise' of architectural theory over the long modern era, and to understand its function for contemporary architecture. Tafuri and Dal Co's *Architettura contemporanea* (1976) synthesises the provisional conclusions of this research, in which Tafuri's interrogation of thought systems and historical evidence coincides with Dal Co's perceptive analyses of the nature of modern thought.[162]

❧

Tafuri's contribution to the development of the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* in the years from 1968 to the middle 1970s, for which 1976 comprises a useful (though ultimately problematic) bookend does not represent the full extent of his intellectual work, research, or writing over this time. We encounter many difficulties in posing his 'other' work

---

[160] Ibid., pp. 56-57.

[161] Ibid., p. 57. The end date that Tafuri nominates corresponds to the publication *Architettura contemporanea* and to Tafuri's resignation from the *PCI*.—Tafuri and Dal Co, *Architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Electa, 1976). He recalls of this book: "I agreed to do it because Wittkower suggested it, and when he died I felt obliged to finish it."—Ibid. Tafuri and Dal Co did not agree on several points, Tafuri noting a specific instance relating to Dal Co's reading of the technical 'origins' of the 1966 flood of the Arno. If we were cynical, we could note the page of photographs of Venice's Piazza San Marco and Florence in flood in his essay 'La ricostruzione. Introduzione alla storia dell'architettura italiana del secondo Novecento,' Dal Co, ed., *Storia dell'architettura italiana*, 'Il secondo novecento' (Milan: Electa, 1997), p. 21.

[162] Dal Co, *Teorie del moderno. Architettura, Germania 1880-1920* (Bari: Laterza, 1982); *Abitare nel moderno* (Bari: Laterza, 1982).

during those years—examining diverse collections of historical materials and archives, understanding and undermining alternate forms of institutional hegemony—as an extension of the classic image of 'Venice School' historiography. Equally, it is impossible to position his work on the early and middle modern era as entirely *independent* of the concerns and tools of his colleagues at *IUAV*, working principally on the *novecento*. There are as many continuous lines running between these two bodies of work (if we can use such a simplistic construction) as many as there are barriers keeping them apart. Nonetheless, in trusting the intentions of historical practice as Tafuri positions them in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura,* as an enduring principle that is not specific to the period of historical study, or to the types of materials at hand (at least in the first few years that follow its publication) we might begin to reconcile what traditionally have been two more or less discrete bodies of work, read by two rather different audiences. (These audiences almost, though not completely, define the different ancestor-disciplines of a pre-disciplinary architectural historiography: art historians concerned with the early to middle modern period; architects interested in their recent past and artistic heritage.) Tafuri's approach to the 'problem' of historical practice, we contend, is not limited by the timeframe of its subject, but concerns *any* period in which architectural theory, disciplinary manifestations of utopian ideas, 'eclipse' the representation of history by its activation in the present as a pre-emptive view of the future.[163] The rhetorical 'death of architecture' often distilled from readings of *Progetto e utopia* is little more than an acknowledgement that architectural theory had ceased, by the twentieth century, to be the primary vehicle compelling architectural practice forward. Rather than a judgement handed down to contemporary practice, it is an historically informed analysis of a long-running relationship between the various branches of architectural culture, no more and no less forthright than his 'judgement' of those same branches in the *quattrocento*.

The status of architectural theory in Julius II's urban impositions in Rome for Sansovino's historical and geographical 'memory' in the Veneto pose the same questions of architectural theory as does *Progetto e utopia*, while testing the ideological dimension of those tools available for deployment in philological practice. His books *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* (1969) and *L'architettura dell'umanesimo* (1969)—an echo of Geoffrey Scott's title, but a 'destruction' of Rudolf Wittkower—appear very early, as do a number of scientific and theoretical writings on such canonical figures as Palladio, Wren, Guarini, Michelangelo, Borromini and Piranesi.[164] His substantial study on via

---

[163] In making this point, we (of course) acknowledge the structures that define research projects and research, publication and exhibition funding, forcing this generous (if abstract) disciplinary observation into more measurable patterns, especially since the 1980s.

[164] Tafuri, 'Una "lettura" settecentesca del modello di Michelangelo per S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini,' *Palatino*, no. 3 (July-September 1968): 251-255; 'Il mito naturalistico nell'architettura del '500,' *L'arte*, no. 1 (1968): 7-36; 'Teatro e città nell'architettura palladiana,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* X (1968): 65-78; 'Committenza e tipologia nelle ville palladiane,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XI (1969): 120-136; *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* (Padua: Marsilio, 1969); '"Architettura artificialis": Claude Perrault, Sir Christopher Wren e il dibattito sul linguaggio architettonico,' *Barocco europeo, barocco italiano, barocco salentino, Atti del Congresso internazionale sul Barocco, Lecce 21-24 Settembre 1969*, ed. P. F. Palumbo (Lecce: Editrice 'L'Orsa Maggiore,' 1970); 'Ambiguità del Guarini,' *Op Cit. Selezione della critica d'arte contemporanea*, no. 17 (January 1970): 5-18; 'La fortuna del Palladio

Giulia (1973), produced alongside art historians Salerno and Spezzaferro, describes building by building the accumulating density of one Roman street over four hundred years, a utopian urban gesture ultimately reclaimed by the city's own tendency towards complexity, an historical entropy perpetually weakening the desire of historiographical practices to restore order to the chaos of the past.

> With the Via Giulia, for example, there were the political motivations of Julius II, and the early drawings mentioned by Paolo Prodi; the political and spiritual power were as complimentary as they were contradictory, like all the great works of art and architecture that grew up along this papal artery—until they were so enmeshed that individual threads could no longer be unravelled. I don't believe that you can reduce Bramante to the sheer will of Julius II. Their wills were tangent. They came together by chance, even coincidence, in a final moment.[165]

Despite Tafuri's extraordinary dexterity in shifting between one field of study and another, developing both research programmes and audiences in Renaissance scholarship and contemporary architectural and cultural history and theory, the years that span from his introduction into the faculty at Venice through to the publication of *Progetto e utopia* mark out the boundaries of the 'Venice School' as it is represented by such later historiography (and as characterised, for instance, by Tournikiotis or Heynen). Their major collaborative publications in 1971 (*URSS*) and 1973 (*La città americana*) reinforce this frame. We are likewise readily forgiven for testing these historical 'projects' against Tafuri's more abstract 'ideological' (or 'ideologico-critical') analyses in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* or *Progetto e utopia*. While this characterisation is useful, to a degree, it has been sustained well beyond its natural lifespan by Tafuri's audiences insisting upon rendering the entirety of his work over these years as an equivalence of the popular visage of the 'Venice School.' The presentation of Tafuri's collaborators as a School appears late; the 1985 'Venice School' issue of *Architectural Design* referred initially to Carlo Aymonino's entire faculty at IUAV, of which Tafuri's then *Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura* was simply one element.[166] By extracting Tafuri from his communities, as we are here attempting to do, we treat his thinking as both personal and continual, and thus not open (or at the very least, as *less* open) to the kinds of dramatic shifts that respond to institutional change and shifting personal fields of intellectual reference. If both Alberto Asor Rosa and Francesco Paolo Fiore ultimately mislead us

---

alla fine del cinquecento e l'architettura di Inigo Jones,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XII (1970): 47-62; 'Retorica e sperimantalismo. Guarino Guarini e la tradizione manierista,' *Guarino Guarini e l'internazionalità del barocco. Atti del convegno internazionale promosso dall'Accademia delle scienze di Torino*, intro. Rudolf Wittkower, vol. 1 (Turin: Accademia delle scienze di Torino, 1970), pp. 667-704; 'Alle origini del palladianesimo. Alessandro Farnese, Jacques Androuet Du Certeau, Inigo Jones,' *Storia dell'arte*, no. 11 (1971): 141-162.

[165] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 60.

[166] Heynen, in 'The Venice School,' describes the intellectual leadership of the Venice School as Tafuri, Cacciari and Dal Co. A theoretical and political response to modernity is, it seems, inextricable from this popular image.

in their (conflicting) claims for Tafuri's continuities, then we might respond with the observation that those elements of Tafuri's thinking that *do* remain constant pertain to the rigour of his theorisation of disciplinarity, method, practice and motivation, and neither to the objects of his scholarship nor to his theories of history.

Positioning 1976, even provisionally, as the 'conclusion' of the 'Venice School' requires us to recall the coincidence also of Carlo Aymonino's assumption of responsibility as Dean of *IUAV* from 1974, under which Tafuri's *Istituto* 'graduated' into a full University department in 1976 as part of a general structural reorganisation of the Faculty.[167] The implications of this are important, not least because students could, from this point onwards, take their *tesi di laurea* in architectural history, not simply under the advice of professors associated with the *Istituto*, but graduating as specialists in architectural history. In promoting Tafuri's research institute to a department, Aymonino oversaw the stakes of Tafuri's institutional ambitions raised. Tafuri was now in a better position to lend pedagogical form to the argument of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Within the newly formed *Dipartimento*, he could formalise the education of historians cognisant of the imperatives and techniques of architectural practice, but who would remain detached from architectural practice by delivering a message of history's enduring complexity through their own, conditionally autonomous practice. This transition had two effects upon an outside view of Tafuri's historiographical work and the 'Venice School.' Firstly, the work in Tafuri's *Dipartimento* extended from the intellectual activity of a small number of professors and assistants to an expanded offering of seminars, an increasingly diverse field of student research and a substantially increased cohort of academic affiliates. Secondly, the kinds of collaborations required by the *Dipartimento* within *IUAV* shifted Tafuri's responsibilities from offering his lessons of the historical tendency towards entropy *to* training architectural historians capable of the same level of agitation within architectural culture. Could Tafuri replicate his 'choice' for history, 'rejection' of architectural practice, by shaping both curriculum and academic environment?[168]

❧

Tafuri admits that his writing on architectural and intellectual phenomena of the short modern era (eighteenth to twentieth centuries) found different audiences and required different collaborations—both personal and professional—than those implicated by his

---

167 For a brief, though useful, chronology of *IUAV*'s institutional evolution, see Paolo Nicoloso's summary at http://www.iuav.it/Ateneo1/Presentazi/Storia/ (accessed December 9, 2005).

168 While we pose this question, we regrettably do so with few intentions of responding with the seriousness it deserves. An institutional history of *IUAV* would make direct analyses of the fields of Tafuri's research, external and internal funding allocated to research projects in the *Dipartimento* and its predecessing *Istituto*, and track with more rigour than we can possibly allow time and space for here an analysis of the figures and research profiles of professors, assistants and (later) *dottorandi* over the years from 1968 to 1992. However, while we have not undertaken research on this question, we remain confident that the wider theoretical issues that it implicates are an important index, even if not elaborated here. Jean-Louis Cohen, in 'Ceci n'est pas une histoire,' notes the conspicuous absence of figures corresponding to Tafuri's 'historian.'

research on the early modern period. Translating biographical terms into geographical, he establishes a clear distinction between his life in Venice, where he taught, and in Rome, his home and the research 'site' of his most widely read archival investigations.

> Among our group in Venice there was an on-going, tragic reflection on modernity. This is interesting, because Venice was not fascinating in and of itself; rather, it seemed to me like a place outside the world, so to speak, which could function as an observatory. One could look to the Soviet Union, Germany, America, from this place that had no roots.[169]

His working life was likewise geographically divided: he taught seminars for five days in Venice (three two-hour lectures every fifteen days), followed by eight days in Rome, conducting research.[170] We will return, in conclusion, to a more speculative reflection on this pattern. For now, though, it is useful to note a correspondence between Tafuri's 'life' on the train between Venice and Rome, and the ongoing movement between research and writing on the early and late modern era, resulting (perhaps too conveniently) in quite separate claims on his 'legacy.' One community of claimants are those historians of the Renaissance centred upon the research communities in Rome (attached to *La sapienza* and the *Bibliotheca Hertziana*) and Vicenza (at the *Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio'*); the other centres upon *IUAV* and (now) the American North-East.

It is important to specify that neither Tafuri's published recollections of these years, nor his bibliography, sustain the 'Venice School' image as a clearly defined historiographical project, except as implied through particular efforts and collaborations. Rather, the research of Tafuri and his colleagues attempted at once to address a number of diverse questions. Importantly from the viewpoint of analysing Tafuri's reception (which, in the end, is not here our main concern), most of these questions did not pertain directly (in their formulation, at any rate) to the interests of either architectural practice or the burgeoning pseudo-discipline of architectural theory, as an intellectual pursuit independent of architectural practice, 'founded' in North America. They are thus rarely recalled. They pertain to his more widely disseminated studies on the relationship between ideological systems and architectural production, beginning from an enquiry into the consequences for architecture of post-Feudal age and the growing importance of capitalism through a consideration of theory as ideology, in which (for architecture) the figure of Alberti plays a major role. Within this body of work, as we have seen, the steady conflict between systems of thought and 'the real' (however defined) nurtured a series of analyses into ideologically constructed historical systems in Eurasia and North America. It also includes his theorisation of the historian's tools and tasks, and of the limits of history and historical practice as proper to that figure. His ongoing development of a

---

169   Tafuri, ibid., p. 57.
170   Ibid.

methodologically open critical philology, responding to a wide range of historiographical 'legacies,' capable of, at once, deftly handling evidence and its institutional frames is admirably demonstrated in *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985), which programmatically adopts an ambiguous stance with respect to its materials while calling into question both the frame and that which appears therein.[171] Appearing in the *Microstorie* series edited by Carlo Ginzburg and Giovanni Levi, Tafuri had asked Einaudi to publish it as a history rather than as an architectural or art history, "because in fact it *was* history: the subtitle was *Religione, scienza, architettura*."[172] He continues:

> In the built environment, particularly in Venice, there is no stone that does not have an institutional meaning. Ultimately, nothing about a building can be understood unless we know not only who the patron was but also to which faction he belonged, because the work is always expressive of him in one way or another. The kind of history that I am doing today is somehow a manifestation in myself, in my own work, of what I hoped an institution could be or accomplish. However, for me, the institutionalisation of this practice remains the objective.[173]

The evolution of Tafuri's historical practice, the following chapters show, demonstrates a constant and consistent willingness to remain open to the tools and questions of other historical disciplines while maintaining a steadfast view of history's tasks within architectural culture as a specific disciplinary condition. It follows that the formalisation of his practice both in Venice and in the many institutional settings that he encountered in his academic life, combine this programmatic openness with a rigour, exposing each potential methodological variant to the full battery of intellectual tests to which architectural knowledge was subjected as a matter of course under the initial terms, for instance, of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Consequently, Tafuri exposes both his historical subjects and those disciplinary methods (historically 'proper' to architectural history and from beyond its traditional purview) to test their validity and their applicability to the tasks of historical analysis.

The nature of Tafuri's reception, particularly in the English-speaking world again painted him as a critic and theoretician concerned with locating issues of class politics in the mechanisms of architectural production, effectively reducing his practice to a clear image, tinted red. He had made two trips to the United States by the mid 1970s: the first responding to an invitation by Wittkower to bring students to Washington D.C.; the second to speak at Princeton University, where his '*L'architecture dans la boudoir*' was first delivered, and which marked, with its publication in *Oppositions*, his independent

41

---

[171] Tafuri, *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985). To draw a frivolous comparison: like a simulation of visual astigmatism, we must tilt the book back and read across it to perceive its form, missing out, at once, on the detail. Astigmatic vision is a useful analogy here, because each dimension of Tafuri's analysis functions coherently on its own terms, but to attempt understanding the 'project' as a whole, in all its dimensions, forces the entire construction out of focus.

[172] Ibid., p. 47.

[173] Ibid.

entry into American discourse (that is, excepting his 1972 contribution to the Museum of Modern Art catalogue, *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape*). He observed of his American experiences: "Above all, I have come to understand that it is impossible in the United States. In my view, it is always about closing ranks, the *arroccamento* of disciplines, the academy …. This is the corruption that moved me to say I would try to accomplish these goals on my own."[174]

If such declarations afford some view upon the logic of Tafuri's institutional and methodological choices, they offer very few devices for actively unlocking his *œuvre*, which remains difficult to categorise precisely because of the distance at which it holds itself from its own reception, our own readings necessarily included. While it is tempting to ascribe this strategy to an idiosyncratic intellectual track record without taking recourse to a broader logic, it is impossible to defend this view. His comments are perfectly clear that the relationship between subjects, subjectivities and the methods applied to their historiographical elaboration are not haphazard (even if they are diverse), but rather intrinsically bound up in the subject itself.

> It is not enough to talk generically about Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, for example. You must know him from the point of view of an historian of religion. So you work with Adriano Prosperi one day and with Carlo Ginzburg the next; you have to become competent in the specific domain that concerns you—an almost impossible goal.[175]

Such observations lend fundamental insights to our present understanding of Tafuri's work during the years corresponding to the establishment his *Dipartimento* (from 1982, the *Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura*).[176] Widening the scope of the departmental research programme, he invigorated in Venice those strands of his historical practice that had been independent (through intention or circumstance) of the image of the 'early' *Istituto*. His uninterrupted analysis of the conditions and tools proper to historical practice thus continued by means of the reconciliation of a geographical or institutional disruption, one largely responsible for the identification of his 'Venetian' practice. His work from the early 1980s might seem a break with the 'Venice School,' but this impression belongs firmly to his reception and is much more readily explained, with recourse to his bibliography and to the institutional history of *IUAV*, as evidence of an intellectual consolidation underpinning a mature reflection on historical practice. This reflection, in turn, has a long steady path, with seeds already planted in such apparently definitive works as *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and *Progetto e utopia*.

---

[174] Ibid., p. 48.

[175] Ibid., pp. 48-49.

[176] Tafuri was director of the *Dipartimento* until 1988, after which Paolo Morachiello assumed the directorship until 1993. Since then (and thus since Tafuri's death), the *Dipartimento* has been chaired by Ennio Concina (1993-1994) and Francesco Dal Co (until 2002). Morachiello is again director.—http://www.iuav.it/Ricerca1/Dipartimen/dSa/index.htm (accessed October 23, 2005).

By the mid-1970s, and especially after the three books published in 1973, the 'Venice School' was available for imitation as a formula, readily invoked and often replicated to varying degrees across the span of the decade. This phenomenon escalated with Tafuri's expanding profile in North America, through Eisenman and *Oppositions*, and in France, through Bernard Huet and *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*. Whatever Tafuri's own intentions to keep disciplinary *argomenti* as open and critical as possible, the capacity to abstract out and mimic the resultant image of his historical method demonstrated the potential for his those intentions to circumvent the rigour imposed upon them, tending towards their inverse. He thus recognises the inbuilt predilection of methods to suffer the fate of the Vienna School's own 'rigorous' study of art, the problematic long term repercussions of which he raises as a basic disciplinary problem for both architecture and criticism from as early as 1968. The haphazard pattern of translations of Tafuri's work into English, French, Spanish, Dutch, Portuguese, German and other languages over the course of the 1970s and 1980s comprised a 'red herring' for those who sought to understand his thinking on architecture and history purely from those books and essays available in any single language outside of Italian. It was not at all clear from these 'trajectories,' for instance, the nature of the provisional balance that he had (eventually) found between archival, ideological and institutional analyses.[177] From the late 1970s onwards, those 'reading Tafuri,' in particular through English translations, failed largely to grasp that his archival research practices, concerned principally with the period from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, comprised an uninterrupted thread of his apparently multifarious historical practice, neither an aberration nor a retreat (as it has hitherto been understood). For instance, many readers saw the first chapter of *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980), an essay on Giovan Battista Piranesi, as a 'return' to figures from *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and *Progetto e utopia*; the long-term and active interest in Piranesi's lessons for historical practice escaped most of these readers, as did the close proximity of *La sfera e il labirinto* to the 1978 *anno piranesiano,* and his courses on Borromini (1978-1979), and Piranesi (1980-1981). The different critical trajectories formed by Tafuri's writing as it appeared in English, for example, or in French, Spanish or German, constantly deformed the reception of his thinking (itself constantly evolving) on historical method or the nature of evidence in architectural history. However, it remains virtually intact in his Italian bibliography, even if his Italian audience is rarely moved to consider this evidence in its entirety.[178]

---

[177] We must observe, though, that the trajectory of Spanish translations of Tafuri's work holds closest to a 'true' cross section of his bibliography. It is no coincidence, then, that Víctor Pérez Escolano compiled the 1994 Tafuri bibliography for *Arquitectura*, Escolano having been key in introducing Tafuri's work to Spain and South America.—Víctor Pérez Escolano, 'Manfredo Tafuri (1935-1994). Un ensayo de bibliographía,' *Arquitectura*, no. 300 (1994): 90-94; 'Me-moraie Economium,' *Arquitectura*, no. 300 (1994): 85-89.

[178] We are disappointed that Biraghi, for instance, does not activate the notion of 'contemporaneity' in its wider (Benjaminian) sense. Given the title, we might have encountered the question of how historical practice in a present moment faces its own contemporaneity (a question that brings us closely to the case of Benjamin, to which we will return). However (and despite its uses as a synthesis of this material), the book is myopically preoccupied with Tafuri's writing on 'contemporary architecture,' comprising a lengthy prelude to his ultimate thesis, namely Tafuri's 'fulfilment' in Koolhaas.

While we are obliged to regard with a high degree of cynicism the periodisation of Tafuri's academic career, we can also perceive strategic advantages in a programmatic reconfiguration of his research practice both at institutional and at bibliographical levels. His apparent 'withdrawal' from the identifiable values and research fields of the formalised 'Venice School' consequently allows for the continuation of his disciplinary analyses of architectural history, its corpus, limits and practices, unburdened by an historiographical rule against which we can measure the publication of his research. As we have already argued, the seemingly renewed vigour with which he treated the architectural history of the *quattrocento* and *cinquecento* from the early 1980s until his death does not constitute a vast shift in either his thinking on the nature of historical evidence or on the responsibilities and vicissitudes of historical practice. This does not alter, though, our wider observation that from the mid-1970s, he started work on a number of new projects that established some clear distance between his work and that of his 'early,' 'Venetian' colleagues, notwithstanding the increasing involvement of Howard Burns at *IUAV* or his collaborations with Antonio Foscari. He was increasingly concerned with such crucial historiographical issues as periodisation, historical evidence and analysis of artistic *œuvres*, this comprising a refinement of his more general interest in the 'target' of 'architectural ideology' that occupies the pages of *Progetto e utopia* and *L'architettura dell'umanesimo*. In fact, he turns a form of ideological critique against his own practices as an architectural historian, enacting an advanced critique of historiographical 'ideology.'[179] In a series of projects centred around figures and sites prominent in the history of the Venetian, Tuscan and Roman Renaissance, he systematically addressed a nineteenth century historiographical classification increasingly prevalent as a subject in his writing from the early 1980s. This formed the basis for a deeper enquiry into both the earliest moments of the modern era, one he considered bound up in processes of historical and architectural representation, as we shall seen in a later chapter. His research drew him into new collaborations with scholars of the *Bibliotheca Hertziana* and the *Accademia nazionale 'San Luca'* in Rome, as well as with the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* at Vicenza. It does not represent a shift in the historical 'periods' with which he was concerned, as many suggest. Rather, these new projects extend his observations on the nature and functions of 'values' in architectural culture, isolating them more clearly within the critical space of the historical *intermezzo* between the past and present. In writing on the *novecento*, and on the historical avant-garde in particular, the proximity of past ideologies to present nostalgias, wrapped up in judgements of the modern movement, too readily lent form to the future.

❧

---

179 As we read in 'Il "progetto" storico,' the notion of *la critica dell'ideologia* assumes more complicated dimensions for Tafuri from the mid-1970s.—Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Casabella*, no. 429 (October 1977): 11-18.

To make this series of observations, though, is not to reinforce the widely perceived idea of Tafuri's segregation from his Venetian colleagues commencing in the early 1980s. Indeed, just as his historiography increasingly demonstrates distinctions between his work and that of the other 'Venetians' on superficial grounds, the philosophical imperatives underpinning his ongoing work of rethinking architectural history as a disciplinary practice remain intimately bound to the work of two figures whose presence in Venice continues to exert an ongoing influence: Massimo Cacciari and Franco Rella. Cacciari's role at Venice and his intellectual relationship with Tafuri have already received a great deal of attention elsewhere, and for this reason, we turn to explore Rella's contribution in more detail in a later chapter. Tafuri encountered Cacciari during the months preceding his commencement at *IUAV*. Cacciari, a former student of Negri, was co-editor of the politico-cultural journals *Angelus novus* and *Contropiano*. Reflecting upon his specific role as a philosopher among a community of architectural historians, Tafuri notes that he brought to Venice a set of tools that enabled them to *negotiate* with bourgeois culture rather than to *negate* it. The imperatives of Tronti's *critica dell'ideologia*, in such terms, translate into Erasmus's "ruminato of the evangelist." Through Cacciari, he suggests, it was possible to see that "the ideological is actually all that remains of culture."[180] Tafuri recalls of his first seminar, on Marx's *Kapital*:

> I don't think I've ever witnessed such a violent demolition of that sacred monster: Cacciari demonstrated that between the first and third books of *Capital* lies an abyss of choices, and that Marx found it impossible to decide because of the various problems he encountered. Cacciari entered deeply into the economic problems, of course. In this construction, Marx was simply a 19th-century historian with strong historiographic intuitions. This was, for us, a manifestation of the critique of ideology.[181]

While Tafuri, Cacciari and the intellectuals grouped around them sought to identify, from the late 1960s, the interconnections between architectural history and other historical specialisms—technological, economic, political—they noted the danger of claiming all histories for a broad disciplinary view of architecture's past. "It was this that forced us to shatter the edifice of the discipline … to bring everything together in a single construction."[182] In seeing the disciplinary problem as an issue of tools and tasks, the question of historical representation as perceived by Tafuri is central to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and endures for many years afterwards. It is later reinforced through his collaborations with Rella, ultimately manifest in the refined theoretical lines of *Ricerca del rinascimento*, which reveals his preoccupation from the mid-1970s with representation,

---

180   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 69.

181   Ibid.—Karl Marx, *Das Kapital* (1867, Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1962).

182   Tafuri, ibid., pp. 59-60.

in terms (if not, ultimately, in concepts) that visibly shift from the time that Tafuri and Rella co-teach a seminar on 'language' during the 1976-1977 academic year.

While we will later consider the consequences of their work together, it is important to compare the claim laid by many commentators that Tafuri withdrew into a scholastic world of Renaissance scholarship; the withdrawal coinciding with the timing of Tafuri beginning his most explicit and complex engagement with contemporary thought. That this is absorbed within a disciplinary historical practice and not in a body of writing otherwise available to an abstract, pseudo-disciplinary theoretical discourse centred on architecture is doubtless one reason why his bibliography from the mid-1970s onwards is readily presented as a retreat. If 1973 marks, with *La città americana* and *Progetto e utopia*, the graduation of the 'Venice School' replete with identifiable and communicable disciplinary form, then 1977 (less than five years later) manifests the earliest fruits of an encounter with two specific debates. The first of these is contemporaneous: Carlo Ginzburg's conditional return, with *microstoria*, to the *Annales* and to the 'minor' document. This 'new' approach bursts upon the scene in 1975 with his *Giochi di pazienza*, written with Adriano Prosperi. Its widespread appeal as an approach to historical problems and to the document in historical practice—not to mention Ginzburg's compelling writing style—quickly sees the codification of *Microstoria* as a book series produced by the intellectual publishing house of Einaudi, edited by Ginzburg and fellow historian Giovanni Levi.[183]

The second discourse is that of *il pensiero debole* ('weak thought'). A fully fledged discourse by the early 1980s, it was predicated on philosophical debates emerging during the 1970s. The banner of *il pensiero debole* drew together a large number of Italian thinkers concerned with the limits of rationality, including Rella, as we have seen, but also Cacciari, Gianni Vattimo (who named it in the title of his own significant book, co-written with Pier Aldo Rovatti) and others.[184] The extent to which Tafuri belongs properly alongside these figures remains debatable, as further writing will disclose. While not visibly present in the key indices of either historiography or philosophy as pertinent to the wider development of intellectual discourse in late-1970s Italy, the degrees of separation between Tafuri's writing and the primary debates are extremely slight. However, immediate applications of the tenets of *il pensioro debole* made to a domain of historical practice informed by Ginzburg (and, in parallel with Ginzburg's own reflections upon the histories of institutions, power and mentalities, of the new strategies emerging in historical practice in France and Italy, and of the relationship between 'clues' and 'evidence),' are important as demonstrations of a central problem for debates on realism and history. Furthermore, insofar as they grapple with the vital

---

[183] Carlo Ginzburg and Adriano Prosperi, *Giochi di paziena. Un seminario sul 'Benefico sul Cristo'* (Turin: Einaudi, 1975). Other works by Ginzburg from this moment include *Il formaggio e i vermi. Un cosmo di un mugnaio del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1976) and 'Spie. Radici di un paradigma indiziario,' *Crisi della ragione. Nuovi modelli nel rapporto tra sapere e attivita umane*, ed. Aldo Gargani (Turin: Einaudi, 1979), pp. 57-106.

[184] Gianni Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti, *Il pensiero debole* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1984); Gargani, ed., ibid.; 'Il pensiero debole,' special issue, *aut aut*, no. 201 (May-June 1984); 'Les philosophes italien par eaxmêmes,' special issue, *Critique. Revue générale des publications français et étrangers*, nos. 425-453 (1987).

problem of historiographical distance from a productive practice, Tafuri offers a great deal to this debate that is yet to be widely acknowledge.

In his classic essay 'Il "progetto" storico' (1977), Tafuri notes that it is one of two reflections upon the seminar conducted with Rella, mentioned above; Rella's is entitled 'Il paradosso della ragione' (also 1977).[185] Treating Tafuri's essay as documentation of collaborative research, or at least a parallel study of the same questions, aligns him directly to debates being played out principally through *aut aut*. Although this invites further discussion, for the purpose of forming an introduction to our study it is useful to note the complex translation that takes place between an earlier 'version' of Tafuri's 'Il "progetto" storico,' entitled 'Architettura e storiografia' (1975) and its later form.[186] Essentially, Tafuri's argument for the functions of architectural history within architectural culture remains unchanged from the basic positions plotted out in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, though the terms of the argument evolve, as we might expect, to account for new thinking, theoretical refinement, and the changes that inevitably affect internal disciplinary 'languages.' With the 1977 essay, we witness the emergence of an entirely new field of referents for Tafuri. Some, like Foucault, already appear in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, but their association with a generation of thinkers including Derrida and Deleuze, Lacan, a post-linguistic-turn Freud, Nietzsche (in the 'nihilist' vein of Cacciari's readings), and others is an advance from his frames of reference earlier in the decade. And so while Tafuri, after 1973, publishes several essays that later appear in *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980), from 1977 his work (we propose) lays claim to a seat at a table of broader theoretical debate, just as his *Dipartimento* calls for increasing academic authority (and accountability) within *IUAV*. There is little coincidence that this year sees Tafuri, Cacciari, Georges Teyssot and Rella welcome Foucault to Venice, even if the welcoming spirit is rapidly eroded by basic intellectual differences.[187]

If this explicit take-up of an emergent philosophical discussion is briefly manifest in a new field of theoretical referents, then the work that follows this blip on Tafuri's bibliographical radar takes on renewed significance when seen from the perspective of an historical practice informed by a new, local debate on rationality. Interestingly, Tafuri continues to endorse a model whereby theoretical activity, as a disciplinary border condition, forms the target (though not the subject) of historical enquiry. Simultaneously, he refines his *definition* of disciplinary ideology to account for a more nuanced understanding of critico-historical judgement, rationality and the role of value in the organisation of thought. He consequently adjusts the language of his assault from that of 'theory as ideology' to that of 'theory as reason'; as such, his attention returns,

---

[185] Franco Rella, 'Il paradosso della ragione,' *aut aut*, no. 60 (1977): 107-111.

[186] Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia. Una proposto di metodo,' *Arte veneta* XXIX (1975): 276-282

[187] Franco Rella, ed., *Il dispositivo Foucault* (Venice: CLUVA, 1977). The book contains essays by Georges Teyssot ('Eterotopia e storia degli spazi,' pp. 23-36), Tafuri, 'Lettura del testo e practiche discorsive,' pp. 37-46), Rella ('Un'economia politica del corpo,' pp. 47-56) and Cacciari ('Il problema del politico in Deleuze e Foucault (sul pensiero di "Autonomia" e di "Gioco",' pp. 57-66).

though in more subtle terms, to the relationship between the past, its representation in the present as history, and its projection into the future as historicised theory.

Several of his late 1970s publications index his preoccupation with the analytical devices available to the historian for studying the architectural or theoretical *œuvre*. We can read his studies on Piranesi as a bridge between these explicit concerns with ideological systems in later modernity and the representational conditions to which modern architecture is subject, but we would have to acknowledge (as we will argue) that Tafuri regards Piranesi equally as an historical object of study, and as an exemplar of historical practice. He does not set aside writing on the contemporary after this moment (as some have speculated), any less than he spontaneously and inexplicably 'takes up' the Renaissance as a theme from this point onwards. His writing from the later 1970s includes studies on Vienna, eventually published as *Vienna rossa* (1978, 1980), Giuseppe Terragni (1978), the history of Soviet architecture (1978, in collaboration with Cohen and De Michelis) and Dutch architecture to 1940 (1979). He produces essays on Vittorio Gregotti ('L'avventure dell'oggetto,' 1979) and Massimo Scolari (1980), reflects on the recent history of theoretical debate in architecture concerned with the city (1979), and recounts the history of Italian architecture since 1944, an encyclopaedic essay later republished and expanded as the important (if problematic) reference, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*.[188]

Yet from that same moment, his studies into 'Venice' and the 'Renaissance,' on the *œuvres* of Raffaello, Michelangelo, Alberti, Sansovino, Romano, Francesco di Giorgio, Palladio and other major figures of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, expose various historiographical challenges that continue his interrogation of the aims and devices of historical practice as described in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and elaborated in 'Il "progetto" storico.' Tafuri's concerns with the later modern era may have called for a more engaged, theoretically explicit historiography, but his writing on the modern movement and contemporary architecture, on ideological systems implicating architecture since the eighteenth century, and on other such topics that dominate his bibliography until

---

188 Tafuri, 'Vienna, capitale della "finis Austriae",' *Le città capitale nel XX secolo*, ed. Mario Manieri-Elia (Milan: F. Fabri, 1978), pp. 24-27; '"Das Rote Wien". Politica e forma della residenza nella Viena socialista, 1919-1933,' *Vienna rossa*, pp. 7-148; 'Avant-garde et formalisme entre la Nep et la premier plan quinquennal,' *URSS 1917-1978. La città, l'architettura / La ville, l'archtecture*, eds. Tafuri, Jean-Louis Cohen and Marco De Michelis (Rome: Officina; Paris: L'esquerre, 1979), pp. 16-92; 'Olanda, Weimar, Vienna,' *Architettura socialdemocrazia Olanda 1900-1940*, eds. Tafuri, Giorgio Ciucci, Giorgio Muratore and Pieter Singelenberg (Venice: Arsenale, 1979), pp. 11-18; 'Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and "Mask",' *Oppositions*, no. 11 (1977): 1-25; also published as 'Il soggetto e la maschera. Una introduzione a Terragni,' *Lotus*, no. 20 (September 1978): 5-31; and in *La Casa del fascio di Como*, by Peter Eisenman (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1978); also in Eisenman, *Guseppe Terragni*, ibid., pp. 273-293; in reduced form in *Giuseppe Terragni. La casa del fascio*, eds. L. Ferraio and D. Pastore (Rome: Istituto Mides, 1982), pp. 55-60; 'Le avventure dell'oggetto. Architetture e progetti di Vittorio Gregotti,' *Il progetto per l'Università delle Calabrie e altre architetture di Vittorio Gregotti / The Project for Calabria University and other architectural works by Vittorio Gregotti* (Milan: Electa, 1981), pp. iv-xviii; 'The Watercolours of Massimo Scolari,' *Massimo Scolari. Architecture between Memory and Hope* (New York: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980), pp. 2-15; 'Main Lines of the Great Theoretical Debate over Architecture and Urban Planning 1960-1977,' *A + U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 100 (January 1979): 133-154; reprinted in *A + U*, no. 365 (January 2001); 'Architettura italiana, 1944-1981,' *Storia dell'arte italiana*, ibid., pp. 425-550.

(approximately) 1980, are quickly dwarfed by a long list of studies confronting the 'Renaissance' in (ironically) no uncertain terms, its momentum extending from the early 1960s and reaching full velocity by this time. As a shift in subject, as we have seen, this development was far from radical. Already in the late 1960s, Tafuri was in close contact with Wittkower and James Ackerman, even visiting Wittkower in 1970, as noted above.[189] His studies on the architecture of mannerism and humanism remain widely read and cited within the field of Renaissance historical scholarship.[190] His work elaborated a new way of conceiving the relationships that separate present from past, of the status of memory, mentality, documents and institutions. He produces a long series of studies that, while well-known to scholars of the long Renaissance (even if perceived as overly 'theoretical') attract little attention from those apparently claiming a strong interest in Tafuri's 'ideas.'[191] The principal research projects that mark the final decade of his life include *L'armonia e i conflitti* (1983, with Antonio Foscari), *Venezia e il rinascimento*, and *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992).[192] In addition, they include three significant exhibition projects, for *Raffaello architetto* (1985), *Giulio Romano* (1989), and *Francesco di Giorgio* (1993) in collaboration with an international community of scholars.[193] In 1984, Tafuri's *Dipartimento* began offering the *dottorato di ricerca*.[194] From this time, he was increasingly concerned with doctoral teaching, his research students overwhelmingly preoccupied upon the study of the early modern period. This development comprises a trajectory from that which is perceived proper to the quintessential 'Venice School,' but remains, nonetheless, inextricable from these 'early' efforts. As Tafuri was increasingly engaged with Renaissance and Baroque scholarship, his close colleagues continued to publish insightful and now refential studies on later modernity: Ciucci's work on Italian fascism; Dal Co and De Michelis on the relationship between architecture and philosophy in early twentieth century Germany.[195]

[189] While Wittkower's relationship with Tafuri was cut short by the former's death, Ackerman continued after Tafuri's own death to reflect on his own relationship with the Roman scholar— James Ackerman, 'In Memoriam,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 2 (June 1994): 137-138.

[190] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 53.

[191] Given the long build-up to the publication of the English edition, *Interpreting the Renaissance*, we anticipate that this book will go a long way to rectify this inequality in Tafuri's contemporary Anglo-American audiences, as Joan Ockman predicted over a decade ago.

[192] Tafuri and Antonio Foscari, *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983).

[193] Tafuri, Christoph L. Frommel and Stefano Ray, eds., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1984); Tafuri, Ernst Gombrich, et al., eds., *Giulio Romano*, (Milan: Electa, 1989); Tafuri and Francesco Paolo Fiore, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993).

[194] The first cycle of doctoral students in history of architecture began in 1984, the second in 1986. The programme was co-taught between the *Dipartmento* at Venice and the *Facoltà di lettere* at the *Università di Padova*, a collaboration lasting until 1989. The programme, lead by Tafuri, involved several members of the *Dipartimento*, as well as sustained contact with Lionello Puppi at Padua and Howard Burns, then at Harvard University.—Tafuri, Introduction to *La piazza, la chiesa, il parco. Saggi di storia dell'architettura, XV-XIX secolo* (Milan: Electa, 1991), p. 8.

[195] The now seminal works to which we refer include Ciucci, *Gli architetti e il fascismo. Architettura e città, 1922-1944* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983) and Marco De Michelis, *Heinrich Tessenow, 1876-1950* (Milan: Electa, 1991). We refer also to Dal Co's *Abitare nel moderno* and *Teorie del moderno*, referenced above.

To return to 1977 and to a closer reading of the Passerini interview: Tafuri recalls that the late 1970s also marked the beginning of his second psychoanalysis, his first course having concluded around 1967. In conversation with Passerini, he regards this second analysis as referential for what he called his own scholarly *rinascimento*: "Well, I felt reborn after my analysis, and the only topic that interested me at that point was the Renaissance."[196] Without consider this biographical episode at length, for the moment, it is useful to note the terms in which he characterises this 'change.' With explicit reference to his second course of psychoanalysis, he says that his interest in the contemporary was shaped by the 'problem' of understanding the question of 'origin.' "My spirit tended very much toward the contemporary world in order to understand where we come from, where we are, where we are going."[197] This engendered, he suggests, a view of Renaissance scholarship as a deeper analysis of the origins of *modernity* than the historical study solely of its affects in the twentieth century: "But while I was studying the Renaissance … the relationship between that period and our present situation became increasingly clear. I began to connect many threads around this time, the late 1970s and early 1980s."[198] Under the terms of this 'new phase,' Heidegger re-emerges as an important referent for Tafuri, after several decades' hiatus, through the 'question of technology' and the differentiation of technique from representation.[199] Inviting Heidegger into the Renaissance, he gives the example of religious paintings that raise issues of representation and agency through inclusion of symbols of patronage.

> There were also architects, painters and sculptors who, in rare moments revealed that they were the unwilling accomplices of their patrons, and had the humility to make manifest a concept that is totally contrary to the violence of the age of representation, the age in which the world was submitted to a representational grid—instead of the Palazzo Farnese, ordinary housing that is not recognisable in the urban fabric of Rome. That is, the acceptance of a language, no, a totally foreign dialect that only the deracinated can speak. In my case it was Jacopo Sansovino with a strongly Roman or Bramantesque inflection.[200]

---

196 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 61.

197 Ibid.

198 Ibid.

199 Tafuri refers to the example of Piero della Francesca: "But what did the age of representation mean to art? … I compared Piero's "Madonna di Senigallia" with computer technology because it represented a progressive revelation of the mundane nature of the world. This the dominance of calculable grids, which translate everything into mathematical terms."—Ibid.

200 Ibid., p. 62. Besides his books *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* and *L'armonia e i con-flitti* (with Antonio Foscari, as noted above), Tafuri wrote a great deal on Sansovino from the late 1960s.—Tafuri, 'Sansovino "versus" Palladio,' as noted above; 'Un progetto irrealizzato di Jacopo San-sovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani sul Canal Grande,' with Antonio Foscari, *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* XXVI (1981): 71-87, published also in *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, no. 15 (1981): 69-82; 'Evangelismo e architettura. Jacopo Sansovino e la chiesa di S. Maria a Venezia,' with Foscari, *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* 1982, nos. 1-4: 34-54; 'Sebastiano da Lugano, i Grimani e Jacopo Sansovino.

Writing on Piranesi's *Campo Marzio* (1765) in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' he describes monuments as 'exceptions' in an historical field, which in turn disturb the past as an homogeneous image. The consternation of grand histories through the unpredictable operation of deconstructive catalysts is more and more a challenge sought out in the later years of his practice. The constant contraposition of 'sphere' and 'labyrinth' in his research on Renaissance artistic production and its contexts informs a complex dialectical model. Therein, the centre retains power as an abstract notion that, while indefensible in ultimate terms, is nonetheless unable to be approximated by the labyrinth (as Benjamin suggested, Tafuri recalls). Thus he tempers absolutes, for which the sphere stands as an archetypal platonic form, with the means of their complication, inherent to that same 'absolute.' Yet those means are not themselves a phenomenon without 'centre.'[201] Reading the 'labyrinth' thus, he suggests, lead him to a notion of the centre's *inversion* rather than its rejection: "I believe that the theme of history as a grand construct of many histories was a turning point for me around 1979 or 1980."[202] Practicing neither a history dominated by the meta-narratives, nor a post-structuralist emancipation of the suppressed, his preoccupation with historical *minutiae* called at once for a profound knowledge of the work and a clear understanding of the terms of its provisionality. It is possible, he asserts, to locate an object "in relation to the biography of the designer, the market for the object, the mode of distribution, using the instruments of economic and productive history," but the object itself "amounts to more than all of this."[203] The architectural historian, consequently, is responsible for knowing the subject intimately, and then being able to implicate those fields in which he or she cannot claim direct expertise. Thus, within the 'labyrinth' of potential knowledge, the work occupies a centre, whether the work is defined as a building, drawing, as correspondence, or as sketches of any other 'artefact' of architectural culture. Its analysis, as an object capable of being known—even if provisionally—on its own terms and in all its many contexts, required skills in direct danger of being lost. "Only good healthy Germans could recognise the date of a drawing by means of analysing the artist's handwriting."[204]

Artisti e committenti nella chiesa di S Antonio di Castello,' with Foscari, *Arte veneta* XXXVI (1982): 100-123; 'Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e Jacopo Sansovino. Un conflitto professionale nella Roma medicea,' *Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane. La vita e l'opera. Atti del XXII congresso di storia dell'architettura, Roma, Febbraio 19-21, 1986,* ed. G. Spagnesi, (Rome: Centro studi per la storia dell'architettura, 1986), pp. 76-99; 'Palazzo Dolfin a San Salvador. Un'opera ibrida di Jacopo Sansovino,' *Venezia e la Roma dei Papi* (Milan: Electa, 1987), pp. 143-170; 'Il disegno di Chatsworth (per il palazzo Ducale di Venezia?) e un progetto perduto di Jacopo Sansovino,' *Andrea Palladio. Nuovi contributi. Atti del VII seminario internazionale di storia dell'architettura, Vicenza, Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio,' Settembre 1-7, 1988,* eds. A. Castel and R. Cevese (Milan: Electa, 1990), pp. 100-111; 'Raffaello, Jacopo Sansovino e la facciata di S. Lorenzo a Firenze,' *Annali di architettura. Rivista del CISA 'Andrea Palladio,'* no. 2 (1990): 24-44; 'Giulio Romano e Jacopo Sansovino,' *Giulio Romano. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su 'Giulio Romano e l'espansione europea del rinascimento,' Mantova, Palazzo Ducale, Teatro scientifico del Bibiena, Ottobre 1-5, 1989* (Mantua: Accademia nazionale virgiliana, 1991), pp. 75-108.

201 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' ibid.

202 Ibid., pp. 62-63.

203 Ibid., p. 63.

204 Ibid.

The collaborations that followed Tafuri's pursuit of a rigorous philology of the artefact in his practice—his own description of his efforts of the 1980s—sought to bypass the disciplinary and institutional politics implicated in direct research exchanges, and to identify projects on which a diverse group of people could contribute without losing the identity of their respective disciplinary specialities or institutional 'signatures.'

> I developed the idea that through some concrete projects it would be possible to effect a dual operation: first to conquer Italian provincialism, second to encourage collaborations among students who had never worked together. One could set up an international scientific society that would continue to facilitate communication and collaboration. So, I took advantage of the Italian system (deaths, births, centennials of major artists and architects) to hold meetings.[205]

Tafuri regards as the most important consequence of these efforts the inclusion of Hertziana researchers in Italian scholarship. This claim seems strange, especially given the dominance of Wittkower, Lotz, Frommel, Thoenes, and other giants of the German tradition over Roman architectural historiography. He explains, though, that Rome had taken "an almost Sicilian attitude" towards this community.[206] ("In Rome I even had to justify myself coming from Venice."[207]) While he acknowledged the vast methodological differences separating his work from that of the German art historians in Rome, he also understood how he could "be more like them …. It shouldn't be the case that philology should be done by one scholar and history by another."[208] Starting from Raffaello (Urbino 1483-Rome, 1520), they collaborated upon an exhibition and book (1984) that just missed the quincentennial of his birth. They turned then to the corpi of Giulio, Francesco di Giorgio, and Antonio da Sangallo il giovane, using the institutional vehicles of the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* at Vicenza and the *Centre d'étude supérieurs de la renaissance* at Tours. Their scientific journal *Annali di architettura* continued in the tradition of *CISA*'s *Bollettino*, which included both documentation of scholarly research and reflection upon methodology with respect of the study of Renaissance and Baroque architecture.[209]

❖

---

205 He cites, as an example, an exhibition of Rafaello-influenced seventeenth-century French paintings with Renato Nicolini and Nello Ponente at the Villa Medici.—Ibid. We ought, too, note the *homage Questo*, which takes account of Tafuri's respect as an historian for the objects of his study and for his renewed emphasis on drawing as a mode of critical knowledge and analysis.—Anna Bedon, Guido Beltramini and Howard Burns, eds., *Questo. Disegni e studi di Manfredo Tafuri per la riconstruzione di edifice e contesti urbani rinascimentali / Celui ci. Dessins et études de Manfredo Tafuri pour la restitution d'édifices et de contexts urbains de la Renaissance* (Vicenza: Centro Internazionale di Studi di Architettura 'Andrea Palladio,' 1995).

206 Ibid., p. 64.

207 Ibid.

208 Ibid.

209 Ibid.

That these activities necessitated, for Tafuri, an extension of the 'original' project of the *Istituto* is clear. In teaching, too, he says he came to realise that the highly intellectual nature of his history courses, despite their popularity and importance for the faculty at Venice, did not provide a sufficiently honed technical education for those students concerned with building conservation, preservation and restoration, the destination of a vast majority of history-specialists from the Italian architecture faculties.[210] "These grand intellectual constructions should be addressed to my colleagues who are historians in other disciplines, rather than my students, who in any case will need to know very well how a building was made in order not to make errors in the practice of conservation."[211] Bearing in mind these technical considerations, an historical education in architecture required (he suggests) knowledge of the societal, economic and religious factors bringing buildings into being, as well as of those factors standing in defiance of their realisation. However, there is also, he recalls, another kind of knowledge, based on "a very specific philology in the material product itself." A brick from ancient Rome, he cites as an example, "carries a date stamp. With a wall from the 11th century, the situation becomes far more complex."[212] Likewise knowing how to tell an original drawing from a copy:

> Copying was done using very simple techniques. Students must know them. You take the paper and see if there are needle holes, because to transfer a drawing from one sheet to another … needles were used. You have to be careful not to confuse a needle hole with the hole made by the point of a compass. You need good eyes, a certain sensibility.[213]

This 'sensibility' thus played out in two specific particular forms of philological knowledge: of the artefact and of documents. To this he adds knowledge of institutions, because the structural framing of both artefacts and documents remains inherently important to their status in the present, as extant artefacts, documented demolitions, etc. However, he mourns that students were no longer able to *see* the things before them. "There is a terrible prevalence of literacy in a world that is entirely based on vision."[214] Speaking to Passerini in 1992, he characterised his teaching as a 'mission,' engineering an encounter between students and the material of their study, "into the closest proximity with the brick, the plaster, the cladding, the *peperino*, a recognition of the difference between

53

---

[210] For Tafuri's thoughts on these themes, cf. Tafuri, 'Storia, conservazione, restauro,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Chiara Baglione and Bruno Pedretti, *Casabella*, no. 580 (July 1991): 23-26; republished in *Il progetto del passato. Memoria, conservazione, restauro, architettura*, ed. Pedretti (Milan: Bruno Mondadori, 1997), pp. 85-100; 'Storia e restauro. Il caso di Palazzo Te a Mantova,' special issue, 'L'Istituto centrale del restauro per Palazzo Te,' ed. Elisabetta Guiducci, Loredana Francescone and Elisabetta Diana Valente, *Bolletino d'arte* (September 1992) (Rome: Ministerio per i beni culturali e ambientali; Ufficio centrale per i beni ambientali, architettonici, archaeologici, artisti e storici, 1994), pp. 1-15.

[211] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' ibid.

[212] Ibid.

[213] Ibid., p. 65.

[214] Ibid., p. 66.

one or another kind of *peperino*."[215] This imperative ("I have a notion of transmission that is for me very strong"[216]) extends well beyond his study of early modern architects and themes, operating as a metaphor for how historical contradictions coexist within a field. The avant-garde in *fin-de-siècle* Vienna (one of the last subjects of his history seminar), presented 'grand compositions' that were, in themselves, rife with internal contradiction.

> When Klimt painted a portrait of Wittgenstein's sister, he imagined an architecture like that of Loos, and Wittgenstein himself practiced architecture only once, for the same sister Klimt had painted …. I wanted to show that there isn't so much an identity as a strong relationship between a symphony of Mahler, a painting of Klimt, and the early Wittgenstein, and that this had a bearing on the mature architecture of Otto Wagner, who preserves both the sense of the fragment and of the solidity of grand composition.[217]

It is with this example that Tafuri begins to conclude. He moves quickly to a desolate reflection on the state of architectural culture in contemporary Italy, noting how the weight placed upon architectural theory education and historiography *per se* retards the development of basic 'competencies.' "I am not interested," he says, "in a student full of grand ideas on how to construct history." Rather, "I prefer one who can calculate the layers of a structure built after the war, never forgetting that the cement ties are better than wooden ties."[218] This may appear mundane, especially in light of Tafuri's forceful critique of thirty years before. (It also sends a very clear warning to ourselves, largely ignored here!) However, this particular attention to details, beyond the force of 'ideas,' is capable of fulfilling a function of history crucial to his long-standing arguments for the terms of disciplinary practice.

> Like a medieval scholar copying the writings of Isodore of Seville, making copious notes, we keep transcribing the manuscripts to preserve them, because human destiny is so dubious. This is perhaps fortunate, because the historian is always glad when no destiny is prefigured.
> One of the most emotional scenes in Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* comes at the end, after the burning of the books, when everyone recites Dante, Goethe, Thomas Mann. The crucial question of transmission is portrayed as a tormented one. But I see it like that.[219]

---

[215] Ibid., p. 67.
[216] Ibid.
[217] Ibid., p. 68.
[218] Ibid., p. 69.
[219] Ibid.

Tafuri died in Venice on February 23, 1994, suffering a fatal heart attack after a long period of illness. Today he lies in the *Cimiterio acattolico e per gli stranieri* at Porta S. Paulo in Rome. His students commemorate him with a plaque at the entrance to Tolentini. In his *Dipartimento*, he is formally remembered by the 'lezione Manfredo Tafuri,' an annual lecture delivered in the 'aula Tafuri' at the Palazzo Badoer.[220]

❧

While this account of Tafuri's autobiography interlaces such supplementary 'evidence' as we can find from a cursory glance at his bibliography, or at either of the public records of his seminar topics at *IUAV*, the basic developments recalled above essentially convey Tafuri's personal reflection upon his intellectual evolution.[221] As an oral history constituting an autobiographical statement, it is no longer directly questionable as a record of memory. Therefore, the preceding pages make no claim on objectivity, drawing from his most subjective work to declare the sympathy of this study with the eyes of the producer rather than with those of his readers to date. We must, then, clarify an important distinction: in beginning a consideration of Tafuri's historiography from his own point of view lends weight (perhaps intentionally unbalanced) to the intentions of his subjective position. This is not to announce the commencement of a psychoanalytic historiography on our part; we are here concerned with something rather different. Indeed, we begin from coordinates that are Tafuri's own, even if these coincide with dominant threads of his reception. In teasing out these 'nodes,' we necessarily *depart* from his autobiography, probing the complexity of his claims relative to a body of bibliographical evidence. We thus expose Tafuri's historiographical thought to an analysis that treats his work, as 'material,' with the same degree of distrust as that which underpins his own approach towards the historical subject. Extending this intention even further, we can understand his 'autobiography' as a document evidencing the mechanisms of intentioned—dare we say operative—history; it is programmatic, rife with self-referentiality, infused with values operating metaphorically as ideologies. Ultimately, it presents us with a burden to excise rather than a true path to follow.

If we state this position too strongly at the outset, it is with good reason. The most recent directions in studies of Tafuri's thought and 'legacy' ritually pass through the filter of this account, prompting us to regard as necessary the problematisation of his 'self-explanation' of the basic terms of his historical practice. Since the mid-1980s, Tafuri's reception has been mediated by such important documents as his commemoration in *Casabella*, several thoughtful articles in *Assemblage* and *Zodiac*, as well as Joan Ockman's *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. They are useful, but each introduces new 'problems' to

55

---

220 The 'lezioni Tafuri' have so far been delivered by Carlo Ginzburg (1994), Raymond Klibansky (1996), Rafael Moneo (1997), Massimo Cacciari (1998), Paul Zankar (1999), Salvatore Settis (2000), James Ackerman (2001), Mario Tronti (2002), Franco Cordero (2003) and Pierre Gros (2005).—http://www.iuav.it/Ricerca1/Dipartimen/dSa/eventi/seminari--/Lezione-an/index.htm (accessed July 16, 2005).

221 Guerra and Tessari, ibid; Rosa, ibid., pp. 288-294.

Tafuri scholarship and new obstacles to reflecting clearly upon his historiographical thought, independent of his now undeniable place in the architectural theory canon. The widespread, enthusiastic and apparently unconditional response to Passerini's oral history of Tafuri—of which we are also naïvely guilty—appears to treat this document as unmediated access to his memory.[222] We may be regarding the problem with undue cynicism. However, supposing Tafuri's innocence as an interviewee, despite his (presumably) full knowledge of the privilege Passerini accords to individual subjectivities, we ignore his own long experience as an historical researcher and his complete, if implicit, acceptance that the reflections recorded therein will form the subject of enquiry, sooner or later. Already before his death, *IUAV laurea* Carla Keyvanian defended her master's thesis at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the critical relationship between Tafuri, Barthes and Benjamin, implicating the later import of Carlo Ginzburg to his historiography. Tafuri surely anticipated the questions that researchers might bring to his 'corpse,' and understood the limited opportunities that remained for him to control the terms of his memorialisation. He indicated to Passerini that he did not have much time left, indeed living less than two years from the end of the interview. He had developed heart and lung difficulties, linked (he suggests) to his time in hiding during the German occupation of Rome.

Even setting aside anecdotes and such documentation or personal discussions as might shed further light on personal and private aspects of his final years, Tafuri's allusion to his own mortality in the context of this interview is available as a frame that can overlay this entire oral history. Passerini's record maintains a completely different status from a 'regular' interview for several interconnected reasons. She received her assignment to record Tafuri's oral history from the Getty Research Centre in Los Angeles under a broader project to collect oral histories of the most influential living art historians of the twentieth century. The list of people whose thoughts are on record as a result include many well-known scholars of art and architecture.[223] Tafuri's account was thus not destined for a journal or a newspaper, published in a timeframe allowing for response from those figures, past and present, to whom he refers therein. He would not have to face contradiction or have to revisit his claims in any way. Its destination was a library whose documentation and deposit processes could be relied upon to occupy a sufficiently substantial lapse of time before exposing the history to any public, normally constituting academic researchers, although the interview is in its published form now in wide circulation.[224] Even if Tafuri had in mind the *ANY* audience (which, given that it was already in print by 1992, is remotely possible, if very unlikely), we can safely assume that he anticipated a lengthy hiatus between the interview and its

---

[222] Cf. Biraghi's book, Hoekstra's and Sykes's doctoral dissertations, and our own essays from 2002 and 2003.

[223] Cf. n20 of this chapter.

[224] This is an informed assumption rather than a summary of documented conditions binding the interview's public life. In the oral history, Tafuri does not refer to a readership, but in contrast treats Passerini herself as the limit of his audience.

publication. At least, he might logically have anticipated a longer period of dormancy than if interviewed for *L'indice dei libri del mese*, *Casabella*, *Zodiac*, *Paese sera*, or any of the dozen or newspapers and monthly journals that record his thoughts on various occasions from the mid-1960s onwards. Consequently, in such a setting, we should perceive in Tafuri's 'honesty' a calculated risk in making deliberate and programmatic claims for key contextual influences, referential essays and thinkers, and abstract (if not causal) confluences between his biography and bibliography.

This observation does not precede an attempt to dismiss Tafuri's own recorded view on his scholarly life as either insignificant or irredeemably corrupt. However, it is important to note, even as we attend to its content, that Tafuri's autobiography has the capacity to operate as a sealed message. That his account is viewed as a principal, perhaps *the* most important, extra-bibliographical reference for scholars concerned with Tafuri's work today is sufficient cause to view it with misgiving. For as long as Tafuri is read either through his own eyes, or through those of his former students and devout disciples, it will be cast in a specific, and largely recoverable, subjectivity (as, by extension and inevitably, will this dissertation). However, treating the Passerini account as an element of Tafuri's bibliography would allow us to treat it as documentation of his methodological concerns: akin to, even if apparently quite different from, such texts as *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 'Il "progetto" storico' or *Ricerca del rinascimento*. Its content, also, retains importance for the very reasons that would ensure its relegation to either the completely subjective or the totally methodological; it is neither and both, and in this ambiguity retains the aura of a deliberately framed interpretational key intimately bound to autobiographical representation. The tone—honest, self-referential, self-searching, reconciliatory— distinctly echoes Passerini's 1988 psychoanalytically and contextually reflective *Autoritratto di gruppo*. In the relationship between Passerini as interviewer and Tafuri as her subject, both veterans of psychoanalysis, the interview is a model example of the carefully provoked open flow of language intrinsic to psychoanalytical procedure. Yet in contrast to Passerini's highly personal, naked (even) account of '1968,' Tafuri is calculatingly conscious of both his present and future audiences; he both charms and disarms, and for this reason we must treat with care the clues he leaves.[225]

---

[225] In taking this stance, we have found most useful Bart Verschaffel's essay 'Kleine theorie van het portret,' *De Witte Raaf*, no. 81 (1999): 1-5. We refer to the French edition, 'Théorie du portrait,' *Nature morte, portrait, paysage. Essais sur les genres en peinture*, by Bart Verschaffel, trans. Daniell Cunin (Brussels: La lettre volée, forthcoming 2006), [m/s] pp. 20-38. Verschaffel, here, writes of the mechanism of 're-semblance' in portraiture as one that divests the genre of the need to be 'truthful.' The face remains a final vestige of the personal while at once being that element most open to judgement as a 'similarity.' The eyes reassure us, he writes, that the portrait indexes a real life, thus legitimating the representation, while the face is its material and thus most subject to the vicissitudes of representational tradition. These 'permissions' irreparably divorce the depiction from that which it depicts, rendering it an independent phenomenon with its own imperatives and consequences: "Mais il a fallu du temps pour que ces représentations s'émancipent et que s'imposent des images qui ne traitaient qu'un seul individu, pour que les portraits acquièrent—littéralement—un réel format et un caractère semi-public."—p. 20. In the *autoritratto*, the subject's complicity with the techniques of their self-representation cancels out 'meaning' in the face, which is consequently untrustworthy. "Ce 'je'/visage dont tout le monde dit toujours la même chose et ne dit en fait rien! Le visage ne prouve rien. C'est un masque, et le masque un mensonge."—p. 32.

No representation of Tafuri's contribution to architectural culture, generally, and architectural historiography, specifically, can avoid introducing dislocations between the individual and his disciplinary presence. Even further, Tafuri as *someone* known to many, either central or peripheral to complicated personal, professional, intellectual and academic relationships in Italy and around the world, is necessarily different from the figure who presents *himself* to architectural culture as a writer, lecturer, jurist and editor. Naturally, disjunctions appear between his intentioned image and his perceived ('received') persona. Cultural, linguistic and disciplinary gulfs separate his work as understood in his native Italy and in the varied and widespread fields of its reception. We find many different 'Tafuris' in interviews, monographs, exhibition notes, polemics, practice records, lecture notes, recorded lectures, and in Passerini's oral history. Each manifestation is capable of signifying specific and, at times, rather different dimensions of his thought and of its relationship to whatever we might understand as 'truth.' Yet insofar as Tafuri indexes each image—projected, received and mediated—we must acknowledge a persistent reality in the biological continuity of Tafuri both as author *and* subject. We are also obliged to observe that each representation of Tafuri and his ideas, insofar as they are bound up in an 'image' of their author, is subject to representational conventions that dominate contemporary modes of understanding (any given contemporaneity, in fact) authorship on one hand, or biographical or historical causality on the other.

The self-portrait thus asks the viewer to judge it true or false, a conduit or a diversion; thus, the self-portrait is enigmatic. The Italian language conflates 'autobiography' and 'self-portrait' in *autoritratto*, a word introduced above with reference to Passerini's *Autoritratto di gruppo*. Tafuri, in writing the terms of his own biography, renders (to one extent or another) his image programmatic and his legacy preordained to the extent that we are obliged to follow the clues laid out in his 'final testament.' Our analysis requires that we acknowledge the difficulties of trusting this image in its entirety, without irony, while also admitting that the content of this *autoritratto* serves a number of purposes, both for ourselves and for Tafuri. It: reinstates continuities between his architectural and historical practice; claims the importance of an intellectual life over a political life; lays 'bare' the imperatives of his teaching, drawing together the modes of his 'publication' in the construction of a trajectory from research to dissemination. Yet for the selectivity of this source, we remain wary of leaning too heavily upon it as a final word.

❧

We thus meet a specific problem with respect to Tafuri's capacity to authorise an institutional or disciplinary 'legacy,' or indeed to provide his readers with loaded clues for analysing the same. On one hand, we are obliged to recognise the biological (if not biographical) continuity rendering Tafuri's life a single phenomenon, the bio-memorial condition allowing (for implicit reasons) Tafuri to treat his own memories with intimacy. This observation is perhaps both ridiculous and redundant, but it leads us to a converse

point: Tafuri's memories also constitute an intentioned, functional image (self-portrait) closely bound to the secondary image of his 'legacy' (the proliferation of portraits alluded to at the beginning of this chapter). By submitting his memories in the specific setting of Passerini's commission to record an oral history for the Getty—incorporating *his* recollections, *his* version of events, *his* interpretations of personal decisions and *his* characterisations of relationships with other people and institutions—Tafuri turns his 'legacy' over to institutional property. He thus cognitively renders himself subject to the power and knowledge hierarchies that we have come to perceive, after some decades of exposure, at work in such relationships, not least (and not only) through our reading of Tafuri's studies on Venice and her architects. In other words, we must recognise that his life, as a complex subject, is ultimately unrecoverable; so too, the secondary, tertiary and ongoing repercussions of his life in those of others. Any representation of that life as biography or autobiography constitutes an image and is thus an obstacle to historical analysis. The privileged status accorded by many to Tafuri's perspective of such 'events' as his rejecting architecture to practice history, from the modern movement towards the study of the Renaissance, from political engagement to philological retreat, must be tempered, here (but generally also), by the perception of those claims as problematic in themselves and open to our distrust. This is not to decry the impossibility of 'Tafuri-as-subject' with respect of the study of 'Tafuri-as-image,' accounting for those biographical and autobiographical abstractions set in place (deliberately or otherwise) by a variety of agencies. However, we must be clear in acknowledging the impossibility of 'testing' our analyses of Tafuri's writing (and through it, his thinking on historical practice and the disciplinary nature of architectural history) without raising the 'problem' of his 'reflection,' this at the same moment as we draw clues from Passerini's record and the image of Tafuri most perilously at stake.

Our ultimate goal is a better understanding of Tafuri's contribution to the theorisation of the relationships that exist between the past and its representation as 'history,' and of the place, consequently, the historian occupies in architectural culture. That his life-work constitutes a substantial reflection on these problems is indisputable, even if the degree of indebtedness at stake ultimately remains so. However, the specific nature of that 'legacy,' its origins in Tafuri's reading, contexts or intellectual interactions with others remains the subject of scant analysis. And within that analysis, insofar as this provides a focus for the forthcoming chapters, the figure of Tafuri remains a constant, an ever-present shadow. Of all of the 'advice' contained in the Passerini history, Tafuri is most clear about the complexity of his relationships with other scholars, with friends, with colleagues in architectural and historical practice, and with the institutions that frame his research and its documentation, from teaching to publication and exhibition. In other words, we do not attempt to recover his 'irreducible' understanding of the nature of history and its relationship with the past as an 'answer' to his enigmatic hold in the present over the critical practice of history or his ambiguous power over architectural theory and critical theory in architecture. These are impossible to assess with anything

other than a highly speculative and provisional analyses. Yet we must contend with the present claims laid upon Tafuri's disciplinarity, while discovering a way of treating Tafuri's disciplinary thinking independent of his institutional framing by such agencies as the IUAS and its 'children,' by the 'Venice School' and *IUAV*, by the *PCI*, by the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio,' Accademia nazionale di San Luca* or the *Bibliotheca Hertziana*.

This problem is one that Tafuri himself encounters in his later research projects, wherein historical images and 'resolved' life-lessons, reflections upon the *œuvre complet*, offered historiographical challenges by undermining the capacity, built into every concept of the past, to disrupt this self-same idea of the image, lesson, legacy and so on. How to deal with an *œuvre* while understanding it as fraught with complexity and contradiction, yet at once bound together by continuities that presumably contain, at one level (and even if unrecoverable as a 'truth'), a coherent biographical narrative? The very idea of applying some biographical model to Tafuri's life-work, as if one were necessarily a linear and direct result from their context, offers just as many problems, historiographically speaking, than the corresponding argument that these works emanate directly from their context. A more useful model would rather lie somewhere between these two approaches, between life and its setting, but tempered by the human capacity for self-determination within the options and limitations traceable to either biography or its intellectual, social, political, economic, professional or religious backdrops. Of course, the possibility of recovering the life and approximating it in a primarily literary form, spread over some three hundred pages, is something that Tafuri himself comprehended as fuel for mythification, 'memorialisation' replete with devices too ready to characterise the particular as abstractions and *vice versa*. For him, the question seems less to be one of biography, but of history. Nonetheless, recognising that historiography is less the study of the past than the study of its memory in the present allows us readily to consider the limitations of biography. As a 'task,' it is equally impossible, no quantity of archives or interviews allows for the recovery of memory.

How then, are we to respond to Tafuri's 1992 introduction of an autobiographical dimension to the development of his thinking about the history of architecture, hitherto the realm of literary and historico-critical analyses of his published writing? We might be *tempted* to regard Passerini's history as a key to mapping Tafuri's evolution as an historian in terms offered—who more truthfully?—by himself. However, the possibility of regarding this interview as anything beyond a device that complicates the mythological, textbook figures of Tafuri the Marxist critic of contemporary architecture, Tafuri the historian of Renaissance Venice, or Tafuri as embodiment of the 'Venice School' is now difficult for us to contemplate (even if we have been guilty, so far, in doing just that). For while it has the appearance of several hours of honest conversation—which, to give it doubt's benefit we might assume at some level that it is—the interview recalls his passing, though telling, comment to Françoise Very in another interview conducted during 1976, coinciding with the publication of the French edition of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Therein, he admits that it is thoroughly annotated with autobiography,

available for anyone to retrace in 'unlocking' the methodological references for his thinking.[226] We might therefore consider this idea of his life's inextricability from the discipline of architectural history as signifying a more direct relation between his intellectual and biographical lives. The person of Tafuri, in this case, is a figure mediating *between* contexts and disciplines, the person with whom choice resides, and who bears the consequences of that decision. We have already noted the institutional consequences Tafuri observed when choosing (*for*) architectural history as a discipline. Even though the *Dipartimento* at Venice found a momentum both beyond and after his direct involvement—though the post-mortem years have hardly been golden—he was referential for its thinking *through* disciplinary issues; his personal choices have come to have some bearing upon institutional and disciplinary formations, even if these alone offer only partial corollaries or insufficient explanations. Thus, when Tafuri tells us that he undertook psychoanalysis, that he read Sartre, Benjamin, or Foucault, that he sat on the chest of the Faculty secretary to stop him restraining protestors in 1963, that he was once married, that had a daughter, 'lived' on the train between Venice and Rome and so on, we are not at implicitly invited to find in these sparse facts of his life—subjective though they certainly are—some hard-wired revelations pertaining to his thinking on the practice of architectural history, the principal concern (we propose) of his life-work.

On the contrary, such details offer new and interesting starting points that potentially destabilise the mythicised Tafuris (or Tafuri figures) and as such are invaluable tools for breaking apart his monumental status, which masks rather than explains. It is not possible to replicate the entirety of Tafuri's life-work, or the motivations that gave it momentum, or to assess with any degree of finality (except couched in irony) his contribution to architectural or historiographical thought. However, it *is* feasible to begin *negotiating* Tafuri's œuvre within the bounds of these caveats. In fact, not only is it possible, but it has become necessary in order to undermine the periodisations and subjective demarcations that have crept into the more recent analyses and responses synthesised earlier in this chapter. While there are a small number of notable exceptions, each 'image' of Tafuri demands differing modes of enquiry tailor-made (it seems) or rapidly fitted to those of his works that fall victim to such easy classification. In contrast, we wish to consider his extensive bibliography as a complete and complex construction in order to understand how it potentially describes a fluid, continuous (even if, let us stress, complex), investigation into the relationship between architectural production and critico-historical practice (this, as we note below, despite our inability to treat here all of the leads that it suggests). Such a study, we can see, was established already from within the practice of architecture and its critical capacity (a theme that has acquired new currency in the last two years), and continued in forceful terms under the mantle of analytical practice concerned with architectural history. Armed with strategies (if not tools) proper to Tafuri's own historiography, we thus turn to his œuvre. For this reason, we take neither a chronological nor conclusive approach; we offer no legacy in

---

226 Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' p. 37.

our 'disenchanted documentation' to replace those already claimed by the institutions and individuals who have felt confident enough to do so already.

<center>❧</center>

The following chapters describe a strategy for 'reading' the documentation of Tafuri's historical practice while setting aside the immense, unwieldy and (finally) unanswerable questions that characterise studies of his work to date: What is Tafuri's 'project'? Does his reading of architecture reveal the 'crisis condition' of modernity? How can historians (or architects) participate in the 'class struggle'? Equally, we regard his analyses of the major subjects of his intellectual life large as 'incomplete' (another term with decidedly Tafurian consequences): Sansovino, Alberti, Palladio, Romano and Michelangelo among others. This strategy tackles those portraits of Tafuri now available to us, painted by himself and by others, against bibliographical analysis. While we can accept that his writing is simply one manifestation of his thinking and development, which we must necessarily temper (in time) with his teaching and reception, we will nonetheless treat it as a privileged documentation of his thought, which in turn is fundamentally irrecoverable. We thus open this study on Tafuri's *œuvre* by specifying our concern with his articulation of the relationship between historical material by specifying its analysis and the delivery of analyses to audiences. This historiographical theme, we believe, pervades his bibliography. And yet it describes not one strategy, but many, each operating against the others, simultaneously, consecutively, contrapuntally. As we shall see, the efficacy of history lies in its impossibility as a device for connecting us to our past. Setting out to encounter that 'truism' in Tafuri's bibliography, we openly admit the impossibility of 'knowing' him except as impressions filtered by memory. These are historiographical risks, and their test lies in our ability to undermine these images as they appear in chiaroscuro before us. The validity of these risks is assayed by their resemblance to the risks taken by Tafuri in the study of other lives, other legacies, while being neither mirrors nor shadows.

Any analysis of Tafuri's thinking on the disciplinary practices of architectural history surely starts from *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, neither because it describes the form of a discipline—either new or reformed—nor because it is the absolute beginning of Tafuri's thinking on this subject, but rather because it articulates Tafuri's view of the kinds of questions that a critical intellectual enquiry into the foundations of a discipline might ask. It is symptomatic of the nature of Tafuri's own analysis that the closest this book reaches to a conclusion is his description of the historian's responsibilities to architectural culture *writ large*, and *not* the form of the historian's practice. To repeat, at stake in this dissertation is the relation between a practice within discipline that is assumed, though not described (and ultimately, we suggest, conditional), and the production and theory of architecture. Considered in different terms, it seems clear to us that Tafuri resists, from the very beginning, a fixed disciplinary form with all its

adherent methodological consequences, preferring to identify intellectual strategies capable of rigorously testing the possibilities that new frames of reference might offer the discipline, and additional tools within the broad limits of an 'open' mode of historical analysis. This much is confirmed by a visible evolution of thought on the nature, form and practice of architectural history, an unpredictable development described in detail throughout Tafuri's books, essays and articles. Later texts evidently pursue the tenor of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, but continue to demonstrate the possibility of a *system* of enquiry, open insofar as it persistently resists disciplinary form. That we refer to this development as an evolution is not to suggest a trajectory moving in a consistently or predictable forward motion towards a disciplinary perfection. However, as with the nineteenth century evolutionary models of biological theory, Tafuri's search is carried out in an environment hostile to the historian's practice; as one historian choosing on behalf of all, he attempts to unearth the means of survival. This search describes less a trajectory than an accumulation of trials and errors, constantly reconstructed and repositioned, always looking backwards, rigorously addressing its faults. Just what comprises 'survival' is something that remains proper to Tafuri's views of historical practice, and remains implicit in the chapters that follow.

<p align="center">❧</p>

In this dissertation, we attempt to treat these issues in some depth, investigating the relationships that Tafuri constructs within his broader search for an intellectual frame of reference for the practices of the architectural historian. We look, also, to a small number of those intellectuals or bodies of intellectual production whose work evidently forms some part of the history of that search. By no means is the list of theoretical referents that follows this introduction complete; in fact, it seems clear that this list describes, more than anything else, the impossibility of a closed index of philosophical or methodological referents. But the list is nonetheless proper to Tafuri, indexing his *autoritratto*, and we anticipate that the following vignettes will adequately describe an analytical strategy that may, in effect, continue interminably with each of the figures who appear in Tafuri's footnotes, to varying degrees of depth, and with a fluid appreciation of their relevance to an overall conception of the tasks and tools of the architectural historian.

Further, in drawing this introduction to a close, we should take stock of the limits of this dissertation as a whole. Despite its length, it touches upon a very few subjects, which, in turn, shape our case. There are many topics that have set aside over the course of the project, or that we have determined from the start not to enter into. The study of Tafuri's reception, as one important example, introduces a host of complexities that we have elected to save for a later project. The specific 'national' characters of his readings in the United States, Great Britain, the Low Countries, Japan, Germany, France and Italy itself provide sufficient material to complete a dissertation on each historical field. That said, we will extend, through a post-doctoral research agenda, the translations from

architectural history to architectural theory that Tafuri's work sustains in its reception. For the reason that we are anxious to stay close to his published writing, neither have we seriously engaged the boom of 'Tafuri scholarship' and commentary that has appeared in recent years, except to acknowledge its relativity to our own. A very few cases among these work to which we refer bring Tafuri to bear upon the architectural historian's disciplinarity; any engagement with his early readers, for instance, instantly introduces the deformations of reception as a factor with which we must (and would reluctantly, for now) contend.

A related admission: just as we have stepped back from the reception of Tafuri's work as a discursive phenomenon, so too have we sought out starting points for our analysis that move us quickly to treat topics that have, to date, been beyond the purview of close analysis. Therefore, while we enact an investigation into Tafuri's later critical relationships with his early practice, his 'position' among the wider Italian reception of Sartre's existential discourse in intellectual and popular culture, his translation of Freudian psychoanalysis into the field of architectural history through the mechanisms (eventually) of *la critica freudiana*, and his idiosyncratic yet perceptive responses to Benjamin, we do not, for instance, conduct an enquiry into his critical relationships with Massimo Cacciari or Francesco Dal Co, the 'friendships' traditionally invoked along with the spectre of the 'Venice School.' Nor, by extension, do we undertake (as so many have tried to do) to position 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' in the flow of Marxist critical tradition, or to reconcile it with the *movimento operaio* and its protagonists, including Tronti, Negri, Rosa, Panzieri and others. (Were this our goal, we would be rather more inclined to turn to another essay, 'Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico.') While the popular image of Tafuri is thus constructed as highly politicised in terms of these and other coordinates, we advance a different image that is not entirely foreign to this political Tafuri, but which holds him consistently responsible to the field of architectural history that he sought, we believe, to reconcile with the practices and disciplinarity of architecture. Our image may, consequently, seem alien to some, but it likewise poses a challenge to the validity of that persona that has (after all) persisted now for over thirty years of Tafuri's reception.

While these caveats relate to our initial choices, we have made other decisions over the course of the project. We have been ultimately unable to introduce close readings of many of Tafuri's works. We face a number of opportunities in the immediate future to elaborate, for instance, in much greater depth on *Ricerca del rinascimento*, on Tafuri's critical relationships with Palladio, Sansovino and (especially) Alberti. His readings of Carlo Scarpa's practice have breathed a new life into this work, though we could not give it more than passing attention here. So, too, we leave Tafuri's relationship with several intellectuals from his own architectural culture for another day: Gregotti, Rossi, Argan, Giovannoni, Benevolo, Quaroni. We could equally argue, though we have not done so, the importance of *Ludovico Quaroni* over *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as an index of Tafuri's *choice* for history. Furthermore, the myth of the 'Venice School' is one of our

apparent targets, as a problematic historiographical image, though it does not sustain a systematic analysis. To this, we will also return on another occasion.

Our focus, in the coming pages, is on the relationship between discipline, material and practice. On this subject, we attempt to remain close to Tafuri's writing and to his demonstrations of the capacity that the historian has to respond to the complexities of this relationship. Several points herein sustain repetition; among them, one deserves articulation at the outset. From the earliest moments in which Tafuri declared his disciplinary identification to align with architectural history, he conceives of a field of architectural knowledge in which historians and architects simultaneously, yet not necessarily concurrently, conduct their practice. The relationship between these two figures is ambiguous, fraught even. Yet the ethics of this relationship remains a basic theme that is intrinsic (we propose) to Tafuri's reflections on the nature of discipline and disciplinary practice. It is his preoccupation with that which is 'proper' to the historian's practice in architectural culture that lends weight to his efficacy as a point of departure for our own reflections on historical practice, and which makes his work such a valuable sounding board for contemporary debates on discipline and criticality in architecture.

Chapter II
Criticality and Operativity

Francesco Paolo Fiore, with whom Tafuri curated *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (1993), advocated viewing Tafuri's historical practice as an elaborate case for the disciplinary autonomy of architectural history.[1] While we can agree with Fiore to an extent, he fails to acknowledge the proper origin of the technical knowledge that Tafuri argues as necessary for an integral knowledge of architectural production. As Tafuri writes in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, the architectural historian is capable of complicity with architectural work, and by extension with architectural theory, but deliberately maintains a critical distance in order to pursue different tasks.[2] An important theme of this book is the relation between historical materials and their 'presentation' by historians, on one hand, and the 'rules' against which (and towards which) architects hold their own practice, on the other. His scheme—if we can describe it thus—is both abstract and idealized. He argues that the technical knowledge of architecture held by historians and architects is not *different*. Rather, architectural historians chose to approach the material of their practice, their knowledge of architecture, with goals in view definitively disparate from those of the architect. This in turn shapes for each of their practices the nature and function of disciplinary knowledge.

The capacity for historians and architects to engage in conversation, simply put, lies in the construction of their shared 'territory' as a present condition. It seems redundant to point out that both architectural historians and architects—as practitioners or theoreticians—are interested in architecture, yet their coexistence within architectural culture is predicated on their capacity for fruitful interaction. For Tafuri, it seems that there are two bases for their exchange: (a) they both occupy a present moment, neither past (the historian's terrain) nor the future (that of the architect); and (b) they both invest heavily in architecture's history, either as material or as legacy. Tafuri aligns architecture's artistic emancipation in the Renaissance with a capacity to intellectualise and rationalise history as a representation that hints (at the best) directions for the future or (alternatively) directly informs a future-focussed practice of the present.[3] The operation of platonic ideals in architectural theory, for instance, guiding a quest for a pure classical order from fifteenth to eighteenth centuries relies upon the idea that history contains evidence of a recoverable truth, which architects, in turn, might pursue.[4] This conflation of an

---

1   Francesco Paolo Fiore, 'L'autonomia della storia' / 'The Autonomy of History,' Engl. trans. Steve Piccolo, 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Vittorio Gregotti, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 102-111. Cf. Tafuri and Francesco Paolo Fiore, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993).

2   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968).

3   Tafuri, *Architettura dell'umanesimo* (Bari: Laterza, 1969), pp. 15-66, 317-321.

4   Tafuri makes this argument in the first chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Therein, Tafuri argues that the intellectual (and thus artificial) moves introduced into building by Brunelleschi and Alberti constitutes (1) the construction of an architectural ideology, as theory, which (2) facilitates a break

artistic and an intellectual project comprises a selective appreciation of the past informed by a programmatic relationship between *past* and future rather than *present* and future. The historian, argues Tafuri, eschews the construction of images that inform the future, that presume to know that the future will bring. Rather, he occupies the position of a provocateur who undermines those historical images upon which architectural theory and thus architectural practice build. The provisionality of either the uses that architects make of historical images *or* of the disruptive nature of historical material acting to catalyse the deconstruction of those images renders necessary in perpetuity the exchange Tafuri envisages occurring between architects and historians.[5]

Tafuri's ideas about the way that historians and architects can 'meet' rely upon several contentious points. Firstly, his construction of the architectural historian as an insider to architectural culture, but who is specifically *not* an architect, owes a great deal to his own effort to institutionalise the conditions under which he himself stepped forward as an historian. While *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and the initial formulation of his *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* set up a clear anticipation on Tafuri's behalf that this figure could be cultivated into existence within the confines of architectural culture, the radical position maintained by Tafuri and his colleagues from 1968 until 1976—when the *Istituto* became a full university *Dipartimento*—was undermined by a number of institutional factors. As Jean-Louis Cohen has noted, Tafuri's apparent intention to construct this figure as a force in architectural culture largely failed during his own lifetime.[6] A second point: the impossibility of operating within a pure disciplinary stance means that the figures we draw from his scheme—which is, conversely, ideal—are only ever, at best, provisional. This is clear from his identification of such 'historiographical' exemplars as Francesco Borromini, Giovanni Battisa Piranesi or Carlo Scarpa; or of such 'architectural' (read 'operative') intellectual-historians as Leon Battista Alberti, Giovanni Pietro Bellori, Siegfried Giedion, Bruno Zevi and Paolo Portoghesi.[7] The kind of communication about which we write can therefore be initiated *within* an individual whose complex take on architecture's relationship to the past can nonetheless inform a productive practice or theoretical agenda concerned with the future. His high opinion of Scarpa as a *maestro* of modern architecture originates precisely from an observation

---

between architecture and 'reality.' We will return to this idea in Sections Two and Three.

5   This abstract claim comprises the concluding argument of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, in the chapter entitled 'I compiti della storia.'

6   Jean-Louis Cohen, 'Ceci nes pas une histoire,' trans. French-Ital. B. Pedretti; French-Engl. K. Hylton, Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 48-53. Cohen's observation follows the conspicuous absence of figures corresponding to Tafuri's historian: neither architects nor architectural theoreticians, but equally not art historians. Few practicing historians of architecture emerge from the kinds of institutional settings that correspond to the informed antagonism that his own *Istituto* assumed in the wider setting of *IUAV*.

7   With reference to the first group, compare 'Borromini e l'esperienza della storia,' *Comunità. Gionale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 129 (1965): 42-63; 'G. B. Piranesi. L'architettura come "utopia negativa",' *Angelus Novus. Trimestrale di estetica e critica*, no. 20 (1971): 89-127; 'Il frammento, la "figura", il giocco. Carlo Scarpa e la cultura architettonica italiana,' *Carlo Scarpa. Opera completa*, by Francesco Dal Co and Giuseppe Mazzariol (Milan: Electa, 1984), pp. 73-95. We will attend to the others later in this chapter.

of this nature.[8] Finally, Tafuri's scheme presupposes that historians require a technical knowledge of architecture equivalent to that of professionally trained architects. He implies that only architects, therefore, can become architectural historians in a proper sense. However, he later observed that one of the frayed threads of architectural education was manifest in students' inability to fully understand precedents in, quite literally, the art and technique of building. This comprised, in turn, an obstacle to the effect of exposing historical knowledge in the present.[9] Conversely, he praises the knowledge of the scholars Joseph Connors and Christoph Frommel, who maintain an exemplary grasp upon the technical knowledge proper to architects of the past, *as if* their knowledge was equivalent with those same architects, while coming respectively to architecture from the 'foreign' disciplines of literature and the history of art.

We do not, then, propose that Tafuri offers a permanent solution for the interchange between those positions pegged out historically and contemporaneously, in his view, by historians and architects. However, insofar as he describes distinct actors within architectural culture, whose places on the stage implicate discrete disciplinary agendas, he demonstrates the need to articulate terms of interaction that are bound up in the ethics of publication and architectural production. Tafuri's overriding concern is with the historian's point of view. From this uncompromising position, he elaborates the challenges of being an architectural historian within an architectural culture principally concerned with production from a clear 'disciplinary' scheme against which other figures come under our scrutiny, but always in terms relative to the historian. Accepting that his preoccupation is with history and its practice rather than with architecture and *its* practice quickly renders his entire bibliography significantly more coherent than previous analyses have allowed. We may therefore pose three interrelated questions. How does it inform our understanding of the specific dimensions that call for the historian's interjection in architectural culture? Under what conditions does Tafuri allow for the interaction or disciplinary exchange of historians and architects? And to what ends?

♣

The preceding chapter positions *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as a founding document of Tafuri's *Istituto*, an arguably transparent disciplinary manifesto setting out the historian's tools and tasks—but not methods—as they were initially formalised in institutional terms at Venice. If this book describes the opening gambit of the *Istituto*, its fourth chapter, 'La critica operativa,' is a play that most clearly distinguishes Tafuri's notion of history's disciplinarity from the historiographical traditions that proscribed the field up to the late 1960s and specifically in Italy. We have thus far alluded to the place of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as Tafuri's profession of discipline, a sketch of the forces governing

---

8   Tafuri, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* (Turin: Einaudi, 1986), pp. 139-145.

9   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000), p. 64.

the processes of constructing disciplinary form, conducting disciplinary practice and circumscribing the position of both with respect to a broader architectural culture. Panayotis Tournikiotis suggests that Tafuri goes to some lengths to avoid defining the three terms that comprise the book's title: theory (or, specifically, 'theories'), history and architecture.[10] However, as we shall see, the complex interrelation of these three terms, the provisional nature of their interaction and of those mechanisms that frame and shape their interplay—as architectural theory, architectural history, historiography (a theoretical practice) and theoretical history (as a history of ideas pertaining to architecture)—remain not only present throughout the book, but its principal theme. The difficulty that many experience in reading *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is attributable, we suggest here, to its biographical, historical and institutional particularity, much more than, as too many suggest, to poor translations from Italian into English, French or Spanish. Further, the tendency to treat it, in reception, as a work of architectural theory substantially undermines the book's intentions, relegating it to a field that Tafuri regards as the *target* of his own historical practice (and by inference the book as an instrument of that practice) imbuing it with the oft-noted desolation that, were this claim of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as architectural theory upheld, would be absolutely justified. As a disciplinary work of architectural historiography, though, the opposite view allows us to sustain a more involved discussion pertaining to architectural history's conditional autonomy as a discipline, raising issues that continue to resonate today.

As we have seen, Tafuri wrote *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* during 1966 and 1967, over a number of months during which time he held a temporary professorial post at the architecture faculty at Palermo. This context may have had very real implications for his argument, especially in reference to the historical artificiality of 'the Renaissance': a persistent theme in his writing from the 1960s onwards. However, its importance for our present chapter lies in its relationship with a future position, his chairmanship of the *Istituto* at *IUAV*. It opens up a previously unspoken discourse on the tenuous grasp that practitioners of architectural history hold over their discipline, introducing a number of (since) vital contemporary thinkers into the field.[11] As a book in which Tafuri problematises his own discipline, as well as his own institutional setting, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* deliberately extricates him, or rather programatically differentiates him, from the broad context of architectural historiography in Italy, a process he actively began several years earlier, both generally, in theoretical terms, and by engaging in (often

---

[10]   Panayotis Tounikiotis, *The Historiography of Modern Architecture* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999), p. 194. Tournikiotis observes that Tafuri offers "no explanation whatever … of the three words that make up the title: 'theory,' 'history,' and 'architecture' waver to and fro from chapter to chapter, without ever arriving at a single distinct meaning."—Ibid.

[11]   With specific reference to the book's French reception after its 1976 translation, Cohen notes the importance of its introduction of such figures as Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch to architectural audiences.—Jean Louis Cohen, 'The Italophiles at Work,' trans. Brian Holmes [from 'Les italophiles au travail. La coupure entre architectes et intellectuels, ou les enseignements de l'italianophylie,' *In extenso* (1984)], *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), pp. 508-520; Tafuri, *Theories et histoire de l'architecture*, trans. Jean-Patrick Fortin, François Laisney and Hubert Damisch (Paris: SADG, 1976).

unprovoked) debate with senior figures in the local scene. Conversely, in denouncing specific forms of historical practice, Tafuri risks describing by default a form of the discipline that escapes the traps he lays for other practitioners. This risk is calculated, but he ultimately grapples with the enduring readership of this book, its easy characterisation of his 'history' as Marxist and its perceived claim for the place of 'theory' (of no specific stripe) in historical discourse and for the *death* of Architecture.[12]

Revisiting two events from Passerini's oral history allows us to reflect on 'La critica operativa' in terms that draw closely together the biographical, disciplinary and intellectual factors that render it difficult to speak of Tafuri's thinking about historiography without complexity. He positions his 'turn' towards history, we recall (and too simply, we admit), as a response, in part, to an exhibition curated by Portoghesi and Zevi: *Michelangelo architetto* (1964).[13] He called it a demonstration of how *not* to do history. However, in the months immediately prior to his violent and public reaction to Portoghesi and Zevi's show, Zevi had proven instumental in assisting Tafuri, first into a professorial position within the Italian university system, and then into the chairmanship of the *Istituto* at Venice. Tafuri was already 'present' at Venice by 1966, contributing a lecture at the start of the 1966-1967 academia year within a series of 'positioning' seminars articulating the values and intellectual strategies at *IUAV* for that moment.[14] During this time, though, he was more isolated from the main centres than he had been up until 1966, occupying his post in Palermo for eighteen months 'in preparation' (though also 'in wait') for his role at Venice. At Palermo, Tafuri appears to have represented those lectures delivered for Quaroni in Rome the previous year, a course focussed on the contemporary inheritance of the modern movement and of modern ideas in contemporary architecture. These lectures were entitled 'La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali,' pointing towards the importance of a trajectory of ideas pertaining to architecture within modernity and of the essential contemporaneity of history.[15] This former topic is one of the principal *historical* themes of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, and thus one of two factors that shape our contemporary of it: his relationship with Portoghesi and Zevi indexing his place in the wider setting of post-War Italian architectural historiography; and the time in waiting during which he could prepare for his position at Venice in the remote setting of Palermo.

---

12 The dangers of disciplinary form, open to emulation, is one of the 'lessons' of the fifth chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Therein, Tafuri starts with the 'rigour' with which the so-called 'Vienna School' treated the study of art, following Riegl's 'model.' Its translation from rigorous analysis into a theory of production (as in a 'semiotic' architecture) demonstrates the inherent challenges of entering a methodological debate with a view towards releasing the discipline of its burdens.—Cf. Walter Benjamin, 'Rigorous Study of Art: On the First Volume of the *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen*,' trans. Thomas Y. Levin, *October*, no. 47 (Winter 1988): 77-90.

13 Bruno Zevi and Paolo Portoghesi, eds., *Michelangelo architetto* (Turin: Einaudi, 1964).

14 Tafuri, 'Le strutture del linguaggio nella storia dell'architettura moderna,' *Teorie della progettazione architettonica*, Architettura e città, no. 3, intro. Guido Canella (Bari: Dedalo, 1968), pp. 11-30.

15 Tafuri, 'La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali,' Corso di composizione architettonica, BII, 1964-1965, Rome: Università degli studi di Roma, 1964.

For the reason that *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* has both a biographical and institutional dimension, we can reflect upon the long-term consequences of Tafuri's theorisation of architectural history as a discipline relative to architecture (also as a discipline) and of the historian's tools, tasks and disciplinary knowledge base (which is fluid). This includes his extended meditations on the disciplinary interplay of architectural history and architectural theory as well as his carefully constructed warnings against adopting a disciplinary form, however rigorously conceived. 'La critica operativa' has, in this setting, caught the attention of many commentators as a highly programmatic attack on the existing field of historiography, a vitriolic denouncement that earned Tafuri both bitter rebukes and unprecedented presence in the field.[16] By far the most often cited comments by Tafuri on the practice of architectural history involve his application of the moniker 'operative critic' to Zevi, Portoghesi, Pevsner and Giedion: avatars of the modern movement, historians of the future.[17] Tafuri's dramatic 'damnation' of these figures has been accurately perceived by many as integral to this broader charge. However, the current tendency to deal solely with these elements of his 'attack' risks ignoring a more widely ranging construction of a trajectory of operative critical practice that informs us of the more basic reasons for Tafuri's response, moving beyond a reflexive reaction against the mythology of the modern movement. This trajectory is programmatic on Tafuri's part insofar as it allows him to reflect strategically upon the organisation of those disciplines (or branches of disciplines) comprising architectural culture. This enquiry is typified in the questions Tafuri poses of the place of operativity within architectural culture:

> If we take for granted the possibility of the presence, at the same time, of the various types of criticism, each with its well-defined role, what are the margins of validity for operative criticism? Is its insistence on taking a traditional literary form really useful, or is there already some new field of application?[18]

To regard *la critica operativa* in light of this fundamental examination, wherein the excerpt points not only to Tafuri's declaration of disciplinary poverty as evidenced by those from whom he seeks to distinguish himself, is to ignore the wider implications of an abstract theory of disciplinarity that, we perceive, underpins this passage. Tafuri's theory, in turn, has consequences both to the relationship between his own involvement in architectural culture *prior* to his 'historical turn' around 1964 *and* to the way that he later reconstructs this moment in *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* (1982, 1986).[19]

---

16 Tournikiotis, ibid.

17 We will not enter specifics here, except to observe that the framing both of Tournikiotis's study and that of Hilde Heynen—*Architecture and Modernity: A Critique* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999)—lend themselves to drawing direct links between Tafuri, on one hand, and Pevsner and Giedion, on the other, through the basic comparative structure of their enquiries. Both, for this latter reason, are excellent works; but they *do* reinforce the tendency we describe above.

18 Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Giorgio Verrecchia (London: Granada, 1980), p. 125.

19 Tafuri, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*, ibid.; this book expands on his essay 'Architettura italiana, 1944-1981,' Federico Zeri, ed., 'Il novecento,' part 2, no. 3, *Storia dell'arte italiana*, vol. VII (Turin: Einaudi, 1982), pp. 425-450.

So what is *la critica operativa* ('operative' or 'instrumental' criticism)? At the heart of Tafuri's critique is his assertion that the tasks 'assigned' to the various branches of architectural culture have overlapped and become indistinguishable. Specifically, he levels a charge at those figures operating under the guise of historians, but whose 'projects' are, in his terms, architectural rather than historical.[20] Indeed, Tafuri underwrites the institutionalisation of architectural history with the acknowledgement and formalisation of architecture's distinction, as both a discipline and a practice, from critico-historical practice, in which architecture is subject to analysis. By way of explanation, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* identifies a series of instances where, in the confluence of history and architecture, the same 'tasks' are approached with different 'tools,' demonstrating the impropriety of an 'architectural' worldview being applied to 'historical' practice. Tafuri's proposal involves a disciplinary reconfiguration whereby the tasks of each discipline are made to align with the tools of each respective practice; architectural questions and motives applied only to the *practice* of architecture, and historical 'tools' employed solely in the *analyses* of architecture. It follows that he identifies one set of tools and tasks for history and another, discrete and necessarily different, for architecture. For Tafuri, history and criticism are analogous and form a single disciplinary unit: criticism is inherently historically situated, it being impossible to apply different critical techniques to 'present time' and 'historical time'; further, history can never be a-critical.[21] The possibility of either a-critical history or abstract criticism of the 'present' belong precisely in the 'historical' practices Tafuri takes to task. For him, their pursuit lies at the heart of the 'problem' of architectural discourse of the late 1960s: the confusion of myths and utopian projects of the future with critical analyses of the past. He thus positions *la critica operativa* as an historiographical practice intrinsic to that 'problematic' tendency, but with precedents that are entrenched in the organisation of architectural culture.

Tafuri does not limit his consideration of *la critica operativa* to modernist architectural histories, though his rejection of 'modernist' historiography precedes his negative reading of instrumental historiography. For him, the relationship between modern architecture and operative history as intimate and intricate, developed in parallel from the seventeenth century to his present day.[22] *La critica operativa* is cast, in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, as a written tradition confusing critical historical analyses of the present and the past with carefully framed—what Tafuri regards as utopian—projections into

---

[20]   We note, here, without entering into the subject further, that the notion of 'project' is theoretically loaded for architectural history. We will return to it in our final chapter.

[21]   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, p. 200; 'There is No Criticism, Only History,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Richard Ingersoll, *Design Book Review*, no. 9 (Spring 1986): 8-11.

[22]   We here draw the distinction between a written practice that is architectural, while appearing 'critico-historical' (ie. *la critica operativa*) and the intellectualisation of architecture through an historical practice within architecture, represented explicitly as architectural theory. While the examples that follow pertain to the latter, in the 'tradition' of Giovanni Pietro Bellori, we would point (and do so, in a later chapter) to the theoretical moves made by Alberti and Brunelleschi implicating the programmatic uses of history.—Cf. Chapter Five.

the future, which is thus preconceived according to an agenda derived from the present. Put another way, history constructed operatively takes an active role in influencing the future trajectory formulated in the present through a process of selectivity, affirmation and judgment. The conclusions reached by historians of this ilk, and by the practitioners and institutions subscribing to their influence, are specific, resulting from value-laden conceptions of "*that which ought to be*."[23] Operative writing thus measures success from the degree to which its judgments affect practice in the present, following a pattern in which history is projected forward into a future conceived and recommended by the historian.

Tafuri's account of the operative tradition commences with Giovanni Pietro Bellori's *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni* (1672), in which the 'most important' artists of the time are presented as a series of art-biographical accounts, in the tradition of Vasari, framed by an introductory treatise on classical art.[24] The text is operative, in Tafuri's terms, because of the values inherent to Bellori's selectivity. Among *Le Vite*'s twelve biographies are Annibali and Agostino Carracci, Caravaggio (but provisionally), Nicolas Poussin, Antoon van Dyck and Pieter Paul Rubens: the principal exponents of a 'pure' classical tradition. Their contemporaries associated with the baroque of Rome's Counter-Reformation—such as Gianlorenzo Bernini, Francesco Borromini and Pietro da Cortona—are conspicuously absent. In promoting the classical tradition and setting aside the baroque as a forgettable interruption, Bellori's history sets up a dichotomy among his contemporaries of "the *goodies*" and "the *baddies*."[25] But more than this: in judging the present and recent past according to a preconceived idea of what the future should hold—the unconditional reinstatement of Renaissance classicism, in this case—Bellori, as Tafuri's archetypal operative historian, writes a distorted account of the past in order to convey a specific message to patrons, who will spend in the present, Bellori does not visibly reject the baroque, but discounts its very existence, as though it is erased from that memory available to the present day. He "does not take history for granted [nor] accept reality as it is," writes Tafuri. The operative critic does not "simply influence the course of history, but must also, and mainly, change it, because its approval or rejection have as much real value as the work of the artists."[26] Thus Tafuri distinguishes between 'innocent' partiality and operativity. The former says 'this is what happened, but I don't like it' while the latter says, implicitly, 'that never happened, and nor should it ever.' Historical authority therefore impinges upon the production of art at a broader institutional level. An historian judging either an artwork or an artist as without merit effectively recommends to an institution or patron not to buy this sculpture, commission that architect, or exhibit that painting. While Tafuri cites Bellori as an extreme case, the fact that baroque art did not disappear is evidence of the relative power of such authority.

---

23   Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 143.

24   Giovanni Pietro Bellori, *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni* (Rome: 1672).

25   Tafuri, ibid., p. 142.

26   Ibid.

However, his model nonetheless perpetuates in subsequent distortions of history written with a particular view of the future in mind.

Tafuri introduces Andrea Memmo's *Elementi dell'architettura lodoliana* (1786), which, in articulating this relationship a century later, argues that the 'philosopher' (corresponding to the critic or historian) provides "the legislation" for artistic execution.[27] The artist thus operates according to a predetermined path where their practice tests the extent of the applicability of the critic's hypotheses. Francesco Milizia also considers this mechanism in *Principi di architettura civile* (1804), in which a well-meant philosophical position, based on "principles certain and constant" leads art closer to 'truth.'[28] Critical practices of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are likewise imbued with moral positions undermining the possibility of disengaged reflection on the past: "the ambiguities of enlightenment criticism are also those of operative criticism."[29] Entering the twentieth century, the excision of such judgments in historiography shifts, accommodating two specific historiographical impetuses for the future. As for Bellori, history may be called to rally behind "a new courage"; or enlisted in support of a revolutionary cause.[30] Tafuri identifies these inclinations in Zevi's citation of De Sanctis' account of the thirteenth century fall of the Guelph White faction to the Black:

> The [victors] tell with quiet indifference, as if drawing up an inventory; the [losers] write history with a dagger. Those happy with the surface, let them read [Villani's chronicles]; but those who want to know the passions, the customs, the characters, the interior life where facts come from, let them read Dino.[31]

The operative documentarian, in this context, dons figurative battle-gear: "not able to change, in politics, the course of events, he forces instead written history."[32] The operative tradition commencing from Bellori and the revolutionary call for "a new courage" inherent to the modern movement are simultaneously 'fulfilled,' for Tafuri, in the revolutionary authority granted the *Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne* by Giedion, its historian. His *Space, Time and Architecture* (1941) epitomises *la critica operativa*, placing modern architecture in a tailor-made historical field reaching forwards from the past and legitimating a movement conceived in terms of rupture, dislocation, and originality. Giedion's history projects lessons of a past, reconstructed according to present values, into a preconceived future. His tome lends the authority to the architecture of the modern movement, which hitherto struggled for historical legitimacy.[33]

---

27   Ibid., pp. 144-146; Andrea Memmo, *Elementi dell'architettura lodoliana, ossia l'arte del fabbricare con solidità scientifica e con eleganza non capricciosa* (1786, Milan: Gabriele Mazzotta, 1973).

28   Tafuri, ibid., p. 148; Francesco Milizia, *Principi di architettura civile*, edited and illustrated by Giovanni Antonini (1847 ed.) (1804, Milan: Gabriele Mazzotta, 1972).

29   Tafuri, ibid.

30   Ibid.

31   Ibid.

32   Ibid.

33   Siegfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard Uni-

For Tafuri, confusing the tasks of history with the programme of the modern movement represents a destructive turn for *both* history and practice. His basic proposal for history and architecture involves a clear demarcation: history starts from the present and looks to the past, with eyes conditioned by the present; architecture starts from the present, including history as one contextual element, and looks to the future. In this sense, history is analytical, while architecture is utopian, insofar as it exists in a world conditioned by the present, but projected into a future with hopes but without guarantees. The historiography of the modern movement, and of *CIAM* as its agency, legitimated architectural projects professing to solve the range of social, economic and cultural ills faced by society. From the outset of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, Tafuri positions the modern movement as an 'eclipse' in which that movement's utopian futures and the possible paths that the future might actually take drew so far apart that it represented a retreat from the present real world and the clues contained therein as to how architecture might legitimately proceed. Yet the 'eclipse' Tafuri identifies as the end point of this trajectory is of 'history' rather than 'architecture.'[34] The reconsideration of knowledge and its organization in the 1950s and early 1960s undermined the utopian aspirations of modern architecture by demonstrating their self-referentiality and ultimate detachment from 'the real.'[35] The histories employed in service of such utopian goals are thus framed as elements of, and not distinct from, the mainstream modern movement. The historiography of the "'masters' of contemporary architecture" thus forms an "incessant polemical operation" in support of the 'maestri' of modern architecture.[36] The simultaneous fulfillment of *la critica operativa* and modern architecture therefore coincided, in Tafuri's terms, with their greatest interdependent poverty, demonstrated in the production of relics to legitimate a mythical quest for the future.

❧

In restating Tafuri's case, it is important to acknowledge that he does not reject operativity *per se* as a tendency within *architectural* discourse. He rather rejects it as a methodology that draws history into a servile relationship to architecture. The future-focused discipline of architecture thus transforms, by the nature of the interaction, history into architecture, or following Tafuri's logic, the past into utopian representation. It seems clear that such 'myth' undermines the premises of history as an analytical discipline. However, just as the operative tradition assumed the characteristics of an architectural project under the guise of history, Tafuri's proposal continues that trajectory by proposing the *removal* of operativity from history, aligning it properly *with* architecture in a form of critical

versity Press, 1941). We ought also to identify the most extraordinary example of Giedion's *la critica operativa*, his collected lectures, published as *The Eternal Present*, 2 vols. (New York: Pantheon, 1964).

34   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, p. 170.

35   This same criticism would be directed elsewhere by Tafuri and his colleague Franco Rella.—Cf. Chapter Six.

36   Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 154.

practice that is at once concerned with the future, but which makes analyses of present, and not past, conditions in order to realise future ends. History, as an accumulation of events traced and understood from a present moment, becomes one contextual element of an operative architectural discourse that includes such media as writing, photography, drawing, modelling, master plans, treatises, and buildings. It is understood as a complex of the present—neither of the past nor the future—inviting analysis conceived with the future already—and programmatically—in mind. Tafuri therefore distinguishes between the possibility of a written architectural discourse assuming the (consequently) vacated place of *la critica operativa* (what he regards as the *recovery* of history by discrediting operative historiography) and the reconfiguration of the operative tradition to exclude literary form beyond explicitly polemic or theoretical modes. In this program, he identifies 'critical photography' and 'typological criticism' as 'architectural' practices capable of looking to the future from a field distinctly isolated from the production of history.[37]

Under the terms of Tafuri's conception of an operative architectural production, photography in architectural publications may *replace* the function of text in criticism of current issues. Rather than relying on strategically positioned myths, photography engages the visual conditions of the present, perpetuating models consumed as images and replicated in the production of new buildings and cities. The difficulty faced by this mode of operative discourse, as Tafuri understands it, lies in the transition from the editorial inclusion of staged, but inert, photographs in architectural magazines to integrated visual arguments that convey critical positions intended to steer readers towards a specific course of action. Tafuri cites the attempts of *Carré bleu* (since 1958), *Archigram* (1961-1974) and *Il marcatrè* (1963-1969), but regards their influence as ultimately marginal. In offering dislocated images—fixed and isolated representations of the whole—and eliminating time, photography embraces its own discontinuity as an inherent deformation of visual critique. Tafuri argues the capacity for architectural photography to transform a "pure visual hedonism" into a "formidable operative instrument."[38] The typological bases of urban schemes of Alison and Peter Smithson,

37   The proper terrain of that field—architectural practice as an operative critique—is the subject of Luca Monica's *La critica operativa e l'architettura*. The edited collection restates Tafuri's critique but asks what the positive limits of architectural criticality might be, and where the positive consequences of architect-historians offering exemplars might reside. Daniel Sherer considers the implications of 'La critica operativa' to the theoretical strain exemplified in the work of Peter Eisenman and continued to the present day.—Luca Monica, ed., *La critica operativa e l'architettura* (Milan: Unicopli, 2002); we refer to Daniel Sherer, 'Un colloquio "inquietante." Manfredo Tafuri e la critica operativa, 1968-1980,' pp. 108-119. The discussion of 'critical' architecture has more recently been reinvigorated in the United Kingdom through conferences of the Architectural Humanities Research Association. The 2004 meeting, 'Critical Architecture,' has been reported upon, in part, in *The Journal of Architecture* 10, 3 (2005); it will be published in full in 2006 as *Critical Architecture*, eds. Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser, Jonathan Hill and Jane Rendell (London: Routledge, forthcoming).

38   Ibid., p. 158. Consider, by comparison, Tafuri's own collaborative practice of 'staging' photographic arguments in *Casabella-continuità* as a member of 'lo studio Architetti e urbanisti associati di Roma.'—Tafuri, 'Studi e ipotesi di lavoro per il sistema direzionale di Roma,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 264 (June 1962): 27-36; Tafuri, Giorgio Piccinato and Vieri Quilici ('per lo studio AUA di Roma'), 'La città territorio. Verso una nuova dimensione,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 270 (December 1962): 16-25; Tafuri and Enrico Fattinnanzi, 'Un'ipotesi per la città-territorio di Roma. Strutture produttive e direzionali

Carlo Aymonino, Also Rossi, Vittorio Gregotti and others likewise displace text by conducting analyses of existing urban complexes in order to propose *plans* as solutions. The practitioners of typological criticism apply analytical tools in assessing architectural questions of systems and relationships. It commences not from an ideological position but from an existing reality, determining schemes (literally, plans) for the future based on studies of the present. History is not removed from the spectrum of concerns for the fields of criticism aligned with planning, but rather treated as a present contextual condition, along lines similar to the treatment of history by modern architecture, but without the confusion introduced by the manufactured detachment of its writers. They interrogate the past as one dimension of a specific site of enquiry in present in order to propose an idea for the future from a thoroughly considered present. Urban typology and the conception of architectural form are thus drawn together in a practice where *analysis* informs the *plan*.

As with photography, the methodological deformations of typological criticism are acceptable in their transparency. Just as a photograph isolates fragments of an unrepresentable whole within a frame, typological criticism tests experimental planning strategies based on the analysis of existing contexts. Employed openly, both lead to a perpetuation of operative tendencies within architectural discourse, but avoid the misidentification of *la critica operativa* with a form of historical production in which the future is not preconceived, or is at least not pre-emptively valued. But what end does this latter form of history serve? Its fundamental concern, Tafuri argues, is the evaluation of meaning in architecture (and, by extension, the meaning *of* 'architecture') particular to specific times and places. That is to say, at each moment of architecture's past, 'architecture' in the sense of a *project* is implicated in a perpetually changing "universe of discourse." The artifacts, materials and tools of critical examination, along with the significance of criticism and history to artistic production, perpetually change: "the language of architecture is formed, defined and left behind in history, together with the very idea of architecture."[39] Tafuri therefore advances one 'task' of historical practice as

> the recovery, as far as possible, of the original functions and ideologies that, in the course of time, define and delimit the role and meaning of architecture. That this recovery is always subjective does not constitute a real problem … contemporary criticism has long since worked out parameters able to set up a productive dialectic between the work and its analyst …. By showing the 'pieces' of that organic whole which is architecture, the historian can reveal the multiple meanings and contradictions hidden—by definition, we are tempted to say—behind the apparent organicity with which architecture presents itself.[40]

nel comprensorio pontino,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 274 (April 1963): 26-37.

39   Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 228.

40   Ibid., pp. 228-229.

By referencing to a complex past, historical analysis unearths the "ambiguity, values and mystifications" of the present. There remains a relationship with architectural practice, but this is not pre-emptive.[41] Rather, critical analysis exposes history's contradictions and these, in turn, are unconditionally brought to the attention of those who conceive the world of the future.

> We need, then, to give up simplifying history, and to accept its internal contradictions and its plurality, stressing its dialectical sides, and exalting it for what it really is …. Not because the instrumentalization of history is *wrong*, but because our goals are different, they aim at another type of 'productivity,' they want to enter the architectural operation in a mediated and indirect way, suggesting a multiplication of the problems rather than solutions to the existing ones.[42]

Tafuri argues for a concept of critical history in which the historian plays "a dialectical role in respect of the architect; almost to the point of constant opposition."[43] An '*in*operative criticism' must see "history as a continuous *contestation of the present*, even as a threat, if you like, to the tranquillizing myths wherein the anxieties and doubts of modern architects find peace."[44] This position is predicated on history's contrapuntal position towards the myth-making tendencies of architecture, maintained in order to hold practice more rigorously responsible for its own production. Tafuri's historian, consequently (as ideally conceived in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*), tests architects against functional and ideological positions and demystifies the past by recovering its *milieu* of codes from each moment and exposing their historicity, on one hand, and their unavailability to the future, on the other.

<div align="center">❧</div>

This scheme treats the architectural historian and the architect as two separate figures; in such terms, the relationship Tafuri outlines is both sensible and readily understood. However, the situation is both complicated and problematic because of the regular coincidence of the architect and historian in one complex figure. Tafuri's own disciplinary alignments shift from architecture to architectural history over the course of the 1960s pervades the wider institutional claims of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Neither this complexity nor its causality is surprising. In his Passerini *autoritratto*, he couched his 'turn away' from architecture as a divorce neither immediate nor complete, oscillating between the love of history and the suspicion that it was "something to be renounced in favor of action." He locates exactly in 1964 his dedication "entirely to history," while still

---

41   Ibid., p. 230.
42   Ibid., p. 233.
43   Ibid., p. 64.
44   Ibid., p. 233.

an assistant in Rome and Milan, two years before assuming a professorship at Palermo.[45] We must wonder if Tafuri deliberately implies that the archetypal architectural historian practicing according to the principles of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* would mirror his personal experience of an 'historical turn.' Would this, what was for Tafuri a private intellectual choice, correspond to institutional structures under the changed disciplinary landscape that he sketches out? Are those historians who practice history as Tafuri intends (though we are obliged to read between the lines), educated within an *autonomous* discipline? Or are they, like Tafuri, architects by training who, for one reason or another—although the best reason appears to be a search for criticality—favour history over architecture and accordingly trade the tools and tasks of architecture for those of history? While the former would provide a clearer institutional impetus, the latter appears to be the explain the tendency, in Venice as elsewhere, in architectural history initially taking the form of a specialised field within and after the broader enterprise of a professional architectural education. However, and while Tafuri himself seems to favour this path for reasons that are quite clear clea in biographical terms, it does not, on its own, resolve the essential incongruity of two dialectical disciplinary figures placed on the same continuums of education, knowledge, materials.

Tafuri's historians test architectural practice by presenting history as a complex accumulation of events, not readily, or even possibly, retold. They argue that the past is fundamentally heterogeneous, as is the present and as will be the future. The pursuit of homogeneous, resolved, and singular visions is the domain of architecture; to undermine this quest is the responsibility of history.[46] In Tafuri's conception of historiography, *la critica operativa* is problematic because it pursues myth while appearing as history, presenting accounts of the past as trajectories, suggesting that these may be continued into the future.[47] In contrast to the 'operative critic,' Tafuri's historian limits his analyses to expose the "multiplication of problems" inherent to reality and by so doing reveals the fundamentally complicated and elusive task of rendering contemporeneous that which has already passed. The irreconcilability of that past (both to itself and to its representation) is thus exposed as a burden of the present, but one that enjoys a productive dimension in a history-architecture dialectic. Later revisiting this theme in *Ricerca del rinascimento*, Tafuri writes of "the 'weak force' of analysis … as a moment in a process keeping the past's unresolved problems alive, unsettling our present."[48] In the

---

45   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 29-31.

46   We may observe here that the proposition by Eisenman and his contemporaries of a critical architecture, a proposition that finds other forms as 'deconstructivism,' complicates this assertion to a very large extent. To the degree that this development occurs within a period of time *between* 1968 and our contemporary disciplinary concerns, we will not discuss the topic further.—Peter Eisenman, *Houses of Cards* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987); Camillo Gubitosi and Alberto Izzo, eds., *Five Architects NY* (Rome: Officina, 1977); Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley, *Deconstructivist Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1988).

47   We do not, here, refer simply to historicism. As a later chapter explains, the foundations of architectural theory involve the process of historical representation, a translation from analysis to projection.

48   Tafuri, *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1992), p. xxi. The passage originally reads: "il 'debole potere' dell'analisi, in altre parole, viene proposto come momento di un processo che lasci vivere i problemi irrisolti nel passato, inquietando il nostro presente."—our trans.

'weak force' (il 'debole potere') of historical analysis, irresolution of the past continues to haunt the present, though neither as a threat, a talisman nor a warning. It is simply present. With an eye towards the future, the architect cannot *solve* problems of the past; yet he or she must admit, suggests Tafuri, that acts of the present are tomorrow's 'silent' historical burdens. Therein lies the importance of history's presence in this system as an "unmediated operation" in relation to architectural practice. Tafuri's conception of historical practice thus claims a function in stark contrast to the 'strong force' of *la critica operativa*: history mediated by architectural programme, thus incapable of negotiating the past's inherent instability.

Tafuri does not, therefore, position the relation of practice-myth to criticism-analysis as a dichotomy so much as a dynamic system in which actors are assigned clearly defined roles. The historian does not preclude the architect from either looking to the future or theorising the present moment; nor does history stake an absolute claim on written form. Conversely, Tafuri's own (early and) later practice of drawing as a form of critical analysis demonstrates that history would continue to find new ways of looking as the existing *milieu* of material from the past.[49] Even further, it makes room for the historian's own intellectual and ideological *bagage. Teorie e storia dell'architettura* presents a territorial scheme that carves a cross-section through the past, the future, and the present time in which the architect's and historian's disciplines are each exercised within a disciplinary system where the production of architecture is constantly, though not always explicitly, at stake. The extent to which these disciplinary figures can co-exist and the degree to which their dialectical exchange tends towards opposition in practice—the constant opposition of which Tafuri writes above—remain the elusive values of this polemic. Tafuri's historian, to put it otherwise, is not simply something other than an architect; rather, he or she is programmatically antagonistic towards 'the architect' (for their own sake) while claiming advanced knowledge (in turn) of the architect's field of disciplinary knowledge (yet not, to repeat, sharing either their tools or their tasks). In *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, he asserts that the tools and tasks of historical practice self-consciously and respond auto-critically to specific historical, intellectual and institutional settings. It is impossible to extricate, he contends, historical consciousness from the ongoing testing process, *through* historical practice, of the disciplinary form and 'proper' practice of architectural historiography. Tafuri interrogates, in turn, the approaches of the historian-architect (such as Giovannoni or Zevi) and the art historian who takes architecture as his or her field (such as Argan or Giedion) to understand the place of their historical knowledge within, firstly, architectural practice, and subsequently architectural culture *writ large*.[50] Yet while the historian of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* eschews the practice of

49   Anna Bedon, Guido Beltramini and Pierre-Alain Croset, 'Una prima bibliografia' / 'An Initial Bibliography,' Gregotti, ed., ibid.: 170-175. We would indicate, too, the 'celebration' of this later practice of Tafuri's by the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio.'*—Anna Bedon, Guido Beltramini and Howard Burns, eds, *Questo. Disegni e studi di Manfredo Tafuri per la ricostruzione di edifice e contesti urbani rinascimentali / Celui-ci. Dessins et études de Manfredo Tafuri pour la restitution d'édifces et de contextes urbains de la Renaissance* (Vicenza: Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio,' 1995).

50   For a commentary on Tafuri's critical relationship with Giovannoni, see Christof Thoenes essay, 'Bra-

architecture, he or she clearly remains *within* architectural culture, an inbuilt conscience treating historical practice as a constant critical operation releasing architecture of its burdens, which in turn continue to pile up on its disciplinary shoulders. To this extent that we cannot call this step away from architecture as a 'retreat,' given what remains at stake. We regard it simply, though importantly, as a *choice*.

<p style="text-align:center">❧</p>

Returning to elements of Tafuri's 'autobiography,' we can frame his *choice* in terms of a specific professional, cultural and polemical setting.[51] While not the sole explanation for his practice, as an historian, the setting of this practice (with its adherent disciplinary rationale) reflects back upon the way he constructs himself, both through his academic life and into death. His gravestone, even, makes a simple yet heavily intentioned claim with the inscription 'Storico dell'architettura.'[52] A short review of his 'early work' in 1960s Rome reveals substantially more complicated life in architectural culture than his 'easy' dismissal of the architect's position in historical practice tends to suggest. From this time and place, he conducted a sustained exploration of the disciplinary limitations of architecture and history, and by extension an exploration of *both* architectural and historical practices. The theme of 'criticality' is particularly important here, extending across his forays into both architecture and historiography. If, as architect *and* historian, he ultimately followed (we would venture to observe) a principle of criticality, what change does he effect by *choosing* history over architecture? What of this choice belongs specifically to its setting? What bearing, in turn, does it have upon his apparently new historiographical criticality that emerges towards the end of that decade?

When Tafuri writes of 'architecture' and 'history' as disciplines or practices, he invokes their abstract disciplinary perspectives that he names 'operativity' and 'criticality.'[53] To repeat a formula introduced earlier: both 'operative' and 'critical' disciplinary figures (allowing that these can be conflated into one person) start from a 'present moment.' The operative (architect) looks forward while the critic (historian) looks back; both activate what they observe through a practice of and in the present, a veritable contemporaneity. While the architect *anticipates* the future from the present, designing in effect '*for* the future,' that which the historian sees '*from* the past' appears in books or lectures as documentation of research shared with a present audience. Tafuri introduces, though, an important distinction that allows us to differentiate between their two respective 'visions.' The architect's is utopian, conceived but not yet realised; the historian's is memorial (this, in turn, a convenient term, but substantially more complicated that its

---

mante-Giovannoni. Il Rinascimento interpretato dall'architettura fascista, Manfredo Tafuri su Giovan-noni,' *Casabella*, no. 634 (May 1996): 64-73.

51 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 31.

52 A photograph of the monument appears in *Zodiac*, no. 12 (1994), pp. 4-5.

53 Insofar as he reflects on these positions explicitly, he does so in 'La critica operativa' (*Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, pp. 165-197) and 'I compiti della critica' (pp. 261-272) respectively.

easy invocation implies): representing a past that is unrecoverable in its entirety. These abstractions encapsulate a basic premise for the tension identified by Tafuri in the ideal relationship of historian to architect, in their tendency, he anticipates, towards 'constant opposition.'

If we assay Tafuri's choice against its setting, Rome quickly becomes vital as a backdrop to this polemic. It exemplifies in perpetuity the figurative 'context' for architectural practice, even after 1964, and even if rarely named.[54] In historicising his decision for history, both 'criticality' and 'operativity' remain constant for their importance for addressing his place within architectural culture, one programmatically assumed on behalf of all historians of architecture. Yet, by arguing an image (in turn) of 'Tafuri the historian,' we must consider those factors undermining that same claim. In advancing a scheme of constant dialectical confrontation between architect and historian, operator and critic, Tafuri suggests that this confrontation is something that occurs *within* the bounds of architectural culture. He notes that the 'critic' is rarely 'raised' within an existing discipline of architectural history, rather enlisted *from* architecture, history of art, or other related fields.[55] The decision to 'become' an architectural historian involves entering or shifting *within* architectural culture, taking up the equipment and the critical tools of other disciplines, but always (according to Tafuri's framework), in opposition to the architect, which is to say, in rejection of operativity. In the most fundamental terms, the choice for history is a choice for criticality.

Returning to Tafuri's response to Zevi and Portoghesi's *Michelangelo architetto*, we can expand upon the nature of this catalyst for his 'rejection' of architecture. While Zevi introduced Michelangelo's mannerism in defence of specific architectural practices of the twentieth century, he also draped over Michelangelo's shoulders the mantle of the archetypal artist-intellectual-genius capable of leading the masses towards their greater good. Tafuri objected to Zevi's thinly veiled promotion of existing polemical structures governing urban debate in Rome in the early 1960s, wherein intellectuals exercised political influence, while 'the people' effected none. Zevi's championing of organic architectural and urban forms, and of the modern day artistic legacy of Frank Lloyd Wright, constructed Michelangelo thus in order to uphold his *Democrazia cristiana* (*DC*) vision for the immediate future of the Italian city. This comprised a criticism of Fernando Tambroni and Amintore Fanfani's ambivalent centre-left governments; each leader anxious to court both the popular vote and developer *lire*.[56] Tafuri, though endorsing

---

54   To demonstrate Tafuri's complicated relationship with Rome, consider how Italo Insolera mentions his activities, yet Tafuri writes himself out of *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985*.—Insolera, *Roma moderna. Un secolo di storia urbanistica 1870-1970*, rev. (1962, Turin: Einaudi, 1993), pp. 215, 261-262. We will return to this issue later in the chapter.

55   We use the word 'rarely' to allow for exceptions, although Tafuri might as well say 'never.' Overall, this point is a vast simplification, but one that we can uphold even though several institutions in a number of countries offer undergraduate architectural history and theory majors distinct from or complementary to professional architectural or art historical education. Our point resides in the degree to which a disciplinary position rather than course catalogues determine the nature of an architectural history education.

56   On this era of Italian politics more generally, cf. Paul Ginsborg, *A History of Contemporary Italy, 1943-*

this latter criticism, disagreed that Zevi's organicism was the natural alternative to *Le mani sulla città*: the new expressionism, as the new mannerism, as proper to intellect-led, democratic society.[57] In the tradition of *la critica operativa* described above, *Michelangelo architetto* purported to be *critical* while instead being *operative*, implicating contemporary debates and expressing clear views functioning as judgements. Zevi's eyes, in Tafuri's view, were fixed not on the past but on the future.

Tafuri melodramatically equates his rejection of architecture with "one tragic night" after seeing *Michelangelo architetto*.[58] He finds many occasions in which to continue chastising Zevi, emphasising (among other things) the show's importance to him as an example of 'irresponsible' historiography.[59] Tafuri perpetually, from the mid-1960s onwards (the terms evolving, but the sentiment less so), underscores the importance of criticality as a general disciplinary concept; yet when he argues in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* for the historian's capacity to disturb architecture's self-referentiality, as nourished by an isolating yet internalising theoretical device, we might recognise the relevance of his experience in Rome's urban polemics during the regulatory planning era of the late 1950s and early 1960s, during, that is to say, his limited years of architectural practice.

<center>❧</center>

During these years, Tafuri was a member of the studio *Architetti e Urbanisti Associati di Roma* (*AUA*) and of the *Associazione Studenti e Architetti* (*ASEA*). *AUA* formed in 1961, its manifesto signed by Tafuri and five others.[60] They sought to wrest the *Piano Regolatore Generale* (*PRG*) from the hands of those developers cashing in on Italy's 'economic miracle.'[61] They entered urban, regional planning, and urban infrastructure competitions,

[57] Cf. Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 21; *Le mani sulla città*, dir. Francesco Rosi (Warner, 1963).

[58] In his own words: "One tragic night I was miserable because I had to decide between practice and history. I remember I was sweating, walking around, felt ill, had a fever. At the end, in the morning, I had decided and that was it! I gave up all the tools of architecture and determined to dedicate myself entirely to history. What kind of history I didn't know, but I knew at that moment that it should be history."—Tafuri, ibid pp. 30-31.

[59] Consider, for instance, his characterisation, on 'Il "progetto" storico,' of "i suoi arbitrari e pirotecnici sdoppiamenti di Michelangelo, Borromini o Wright."—Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie da Piranesi agli anni '70* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980), p. 21.

[60] They were Lucio Barbera, Bernardo Rossi Doria, Stefano Ray, Massimo Teodori and Tafuri, with Enrico Fattinnanzi's name added later.—Federico Rosa, 'Progetto e critica dell'urbanistica moderna. I primi anni di attività di Manfredo Tafuri, 1959-1968,' unpublished *tesi di laurea*, Università Iuav di Venezia, 2003, p. 17n; *Superfici* 2, no. 5 (April 1962), p. 19. *AUA*'s projects were often co-signed by a large cohort of *progettisti*, including those named above as well as Lidia Soprani, Vieri Quilici, Sergio Bracco, Alessandro Calza Bini, Massimo La Perna, Claudia Maroni, Gianfranco Moneta, Maurizio Moretti, Giorgio Piccinato; named project collaborators also include Mary Anselmi, Gino Ceci, Mimino D'Ercole, Sandro Orlandi. By 1963, *AUA* could claim the following stable core of *progettisti*: Barbera, Bracco, Bini, Fattinnanzi, La Perna, Maroni, Moneta, Piccinato, Quilici, Ray, Doria, Teodori and Tafuri. Rosa's *tesi di laurea* contains the most informed synthesis of material pertaining to Tafuri's work in the period under discussion here, relying heavily upon Quilici's personal papers. I have noted several references hitherto unknown to me from his text and recommend it to others interested in further reading on Tafuri's 'practice.'

[61] Ginsborg treats this in depth.—Ibid., pp. 210-253.

wrote in professional journals and daily newspapers, and attended the meetings of such politicised (if entrenched) cultural and professional associations as *Italia nostra* and the *Istituto Nazionale di Urbanistica* (*INU*).[62] *AUA* researched social and technical problems raised by the *PRG*, into the pressing issue of public parks in Rome and into the largely unheeded challenges posed by suburban sprawl in Italian cities, much romanticised in neorealist cinema and literature.[63] Further, they promoted projects elaborating the principles of what they regarded as 'good architecture.'[64] In a commercial exhibition at Toulouse in 1964 (the same year in which the *atelier* dissolved), *AUA* presented itself as a professional and research organisation concerned with construction, architecture, urbanism and regional planning. The studio claimed expertise in territorial planning, in issues deriving from 'new social and political organisation,' housing, social and collective infrastructures, new formal modes of urban and landscape design, and the modern organisation of industry, commerce and transportation.[65] Tafuri's own 'projects' tend to be polemical; the only built work Rosa records is a *centroturistico* for the west-coast town of Farmia, designed with Lidia Soprani.[66]

Read in the broader scope of Tafuri's architectural practice, *AUA* followed *ASEA*'s attempts to claim the *piano regolatore* debate for a discussion of architecture's moral responsibilities to society. Tafuri and several contemporaries founded *ASEA* in 1959 to oppose, among other things, the teachings of Saverio Muratori, Rome's conservative

---

62   Rome was well-stocked with associations at a variety of scales at this moment. Besides *ASEA* and *AUA*, they included the *Società di Architettura e Urbanistica* (*SAU*), *Italia nostra*, *Istituto Nazionale di Architettura* (*INArch*), *Associatione per Architettura Organica* (*APAO*) and the *Gruppo Romano Architetti e Urbanisti* (*GRAU*). Besides his work in *AUA* and *ASEA*, Tafuri also sat on the Roman committees of both *Italia nostra* and *INU*.—Tafuri, 'Attività politica e critica di architetti romani,' *Superfici* 2, no. 5 (April 1962), pp. 42-47; F. Tentori, 'Progetti di architetti romani,' *Casabella-continuita*, no. 289 (July 1964), pp. 3-11. On *AUA* projects for housing blocks in Latina and Bologna see *Casabella-continuità*, no. 289 (July 1964), pp. 9-11. Their project for a systematic plan for the Villa Savoia public park (Tafuri, Quilici, Moretti, Soprani, Doria and Alessandro Urbani) appears in Tafuri, 'Il problema dei parchi pubblici in Roma e l'azione di "Italia nostra",' *Urbanistica. Rivista trimestrale dell'Istituto nazionale di urbanistica*, no. 34 (1961), pp. 105-112. Rosa includes a number of archival competition records from the Quilici's papers: projects for the *PRG* of Acqui Termi (1961: Soprani, Tafuri), Roseto degli Abruzzi (1961: Quilici); for the systematic plan at Fano (1962: Barbera, Bracco, Bini, Fattinanzi, La Perna, Maroni, Moneta, Moretti, Piccinato, Quilici, Ray, Doria, Tafuri); for a directional centre in Turin (1962: Barbera, Bracco, Piccinato, Quilici, Ray, Doria, Teodori, Tafuri, with P. Piazzo); for a hospital in Venice (1963: Barbera, Bracco, Bini, Fattinanzi, La Perna, Maroni, Moneta, Moretti, Piccinato, Quilici, Ray, Doria, Tafuri, Teodori) and for the urban system at Piazza A. Costa in Fano (1963: Barbera, Bracco, Bini, Fattinanzi, La Perna, Maroni, Moneta, Piccinato, Quilici, Ray, Doria, Teodori, Tafuri).—Rosa, ibid., pp. 129-177.

63   Cf. Maristella Casciato, 'Neorealism in Italian Architecture,' *Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture*, eds. Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture; Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2000), pp. 25-53.

64   Compare Tafuri's review of recent work from the emerging 'Rome School,' framed in terms of the constituent factors of 'good architecture': "striving for a broader dimension in architectural interventions in cities," "a move beyond the 'International Style,' towards more complex and better articulated plan and volume solutions," and "experimentation with … new technology."—Tafuri, 'Recente attività dello studio romano architetti e ingegneri,' *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 93 (July 1963), pp. 150-169.

65   The *AUA* display at Toulouse was organised by the *Istituto italiana per il commercio estero di Roma*.—'Presentazione dello Studio AUA ed esposizione dei propri progetti presso la 33° Fiera di Tolosa (30 aprile-11 maggio 1964),' reproduced in Rosa, ibid., pp. 178-179, followed by 8pp unpaginated tables, from the papers of Vieri Quilici.

66   Ibid., p. 142.

professor of architectonic composition.[67] *ASEA* provided a forum for young graduates and faculty assistants to agitate for curriculum change, intended to equip students with an understanding of contemporary problems and to prepare them for practice as urbanists. *ASEA* was involved (like *AUA*) in *Italia nostra*, which from the late 1950s enjoyed support from a number of Leftist architects and intellectuals. Their university polemic (as noted) argued for the inclusion of urban and regional planning in the curriculum to emphasise its importance outside of the university. Faculty Dean Saul Greco allowed *ASEA* to run a 'parallel course' in urban planning. They recorded the debates and results of this course in articles appearing in *Comunità*, *Casabella-continuità* and *Urbanistica*, and in 1964 published *La città territorio*.[68] Illustrating the congruity of these two groups, an essay of the same title appeared under the authorship of *AUA* in *Casabella-continuità* (naming studio members who also belonged to *ASEA*), a visual essay addressing recent urban work in several large cities that accounted for the scalar shift from 'city' to 'territory.' Within little time, Tafuri's first two books echo this objective; *Ludovico Quaroni* and *L'architettura moderna in giappone* identify historical lessons both close and at a remove for these debates in Rome.[69]

Until its publication in 1962, the *PRG* and its impact both in the university and in the profession provided focus for the activities of *AUA* and *ASEA*. They quickly identified the impotence of architects to effect any significant change in an even vaguely politicised construction sector. In neither setting did Tafuri distinguish between architectural and political activity, especially insofar as it implicated the university, which represented (even if only theoretically, and to a very few) the intellectual vanguard of planning laws and practice. The forty-three day occupation of the Valle Giulia *Facoltà di architettura* during 1963 (or throwing rocks at mounted police, as an ongoing protest against authority exercised against students) also represented a form of critical architectural practice, logically extending from activities that included writing and teaching the *corso parallelo* to balance out the university's deficiencies and the profession's

---

[67] 'Gli studenti di architettura contro il Piano Regolatore,' *Il tempo,* November 21, 1959, p. 5. This article contains the *ASEA dichiarazione. ASEA* mounted an exhibition of 'scandalous' projects from Muratori's course from March 21-26, 1960.—Ibid., p. 101.

[68] Tafuri, 'Un piano per Tokyo e le nuove problematiche dell'urbanistica contemporanea,' *Argomenti di architettura*, no. 4 (December 1961), pp. 70-77; Giorgio Piccinato and Tafuri, 'Helsinki,' *Urbanistica*, no. 33 (1961), pp. 88-104; Piccinato, Quilici and Tafuri ('per lo studio AUA di Roma'), 'La città territorio. Verso una nuova dimensione,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 270 (December 1962), pp. 16-25; Tafuri, 'Razionalismo critico e nuovo utopianismo,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 293 (November 1964), pp. 20-42. Articles dealing with Rome itself include Tafuri, 'Studi per ipotesi di lavoro per il sistema direzionale di Roma,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 264 (June 1962), pp. 27-36; Fattinnanzi and Tafuri ('per lo studio AUA di Roma'), 'Un'ipotesi per la città-territorio di Roma. Strutture produttive e direzionale nel comprensorio pontino,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 274 (April 1963), pp. 26-37; Tafuri, 'Ludovico Quaroni e la cultura architettonica italiana,' *Zodiac*, no. 11 (1963), pp. 130-145; and Carlo Aymonino, Sergio Bracco, Saulo Greco et al., eds., *La città territorio. Problemi della nuova dimensione. Un esperimento didattico sul Centro direzionale di Centocelle in Roma* (Rome: Leonardo da Vinci, 1964). Cf. Tafuri, 'La vicenda architettonica romana 1945-1961,' *Superfici* 2, no. 5 (April 1962), pp. 20-42; 'Letteratura architettonica romana del dopoguerra,' *Superfici* 3, no. 6 (September 1963), pp. 64-69.

[69] Tafuri, *L'architettura moderna in giappone* (Bologna: Cappelli, 1964); *Ludovico Quaroni e lo sviluppo dell'architettura moderna in Italia* (Milan: Comunità, 1964).

blind-spots.[70] A consistent theme of Tafuri's writing in the early 1960s is the inability of architectural institutions to counteract the capitalist mechanisms underpinning public works legislation.[71] Consistent with his basic stance, he denounced the *PRG* in *Paese sera* as a 'piano di vincoli.'[72] Fiorentino Sullo's scheme to turn undeveloped land over to public ownership encountered overwhelming opposition from the political centre and its investor-developer financiers. Professional debate exerted no discernible force upon the 'real' problems Sullo (in sympathy with the Left) sought to address, or on his subsequent political abandonment by the Centre and his own Party.[73]

Tafuri reiterates this judgement on several occasions. For example, in his revision of Argan's definition of 'Architecture' in the *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti* he writes of the "ethico-social and political motives" in contemporary architecture that licensed modernist architects to divorce practice from critical discourse.[74] He argues that the self-assigned missions of (late) *CIAM*, Team 10, MARS, and others of the late modern movement were concerned more with architectonics and form than with development and post-War reconstruction, which were important in many places, but not necessarily to architectural theory. While *CIAM* and its 'children' understood society's problems in architectural terms, *AUA* and *ASEA* sought to enter a direct political and social debate on (precisely) 'ethico-social' and 'political' terms. For Tafuri, this comprised a critical operativity: a professional architectural practice that perceived what the future might be, but designed as critique of the contemporary debate. Criticism of the present remains Tafuri's principal objective in these years. It differs markedly in tone, as well as in content (though not in assertiveness), from Zevi's operative criticality, which did not directly seek change outside of architecture, but rather change *within* architectural thinking, limited by historical example. Admittedly, Tafuri's writing on contemporary urban issues does not appear critically distant in the sense that he later argued was necessary for the historian. Likewise, his historical essays in *Comunità* tend to identify appreciable 'lessons.'[75] Tafuri's years in architectural practice, therefore, demonstrate

---

70   While we can trust Tafuri in claiming involvement in the student action, which in itself is important for the present essay, Rosa throws some doubt on his 'engagement': "La participazione di Tafuri a tale occupazione, per lo meno nelle sue fasi iniziali, è da mettere in dubbio … pioché è accertata la sua presenza tra il 20 marzo e il 3 aprile a *Corso sperimentale di urbanistica* di Arezzo … si produsse una dichiarazione collettiva di solidarietà, agli studenti, datata 21 marzo 1963."—Rosa, ibid., pp. 113-114; Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 21.

71   See, for instance, his discourse in the journal of *Italia nostra*: Tafuri, 'I lavori di attuazione del PR di Roma,' *Italia nostra. Bollettino dell'Associazione nazionale 'Italia nostra' per la tutela del patrimonio artistico e naturale*, no. 18 (1960), pp. 6-11; 'Il codice dell'urbanistica ed i piani di risanamento conservativo,' *Italia nostra*, no. 21 (1961), pp. 13-17; 'Il paessaggio industriale,' *Italia nostra*, no. 27 (March-April 1962), pp. 1-5.

72   'Intervista di "Paese sera" [5-6 maggio 1962],' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 279 (September 1963), p. 45.

73   Ginsborg, ibid., pp. 217-272.

74   Tafuri, 'Architettura,' *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti. Terza appendice 1949-1960*, vol. 1 (Rome: Istituto della enciclopedia italiana, 1961), p. 122.

75   For example: Tafuri, 'La prima strada di Roma moderna. Via Nazionale,' *Urbanistica*, no. 27 (1959), pp. 95-109; 'Storicità di Louis Kahn,' *Comunità. Giornale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 117 (February 1964), pp. 38-49; 'Problemi d'urbanistica,' *Comunità*, no. 112 (August-September 1963), pp. 46-53; 'Architettura e socialismo nel pensiero di William Morris,' review of *William Morris. Architettura e socialismo*, ed. Mario Manieri Elia, *Comunità*, no. 280 (October 1963), pp. 35-39; 'E May e l'urbanistica

an operativity appropriate to his discipline. However, and paradoxically, his operative practice remains underpinned by a sustained critical position, one extending from judgement of the university and profession alike.[76]

<div align="center">❧</div>

In characterising Tafuri's practice from the turn of the decade until around 1964 as a form of critical operativity, as *action* informed by *critical assessment*, we must ask what broader theoretical issues are at stake in his choice against *la critica operativa* and for a criticality uncompromised by programmatic objectives (for architecture, at least)? One answer lies implicitly within the historian's relationship to the architect as we synthesised it in the first part of this chapter. *La critica operativa* obfuscates the disciplinary clarity potentially claimed by both architecture and history. It aids architecture's irrelevancy to the world at large, as Tafuri claims, by reinforcing the isolating shield of architectural theory, which in turn orders the discipline and practices of architecture while justifying the nature of that same order. *La critica operativa* borrows the disciplinary intentions of architecture while employing the media of historiography. It thus avails itself of the programme imposed by architectural theory. In doing so while posing as historiography (and implying a degree of critical distance), *la critica operativa* fails, in Tafuri's eyes, for not being critical *enough* of the very device that maintains architecture's insularity and, ultimately, its false sense of disciplinary instability. Architecture's disciplinary introversion undermines its capacity to address suburban sprawl and neo-realist romanticism of the 'everyday' (or, by extension, of the 'class struggle'), urban legislation, public space and other issues facing architecture and urban planning at that moment. Architecture lacks, he argues, an informed conscience that can question architects as they justify 'architectural' futures with history and ideation. He concedes to architects their responsibility for forcing the future, but challenges their self-regulation through a theoretical agenda that assumes an ideological role in framing that future from the present, relative to the past. Tafuri thus demonstrates the shared mission of historiography and the 'critique of architectural ideology,' with the task of exposing the construction of architecture's theoretical agendas according to value-laden representations of heterogeneous fields.[77]

We could contextualise much of this disciplinary reconfiguration as simply a judgement of architecture's ineffective role in solving Rome's post-War urban problems.

razionalista,' *Comunità*, no. 123 (October 1964), pp. 66-80; 'Simbolo e ideologia nell'architettura dell'Illuminismo,' *Comunità*, no. 124-125 (November-December 1964), pp. 68-80. He published several archival studies in the *Quaderni* of Rome's *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* at the same moment (one, interestingly, with Lidia Soprani). However, we do not include these works here in the same terms; they rather test out historical methods that would become increasingly important from 1964.

76   Rosa notes, in this respect: "Il fatto che, secondo le testimonianze dei colleghi, Tafuri assumesse il ruolo di 'controllare critico' del processo dicisionale all'interno dell'AUA."—Ibid., p. 120.

77   His reference to Mario Tronti's *critica dell'ideologia* forms the basis of 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79. We will consider this idea in more detail in the following chapter. Cf. Tronti, 'Critica dell'ideologia,' *Operai e capitale* (Turin: Einaudi, 1966), pp. 152-159.

However, Tafuri's attack on operative history reveals a more significant disciplinary problem. The operative historian, he demonstrates, can ask 'why' or 'how,' but only in search of a discursively predetermined answer. Tafuri's theorisation of the relationships between disciplines and practices shifts the place of history from being under the guidance of architectural theory to somewhere *beyond* its control. Through critical (though not operative) analysis, the historian (Tafuri's historian) indeed delivers a programmatically predetermined lesson. However, it is not an image of the future, but a perception that the past is too complex to recover in its entirety and thus too heterogeneous to represent as a principle of architectural production. In so doing, he positions criticality as a necessary precondition of operativity, while intentionally insisting on the irreconcilability of the architect and the historian. By constantly confronting the architect with material traces of the past—both constructing and undermining the architect's artistic heritage—the historian impedes the architect's withdrawal into a theoretical defence conducted solely on architectural terms. If theory defines architecture, Tafuri intends history to expose the weaknesses of that definition. Operative criticality is a form of historical writing conditioned by this theoretically self-referential domain; Tafuri's criticality, in contrast, targets that domain by confronting it with knowledge unmediated by architectural theory. The historian seeks not to impede architectural production, but to have it acknowledge the importance of 'seeing everything with new eyes.'[78] In rejecting operativity in favour of criticality, Tafuri thus advances for history a productive role *within* architectural culture (and by implication *for* practice), but not one that requires the historian to share the architect's functions therein. This calls for a new kind of historian, able to demonstrate the dangers posed by architecture's tendency both towards discursive isolation and towards its *simulation* of criticality in the production of theory.

❦

In the light of two points, then, we return to scrutinise Tafuri's approach to the 'problem' of historical practice. The first involves the roles and relationships of architectural historical practice within architectural culture, in its most inclusive sense. Tafuri openly offers his own historiography up for examination; indeed this is fundamental to his notion of discipline, that practice resists the tendency towards disciplinary form by perpetually reinvestigating its imperatives. The second point functions as a claim on the biographical specificity of this structure of practice and disciplinary relationship, namely that Tafuri's institutionalisation of his thinking about architectural history (initially, at least) in his *Istituto* at Venice (as we have sketched out), have some origins in his own 'rejection' of architecture in favour of history. The place of operativity and criticality, as Tafuri elaborates in 'La critica operativa' with a scheme that situates the limits of historiography relative to architectural practice, thus likewise has a biographical dimension. In this, it

---

78   We refer to Tafuri's citation, at the outset of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, of Peter Weiss, *Die Verfolgung und Ermordung Jean Paul Marat's Dargestellt Durch die Schauspielgruppe des Hospizes zu Charenton unter Anleitung des Herrn de Sade* (Frankfurt am Main: Surhkamp, 1964): 1, 12.

comes the closest of any of his writing to the intellectual 'autobiography' we perceive in the Passerini recording. We can legitimately understand, in this setting, the rejection of history as a rejection of the confusions, intended or accidental, of operativity and criticality. The impression of being focused on critical historical practice, then, to the exclusion of any operative imperative is thus vital to Tafuri's own 'image' of the architectural historian. Not only this, though: the rejection of operativity and, by extension, of operative practices (specifically, those of the architect) in order to render historical practice a more incisive presence, a cultural conscience constructed as both discipline and practice, demands of Tafuri the *denial* of his own history of architectural practice. That he returns to speak of this practice at the end of his career, when his life is limited and when recourse to his claims is readily avoided, is evidence (even if merely implicit) of a deliberate strategy on his part to set aside the confusion of architect and historian as professional or disciplinary figures. In this sense, then, his 1982 essay 'Architettura italiana, 1944-1981,' later expanded under the title *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-85*, demonstrates an extraordinary effort to distance himself from a professional scene and debates with which he was intimately involved, even if for a short time, immediately prior to his 'rejection' (as a member of the architecture fraternity) of that same endeavour.

Put in the most elementary terms, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* aims to problematise architectural production within the history of post-War Italy. This necessarily implicates a raft of economic and political alliances, these extraordinarily complex, as well as a philosophical tradition with origins properly (though not precisely) aligned with the post-War Italian Left. It is one of the most complex of Tafuri's books, demonstrating several similarities with his contemporaneous '*microstorie*' of the Venetian church of S. Francesco della Vigna, *L'armonia e i conflitti* (written with Antonio Foscari) and of 'Renaissance Venice,' *Venezia e il rinascimento*.[79] Yet its differences from these contemporaneous studies are equally vast, reducing the 'critical distance' experienced between Tafuri and his subjects in *L'armonia e i conflitti* and *Venezia e il rinascimento* to a 'zero degree.' This other book forces him to regard, essentially, contemporary events and their immediate prehistory with a complex historiographical sensibility. Tafuri had declared, in 1986 (the year in which *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* appeared) that historical and critical analysis amounted to one single enterprise, the past to a single phenomenon, famously asserting that "there is no criticism, only history."[80] However, the temporal distance normally erased in the equivocation of historical and critical practice could not readily account for the confusion of objectivity and subjectivity that Tafuri implicates in this book. Therein, he evidences a decision not to write of his own place in architectural culture, either as an architect or as an engaged critic, present in juries, debate and journalism, or (for that matter, and perhaps most importantly) education.

---

79 Tafuri and Foscari, *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983); Tafuri, *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985).

80 Tafuri, 'There is No Criticism, Only History.'

In other words, as a problem proper to historiography, the book tackles the difficult task of determining a strategy for producing and documenting the critical histories of contemporaneous *milieux* that work principally as histories of the present rather than as criticism as criticism might conventionally be understood. That is to ask, what impact does the historian's contemporaneity with his subject matter have upon either the author's role in the production of history or upon his complicity as an 'actor' with the 'facts' of that very history? Moreover, what influence may an historian hold legitimately over the future development of architectural production within his own, immediate, setting? What are the historiographical implications of this which Tafuri presents as the ultimate challenge to myth-making, the forced removal of the historian from the past?

As we noted above, his study first appeared as 'Architettura italiana, 1944-1981' in the volume of *Storia dell'arte italiana* entitled *Il novecento*. It followed logically its neighbouring article, Giorgio Ciucci's 'Il dibattito sull'architettura e le città fasciste,' which likewise appeared as a monograph towards the end of the 1980s.[81] Tafuri's initial version of *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* comprised approximately the first ten chapters of the final publication, these slightly modified between 1982 and 1986, but not to the extent that the book and article pose different historiographical problems relative to our observations.[82] Part Two deals with new forms of architectural culture and discourse emerging from the 1970s, fully manifest during the early to middle 1980s. *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* is Tafuri's only monograph concerned exclusively with the wider historical context in which he practiced as both an architect and historian. (It is not, of course, his only study on post-War Italian architectural history, or on the specific individuals who mark out its trajectory: Ludovico Quaroni, Vittorio Gregotti, Carlo Scarpa, Aldo Rossi, Massimo Scolari, and others sustain his attention from the 1960s to the 1990s.[83]) One way to situate this study is between the multiplication of architectural biographies (of the numerous 'actors' in *Storia dell'architettura italiana*) and Tafuri's autobiography, narrated (largely by implication) with Tafuri *in absentia* as an actor while completely present as the history's author. In fact, the only reference to himself—"this writer"—in the book is significantly as the recipient of Aldo Rossi's 1975 watercolour 'L'architecture assassinée (à Manfredo Tafuri).'[84] We would quickly set aside the possibility of reading the book as a psycho-biography, seeking out suppressions,

---

81 Giorgio Ciucci, 'Il dibattito sull'architettura e le città fasciste,' *Storia dell'arte italiana*, ibid., pp. 263-391; expanded and edited as *Gli architetti e il fascismo. Architettura e città, 1922-44* (Turin: Einaudi, 1989)

82 Carlo Olmo suggests that the changes are important for a close reading of the two books, while the basic tenor remains consistent.—Olmo, 'Una storia, molti racconti' / 'One History, Many Stories,' Gregotti, ed., ibid., pp. 83-84, n28.

83 Besides those noted above: Tafuri, 'Ludovico Quaroni e la cultura architettonica italiana,' *Zodiac*, no. 11 (1963): 130-145, expanded as *Ludovico Quaroni*; 'The Watercolours of Massimo Scolari,' *Massimo Scolari: An Architecture Between Memory and Hope* (New York: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980), pp. 2-15; *Vittorio Gregotti: Progetti e architetture* (Milan: Electa, 1982); and Vittorio Gregotti, *Il progetto per l'Università delle Calabrie e altre architetture di Vittorio Gregotti / The Project for Calabria University and other architectural works by Vittorio Gregotti*, intro. Tafuri (Milan: Electa, 1981).

84 Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture, 1944-1985*, trans. Jessica Levine (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989), p. 139.

memories and anticipations; that is certainly not our intention. Our interest in it is rather as a highly convoluted account of the four decades following Liberation, in which institutional power structures and an increasingly public and 'free' debate ignite a complex series of ephemeral encounters between architecture and the forces that came to shape it. From the beginning of the book, Tafuri implies that the reader seeking a simple introduction to post-War Italian architecture in any traditional sense will be disappointed, rather providing comprehensive notes and a bibliographical appendix for the novice.[85] The complexity of subject that he alludes to in this comment continues, we propose, into a dimension of historiographical complexity. The complications of *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* derive directly from Tafuri's attempts to 'distance' himself from his (at times) intimate involvement with the subject.

❧

In returning us to the central theme of this chapter, the relation of operativity to criticality in Tafuri's theorisation of the tasks of the architectural historian, the opening words of *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1945-1985* are particularly important.

> After the end of the Second World War, architects who were obliged to respond to the new Italian reality were faced with a difficult dialectic between knowledge and action—difficult because of the contradictory foundations underlying the tradition of the discipline, but also because of the many levels imposed on such knowledge. This was all the more true given that the most competent members of the profession took it for granted that there could be no knowledge divorced from action: an encounter with active politics seemed imperative.[86]

He identifies two indices that signal architecture's immediate future from that moment onwards. Monuments to the massacre at the Fosse Ardeatine (Mario Fiorentino, Giuseppe Perugini, Nello Aprile, Cino Calcaprina, and Aldo Cardelli, 1944-47) ("an impenetrable mass in suspension, a mute testimony to the site of the massacre") and to the dead in German concentration camps (Ludovico Belgiojoso, Enrico Peressutti, and Ernesto Nathan Rogers [BPR], 1946) (a "too rational" lattice containing an urn filled with soil from the camps) provoke a dialectic between weighty rhetoric ("a conclusive reflection on the past") and open continuity (a "search for the specific tools that could contribute to the problem of reconstruction").[87] Effectively, Tafuri saves his condemnation of the first example for the second part of the book, wherein he exposes the early 1980s as a time offering "mute testimony" to architecture's incapacity to enact change beyond its own terms of reference. The BPR project, for him, paints a more poignant picture. The dirt-filled urn corresponds

---

85   Ibid., pp. 251-261.

86   Ibid., p. 3.

87   Ibid., pp. 4-5.

to an allegorical figure of Architecture for the post-War years, a mnemonic device against which architects measured their efforts while moving gradually but surely away from the locus of 'real' development. Several episodes illustrate these tendencies, including events we have already recounted in more biographically specific terms.

The Roman building industry, for example, grew (through the late 1940s and 1950s) subordinate to economically 'sluggish sectors,' manipulated as a mechanism for controlling a fluctuating and disorganised 'worker class' by politicians and municipal administrators. Planning was similarly disabled as a technique, control wrested from the discipline's ranks. The myths of an heroic modern movement were vigorously reassessed against the knowledge that architects' capacity to control the built environment had been disabled by more pressing economic and political issues: "The common thread linking the efforts of this generation was a revolt against the 'fathers,' who were guilty of having transmitted illusions now harshly exposed and whose 'continuity' was still operatively celebrated."[88] Herein, Tafuri also draws attention to his own 'fathers': Zevi, Samonà and Argan. In each case, their good intentions resulted in a rhetorical discourse unable to act directly to wrest architecture from its captors. Zevi's democratic organicism did not take root; Argan's legacy was "an elite group of young historians"; Samonà's hopes for *IUAV* (once a "stronghold of progressive activity") resulted in the "happy island" being "left to flourish on its own."[89] Younger architects of the late 1950s fixated upon planning in order to challenge the "ruling ethical laxity" of an older, regressive, generation. Yet the impulse for total planning as an antidote to "the impact of divisive forces" resulted in a number of immature proposals for sites that demanded a more complex approach.[90] Among these, the 1954 *piano regolatore* for Rome—moving tertiary structures outside the historical city centre—stands out. Quaroni's response is equally noteworthy, including an active retort through the production of an alternative plan and a critical essay titled 'Una città eterna: Quattro lezioni da 27 secoli.'[91]

During the mid-1960s, a general *cultural* reconfiguration—a political event, to be sure, but one that concerned the city above all— led to a broad reconsideration of technical limitations, shaking the foundations of institutions associated with architectural culture. By 1968, the younger generation was well "aware that ancient and recent myths were worn out."[92] Commissions dropped and graduates all but ceased moving into the profession, according to a survey by the *Politecnico di Milano*.[93] Even the important contributions of Quaroni and Samonà from this time were not their built works, but their ideas, "which those projects only rarely succeeded in translating."[94] Their

88   Ibid., pp. 55-57.

89   Ibid., pp. 20-22.

90   Ibid., pp. 60, 62.

91   Ibid., p. 64; Ludivico Quaroni, 'Una città eterna. Quattro lezioni da 27 secoli,' *Urbanistica*, no. 27 (June 1959): 3-5.

92   Tafuri, ibid., p. 95.

93   Ibid., p. 97.

94   Ibid., p. 88.

influence—like that of Scarpa and Rossi—"remained an issue of beginnings that these, like Socrates, would never go beyond."[95] As architecture "struggled with incompatible duties," a new form of practice emerged, based on old techniques of watercolour and sketching—leading, with institutional complicity, to a series of exhibitions culminating in the 1977-78 *Roma interotta*.[96] This competition "invited the new international of the imaginary to measure its own fantastic disseminations against places preserved on Nolli's plan," resulting in a game where the "ruins of architecture" were played out by the young in an effort to "make 'new techniques' concrete." By attempting an historical synthesis on architectural terms, they set aside the "ruins of certainties that had sustained modes of intervention capable only of self-reproduction."[97] For Tafuri, two logical outcomes emerge from such uncertainties and in the decades that saw their fruition, the 1970s and 1980s, architecture becomes a technique practiced in artificial contexts and develops an irreverent, 'hypermodern,' attitude towards the past. The first *Biennale architettura di Venezia* (1980, curated by Portoghesi) presented the city as a 'pre-text' where "love of the ancient" and a "rediscovered continuity" were exercised against hypothetical design problems. Venice became "devoid of identity, or identified with the reign of the mask and of frivolous discourse."[98]

As a consequence, the competition was, in Tafuri's estimation, a dismal failure: "The result of what was intended to be a 'festival of architecture' was a kind of banquet around a city treated like a cadaver."[99] Likewise, a "hedonistic urge and a taste for citation" characterised Portoghesi's brand of postmodernist architecture. Proferring a search for the liberation from ideas—analogous to the Venice Biennale's liberation from 'reality'—Tafuri characterised Portoghesi (as an architect) as being critical of a linear view of history, reflecting upon memory, truth, and identity through a spirited yet careless historicism: "the need for *solutions* predominates."[100] The reductions and misapplications of a new vocabulary appropriated as architectural language resulted in a poorly conceived and haphazardly constructed discourse: "the obvious love of history is resolved, in practice, in the game of repeatedly 'putting the moustache on the Mona Lisa,' now a mass joke thanks to a visual culture more influenced by Disneyland than Duchamp."[101] Tafuri poses questions of enduring poignancy: "How could that which is true for collective behaviour… not hold true for architectural culture as well?"[102] In the context of a culture—generally and architecturally—in flux, the identification of "symptom-architectures" as distinct from "pioneering work" is fraught with

---

95   Ibid., p. 118.

96   The controversial project was recorded and debated in 'Roma interrotta,' special issue, ed. R. M. Adams, *Architectural Design*, no. 49, Profile no. 20 (1979).

97   Tafuri, ibid., pp. 145-146.

98   Ibid, pp. 185-186.

99   Ibid.

100   Ibid., p. 189.

101   Ibid., p. 191.

102   Ibid., p. 197.

complications both for architecture and culture generally, but also for the historian, whose materials shift like sand.[103] On one hand, architecture is seen as a discipline with a continuous and rich history, with ideas established and challenged constantly, though 'internally,' through practices of theorised and formal criticism. This architectural culture is impenetrable from outside its theoretically defined borders. On the other hand, architecture perpetuates a discourse that has slowly lost its footing in the 'real' since the Renaissance, to the extent that any ideas based in architectural discourse rely on the activation of other forces for their survival.

❧

Consequently, the central dialectic of *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* extends that of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*: the incontrovertible interdependence of knowledge and action, criticality and operativity, within architectural culture. That Tafuri identifies this tension to be present in the history of post-War Italian architecture is, therefore, not unimportant in the broader setting of our present analysis. We have seen in our brief reconstruction of the context in which Tafuri made a change from architectural to historical practice, as a 'correction' (enhancing his capacity for criticality, though in order to agitate for 'change'), that these two conditions provoke the historian into making an essential choice. However, as Tafuri demonstrates in *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* this choice is a legacy presented to an entire generation of Italian architects, watered down and passed on to their 'children.' The two possibilities that Tafuri indicates at the outset, knowledge or action (also knowledge *and* action, or knowledge *predicating* action; but *not* knowledge *through* action), are already evident in critico-historical terms twenty years after the War's end. Tafuri's own *Ludovico Quaroni* demonstrates the capacity of an individual to grapple with such choices within this historical, political, and professional context. However, we have positioned here the setting for Tafuri's choosing history as a direct correlation of the broader exigencies of post-War Italian architectural culture. In so doing, we further identify the operative dimensions of Tafuri's own work, even if these are operative in the shaping of knowledge and institutions (thus belying the operation of theories of historiography) rather than architecture, his subject. With this in mind, it is vitally important to note the extent of Tafuri's self-imposed absence from this book in order to position it as a contribution to historiographical debate *and* to give it the full force of the role he assigns it as a disturbance in architectural culture, all without undermining its impact by admitting complicity. It is, at once, a setting for his choices *and* a justification of those same choices in terms that lean heavily upon historiographical preconditions. We can bring his assessment of those same settings, it stands to reason, to bear upon his disciplinary practice, at one level, and (on another) his articulation of the place of critico-historical knowledge in architectural culture.

---

[103] Ibid., p. 200.

Introducing the second edition of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, Tafuri describes the book as an "acknowledgement of what architecture, as an *institution*, has meant up to now."[104] Implicated in "modern production processes and the development of the capitalist society," architecture is, he argues, subject to class critique. The identification of those "*obstacles* contained in the discipline" is here the primary vehicle for that critique. In its withdrawal from 'action' (begining with the 'Renaissance'), from a directly interventionist role in development, Tafuri identifies "the fall of architecture towards silence, towards the negation (also artificial) of itself."[105] The "urgent second 'political' reading of the entire history of modern architecture" he subsequently proposes is not (he claims) "in the least apocalyptic"; it is a necessary fundamental revision of architectural knowledge in terms of the institutions and 'values' through which that institution is perpetuated. This relationship is one that is central to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*: "the confirmation of the *availability* of institutions."[106] As their relevance to building and development diminishes, the gestures within them are increasingly empty. Tafuri poignantly observes while introducing the fourth (1976) edition: "What seems most valid [...] is the effort to show how ineffectual are the brilliant gymnastics carried out in the yard of the model prison, in which architects are left free to move about on temporary reprieve."[107] The space between these two prefaces is equidistant to the space that separates the anticipated capacities for historical practice to provoke immediate action and the return to an understanding that this action needs, first of all, to occur *within* the cultural setting of architecture in order to break up the theory induced 'reprieve.'

Likewise, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' emphasises (in its most famous, or, at least, oft-quoted aphorism) the "simple truth that, just as there can be no such thing as a political economics of class, but only a class critique of political economics, likewise there can never be an aesthetics, art or architecture of class, but only a class critique of aesthetics, art, architecture and the city."[108]

Critical history is, in this sense, not simply another definition for 'action.' Rather, the nature of 'action' itself implicates a broad cultural scene, in which architecture (insofar as it tends towards autonomy) constitutes one part. He writes that "Architecture as the *ideology of the Plan* is swept away by the *reality of the Plan* the moment the plan came down from the utopian level and became an operant mechanism."[109] In extricating this mechanism, Tafuri proposes "the precise identification of those tasks which capitalist development has taken away from architecture."[110] This identification does not have

---

104 Tafuri, 'Note to the second (Italian) edition,' *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Giorgio Verrecchia (London: Granada, 1980), unpaginated.

105 Ibid.

106 Ibid.

107 Ibid.

108 Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1, p. 78. We cite from 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' trans. Stephen Sartorelli, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), p. 32.

109 Ibid., p. 28.

110 Tafuri, 'Preface [to the Engl. ed.],' *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Bar-

direct consequences for the everyday practice of architecture. Rather, action in the sense indicated by Tafuri is played out on a field where knowledge and institutions are at stake. Architecture becomes an example in that setting of an institution cloaking the gradual loss of its authority in a rhetorical superstructure, reinforcing the power of hypothetical action to implement change.

> The systematic criticism of the ideologies accompanying the history of capitalist development is therefore but one chapter of such political action. Today, indeed, the principal task of ideological criticism is to do away with impotent and ineffectual myths, which so often serve as illusions that permit the survival of achronistic 'hopes in design.'[111]

When we treat these observations as a theory of architecture's withdrawal from planning, the construction industry, or even *truly* formal innovation, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* compositely offers a text simultaneously concerned with the study of institutions and discourses and an examination of their precise conditions within clearly defined operational limits, but also within an historically specific field—the same field *from* which Tafuri became to observe the nature of these very abstractions. He thus asks: if architecture has become so internalised and rhetorical by the 1980s as to be ineffectual as an institution faced by planning, housing, industry, historical fabric—in other words, political fields—and is subsequently superseded by more directly engaged institutions—in particular, capitalist society—what is the active value of intellectual work? That is to say, if historiography confronts historical representation with documentation of a 'real' past and if architecture has enacted its retreat from the 'real' itself, what tasks face architectural history in the present moment?

Keeping these questions in mind, the historian's absence from his own context is significant both as a methodological decision and as an advancement of the tools of historical research and writing. James Ackerman writes of Tafuri's "special effort to achieve 'distance.'"[112] Indeed, it is precisely in this device that his historiography is 'operative' within the disciplinary relationships that constitute architectural culture, but not instrumental with respect of architectural practice. Operative critique is predicated by *engagement* and is therefore *complicit*. The critique of which Tafuri writes in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* maintains an active dimension within architectural culture precisely by remaining surrounded by that culture while being '*dis*engaged' from the utopian dimensions of architectural practice. Tafuri's historian pays particular attention, therefore, to the presentation of research in order to 'free' knowledge to become available for its own operations as catalysts the can undermine the *status quo*. In *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*,

---

bara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976), p. ix; *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973).

[111] Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, p. 182.

[112] James Ackerman, 'In Memoriam,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 2 (June 1994), p. 137.

Tafuri had already identified the critical capacity of architectural history as an emergent practice in the specific setting of post-War Italy. In *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*, he pursues this idea in a richly constructed history of figures and relationships depicting a damningly frail contemporary Italian architecture. His challenge is the illusion of critical distance from his subject, by extension from the shortcomings of the institution torn open by critical history. This means, for historiography to be truly critical as a disciplinary practice, capable of prompting change without determining the nature of that change (which is also to say prompting honest assessment of theoretical frameworks without imposing judgement in turn), the historian (as Tafuri) clearly needs to be an 'insider' in architectural culture, but not an architect. For Tafuri, as for his model historian, this implies a disciplinary choice that has at its heart the anticipation of prompting critically informed change *beyond* architectural practice: to make architecture better without making architecture, but by reminding architecture of the artificiality of its limits and thus mirroring, in an act of conscience, its mortal deficiencies. Necessary to the task of action is the intellectual's illusion of distance.

For Tafuri to remain an actor in the history of Italy's architecture is to disable his programme as a critical historian and intellectual. This strategy is most explicit in *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985* because Tafuri is missing in this role. Yet it is precisely because this history, above all others, risks exposing Tafuri's 'origins' in architecture that it must generate a false objectivity. This illusion, in turn, safeguards Tafuri's choice for history, and thus criticality, as a rejection of operativity and the future.

PART TWO
THE BURDENS OF MEMORY

CHAPTER III
CRITIQUE OF
ARCHITECTURAL IDEOLOGY

The function of ideology within architectural culture is one of the most profound and complex themes pervading Tafuri's bibliography. This complexity is multi-dimensional, extending from Tafuri's own reflections on the metropolis and the historical avant-garde, to his private political life, to the conflation of the latter two factors in his reception (at home and abroad), to his historical treatment of theory as a form of disciplinary ideology implicating both historical judgement and historiography. The number of readings, ranging from the meticulous to the clumsy, of his 1969 essay 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' later published as *Progetto e utopia* (1973), demonstrate a high level of attention paid to Tafuri's argument for the relationship *between* ideology and architecture.[1] Even though his sustained enquiry into the mechanisms of ideological formation in architectural history remains vital for framing his corpus, the phenomenon of his reception on purely these terms is an historically specific development proper to his readers of the mid-1970s (in Europe) and to the early 1980s (in North America and Great Britain). The essay itself references (though not inextricably) the left-wing intellectual polemic of *Angelus novus* (1964-1974), *Quaderni rossi* (1960-1966) and *Contropiano* (1968-1972), where 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' first appeared. These journals, in turn, respond to a moment of profound political unrest and extraordinary party activity extending from the early 1960s to the mid-1970s as

---

[1] Manfredo Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79; *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973). Esra Akcan, for instance, makes a strong reading of the theme of the avant-garde in Tafuri's work in her essay 'Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde,' *Journal of Architecture* 7, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 135-170. David Cunningham intelligently treats the notion of "time" in Tafuri's work as a starting point to a wider consideration of 'utopia' and 'project.—David Cunningham, 'Architecture, Utopia and the Futures of the Avant-Garde,' *Journal of Architecture* 6, no. 2 (2001): 169-182. The same author has more recently lead a discussion on the metropolis that problematises *Progetto e utopia* in terms of its broader philosophical and political contexts.—David Cunningham, 'The Concept of Metropolis: Philosophy and Urban Form,' *Radical Philosophy*, no. 133 (September-October 2005): 13-25; Gail Day, 'Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism,' *Radical Philosophy*, no. 133 (September-October 2005): 26-38. Besides these latter articles, firmly in the tradition of British Marxist critique, both Rixt Hoekstra and A. Krista Sykes have treated *Progetto e utopia* in some detail.—Rixt Hoekstra, 'Building versus *Bildung*: Manfredo Tafuri and the Construction of a Historical Discipline,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Groningen University, 2005, http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/283596589 (accessed September 19, 2005), pp. 160-191; A. Krista Sykes, 'The Vicissitudes of Realism: Realism in Architecture in the 1970s,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2004, pp.176-182. Hilde Heynen, too, has positioned Tafuri's work of the late 1960s with respect of broader debates on modernity.—Hilde Heynen, *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999), pp. 128-146; the relevant chapter is published also as 'The Venice School, or the Diagnosis of Negative Thought,' *Design Book Review*, nos. 41-42 (Winter-Spring 2000): 22-39. Among the earliest readings are those of Fredric Jameson and Robert Maxwell.—Jameson, 'Architecture and the Critique of Ideology,' *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, ed. Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984), pp. 51-87; Robert Maxwell, 'Tafuri / Culot / Krier: The Role of Ideology,' *Architectural Design* 47, no. 3 (1977): 187-188. Maxwell's essay is followed by a useful 'summary' of the English translation of the book.—David Dunster, 'Critique: Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia*,' *Architectural Design* 47, no. 3 (1977): 204-212.

a specifically Italian manifestation of widespread socialist and communist agitation in the factory and in the university. The brief synchrony between worker actions, student protest, and intellectual upheaval in Italy during these disruptive years saw, on several fronts, the terms of intellectual protest rendered equivalent—both inside the debates and beyond—to those of the factory and the university student body, rather than conceived as a parallel (if complementary) phenomenon, concerned with the evolving nature of thought and disciplinarity in late modernity.[2] That the English translation of *Progetto e utopia*, *Architecture and Utopia* (1976) was (is) widely read by an anglophone public, and an American academic public in particular, as evidence of the intellectual repercussions of Europe's political and intellectual unrest is hardly coincidental.[3]

It remains possible, naturally, to consider Tafuri's thinking on ideology as intertwined with his personal politics. Yet a generation of theoreticians, in equalising these terms, or at the very least promoting them as unconditionally interdependent, has failed to unfetter the wider implications of his thinking about the construction and recovery of values that determine the nature of historical representation. We can point towards several underlying reasons for this phenomenon. Firstly, the scholarly communities concerned with Tafuri's work on late modern architecture and architectural theory tend to differ from those reading his research on the early modern era. The selection of historical subjects upon the basis of their ideological foundations—Weimar Germany, New Deal America and the evolution of the capitalist American metropolis, the Soviet Union—characterising the early 'Venice School' and Tafuri's more widely read histories of the modern movement corresponds readily to the theoretical proposition framing *Progetto e utopia*.[4] The survival (or demise) of architectural thought in the face of the rising dominance of a capitalist mode of production is arguably common to both *Progetto e utopia* and the books that venture into its historical terrain. It is more difficult, though, to return it to the early moment that Tafuri assigns it in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), namely in the Florentine *quattrocento* and the 'rise' of humanism in the post-Feudal era.[5] It is just as difficult to ascribe to the field of Renaissance scholarship in architectural history the same degree of evident ideological engagement found (in the 1960s) amongst researchers and writers concerned with the twentieth century, and particularly those preoccupied

2 A useful account of this 'cooperation' of resistance—with specific reference to the Venice scene—is found in Patrizia Lombardo's introduction ('The Philosophy of the City') to the English edition of Massimo Cacciari's essays, *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*, trans. Stephen Sartorelli (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993). For a sustained study of politico-intellectual episodes of the 1960s and early 1970s, see Giuseppe Carlo Marino, *Biografia del Sessantotto. Utopie, conquiste, sbandamenti* (Milan: Bompiani, 2004).

3 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976). We refer to Ockman's *Architecture, Criticism, Ideology* as an index of this reception.

4 This bibliography is rather long, but we indicate, at least, representative studies from this record.—Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri Elia, and Tafuri, *La città ameriana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal* (Bari: Laterza, 1973); Tafuri, ed., *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS, 1917-1937. Il contributo degli architetti europei* (Rome: Officina, 1971); Tafuri, 'Socialdemocrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar,' *Contropiano* 1971, no. 1: 207-223.

5 Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968), esp. Chapter One. We return to this topic in Chapter Five.

with the European historical avant-guard. Nonetheless, we must acknowledge, here, and therefore question, the veritable simultaneity of Tafuri's deployment of a theory of ideology's place in architecture in studies of modern architecture *and* in studies of the fifteenth and sixteenth century. From this acknowledgement, we suggest that the historiographical implications of his work fall into relief, at least sufficiently for us to regard them as something other than a purely political preoccupation.

Foremost of these latter works is his 1969 *Architettura dell'umanesimo* in which a (quite literally) encyclopædic approach to 'the Renaissance' yields a strong disciplinary framework wherein ideology figures as a prominent theme.[6] Equally important, in this setting, are *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500* (also 1969) and the slightly later *Via Giulia*, co-authored with Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro (subtitled *Una utopia urbanistica del '500*).[7] In these works, the relationship between Tafuri's subjects, his historiographical perspective, and the identification of ideology as a dimension of early modern architectural production makes it more difficult to perceive the relationship between ideology as an historical subject, historiography, and architecture, that his twentieth century topics afford—with their more familiar ideological frameworks of 'capitalism,' 'communism,' 'social democracy,' etc. This difficulty is intensified in his later writing on the Renaissance, widely perceived to have left the question of 'ideology' behind.[8] Tafuri already admits in 'Il "progetto" storico' (1977) that the critique of 'ideology' as a target of historical practice demands, from the middle 1970s onwards, a more complex view of 'ideology' itself and its functions within architectural culture.[9] His Walter Gropius Lecture to Harvard University's Graduate School of Design (1986), for instance, is heavily preoccupied with the construction and recovery of institutionally entrenched values in 'Renaissance' 'Venice,' but acknowledges that the complicated interaction of such forces at the level of ideas, politics and techniques was simply too nuanced to survive the militant mode of Marxist critique that dominated the *Contropiano*

---

6   Tafuri, *L'architettura dell'Umanesimo* (Bari: Laterza, 1969). The book re-presents, in its first part, the text of Tafuri's entry for 'Rinascimento' in the *Dizionario enciclopedico di architetura e urbanistica*, ed. Paolo Portoghesi, vol. V (Rome: Istituto editoriale romano, 1969), pp. 173-232.

7   Tafuri, *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia*, with photographs by Diego Birelli (Venice: Marsilio, 1969); Tafuri, Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro, *Via Giulia. Una utopia urbanistica del '500* (Rome: Casa editrice stabilimento Aristide Staderini, 1973).

8   The catalogue of his essays published in the *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura 'Andrea Palladio'* would misleadingly appear to describe precisely this phenomenon of 'leaving aside' ideology, though the timing of these articles surely questions the separation of Tafuri's 'ideological' and 'historical' writing.—Tafuri, 'L'idea di architettura nella letteratura teoretica del Manierismo,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* IX (1967): 369-384; 'Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola e la crisi del Manierismo a Roma,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* IX (1967): 385-398; 'Teatro e città nell'architettura palladiana,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* X (1968): 65-78; 'Committenza e tipologia nelle ville palladiane,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XI (1969): 120-136; 'La fortuna del Palladio alla fine del Cinquecento e l'architettura di Inigo Jones,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XII (1970): 47-62; 'Sansovino "versus" Palladio,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XV (1973): 149-165; 'Il teatro come "città virtuale". Dal Cabaret Voltaire al Totaltheater,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XVII (1975): 361-377. The predominance of Palladio himself in this bibliography, notwithstanding the preoccupations of the CISA at Vicenza, is an intriguing topic that we must consider on another occasion.

9   Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Casabella*, no. 429 (October 1977): 11-18. We return to this later criticism in Chapter Six.

discourse.[10] The importance of power relations, in a Foucaultian sense, thus pervades *Venezia e il rinascimento*, but without Tafuri's turning his critique completely over to Foucault, nor transforming his historiography into a preoccupation with 'technique.'[11] Likewise, in singling out some historiographical leads from the *Annales*, he enters into a debate on subjectivity and micro-history, with its emphasis on 'clues' and 'detection,' but tempers it with the same degree of informed detachment pervading the later *nouvelle histoire* of Jacques Le Goff and Paul Veyne.[12]

It is tempting, at this point, to foray into the maze of referents positioning Tafuri within those posing such political questions as frame or inform his writing on the city, on ideological systems impacting upon (or eclipsing) twentieth century architecture and urban planning, and on the operation of power structures in historiography. We are also drawn towards testing Tafuri's historiography against a biographical reading implicating his party politics, seeking out an understanding of the synchronies and discrepancies between, say, *Progetto e utopia* and the historical 'party line' (and its famous internal detractors) of the *Partito Comunista Italiano* (*PCI*).[13] Acknowledging that Tafuri's own party affiliations move increasingly left of centre from the mid-1960s until the mid-1970s—after which he resigns, like many intellectuals of his generation, from party membership—we might ask how far his active political life 'explains' his historiographical treatment of ideology as a device intrinsic to architectural culture from the *quattrocento* onwards. This theme would be worthy of our attention for the proximity it has to the concerns of the preceding chapter, to the interactions of operativity and criticality and to the nature of 'hope' (or, indeed, of 'irony') in a critical practice, or the capacity for action in that same practice.

However, while these topics are presently receiving the increasingly nuanced attention of a number of scholars working in a Marxist philosophical tradition, in Great Britain, for instance, returning critically to the earliest anglophone readings of *Progetto e utopia*, the 'internal' disciplinary scheme for architectural history that Tafuri constructs in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is subject thus far to scant commentary. If, as we noted earlier, architectural theory comprises an ideology *within* architectural culture, circumscribing the disciplinary and artistic identity of architecture, intrinsically bound to the programmatic representation of history, what then is the function of 'ideology' in historiography itself? How, in other words, does the theme of 'architectural ideology'

---

10   Tafuri, *Humanism, Technical Knowledge and Rhetoric: The Debate in Renaissance Venice*, Walter Gropius Lecture, April 30, 1986 (Cambridge: Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 1986); *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985).

11   The 'simplicity' of Foucault's position, in fact, draws his fire (and that of Cacciari and Franco Rella).— *Il dispositivo Foucault*, ed. Rella (Venice: CLUVA, 1977).

12   We refer, here, to the three-volume study *Fair de l'histoire*, ed. Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora (Paris: Gallimard, 1974); Ital. trans. of reduced ed. Isolina Mariana, *Fare storia. Temi e metodi della nuova storiografia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1981).

13   Following Tafuri's oral history with Luisa Passerini, Hoekstra appears to attempt just this.—Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, in 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-70; Hoekstra, ibid.

surface in Tafuri's writing as a reflection of the limitations of his own practice? Admittedly, this question becomes fraught with complications when we address those projects that are, above all, preoccupied with the socio-political aspirations with which Tafuri and his collaborators evidently feel, at best, sympathy or, at worst, nostalgia. However, the theme of ideology as an historical subject is not at all limited to Tafuri writings or collaborations concerned with the twentieth century—with Roosevelt's New Deal, with Weimar Germany—but, instead, pervades his entire *œuvre* and its theoretical limits as a consistent target of historical practice. Rather than join those crowds anxious to pinpoint Tafuri's 'proper' place among such thinkers as Mario Tronti, Massimo Cacciari, Antonio Negri, Alberto Asor Rosa, Raniero Panzieri and other intrinsic figures of Italian *operaismo* (or even Gramsci, as Fredric Jameson famously, though misguidedly attempts), we step back to follow (simply) one line of enquiry intrinsic to the theme that dominates this dissertation. How, we ask, does architectural theory as a disciplinary ideology comprise a target of Tafuri's historical practice? And, perhaps more importantly, since it impinges upon the values inherent to Tafuri's historiography: if his own theory of disciplinary practice, articulated with greatest clarity in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, positions architectural theory as an ideological device guarding architecture's disciplinary borders, limiting its field of knowledge from one moment to the next, as well as the tools and tasks of architectural practice, is architectural history then equally subject to a theoretical border condition, itself subject to disciplinary ideologies? (We propose, as a rapid response that moves the observations that follow into a wider intellectual setting, that this 'diagramme' is, in fact, a theory of disciplinarity *writ large*, and thus of interest well beyond Tafuri's specific disciplinary concerns.) Insofar as the latter of these questions returns us specifically to the place Tafuri accords 'ideology' within his theorisation of architectural culture, and of the negotiations between architectural and historical practice therein, this last question remains our ultimate concern.

❧

Tafuri's theory of disciplinarity applied directly to architectural culture appears in the first chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 'L'architettura moderna e l'eclissi della storia.' This text draws our attention in greater length in Chapter Five, but for now we find it useful to sketch out a basic schema. To summarise: since the 'Renaissance' and specifically with the intellectual 'revolutions' introduced by Leon Battista Alberti and Filippo Brunelleschi, architecture entered a state of disciplinary, practical and artistic autonomy. The Architect's profession was a subset of architectural discourse (equivalent to architecture-*as*-art), determining (in turn) ideas and practices specific to architecture, proper to its 'technique' (however defined). A long-standing debate, for instance, (from the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries) involves architectural deportment relative to the definitions and deformation of the classical orders.[14] Fringing this technical discourse

---

[14]   Tafuri appears adamant that architectural theory, insofar as it facilitates artistic and disciplinary au-

(that is, discourse proper to architecture as technique, continuing to treat the terms loosely, for the moment) is a secondary discourse that informs the values and limits of the primary debate. At times, this secondary (theoretical) debate assumes an autonomous character; at others, it comprises an entrenched component of dominant debates (as, for instance, the late twentieth century debate on rationality). In either case, it maintains a judgemental aspect that propels 'architecture proper' (or should we say 'Architecture') into the future. Tafuri targets this theoretical discourse (historiographically) because the determination of its values is predicated on a selective historiography that remains concerned with the future while 'advising' the present. Such historiography is thus firmly in the tradition that he terms 'operative.' Architectural theory, as Tafuri would have it, is preoccupied with history's utility as evidence supporting a view of the future constructed in the present. While the varied strains of architectural theory manifest this mechanism in different ways (over and within the course of history, and in his present moment), Tafuri locates the classical tradition as the most loaded demonstration of architectural theory's capacity to treat history operatively. That is to say, the role assigned to historical knowledge by architectural theoreticians in their maintenance of the classical tradition is highly mediated, this selectivity in turn determined by values that are projective, utopian.

Within this setting, Tafuri argues, the historian assumes a specific role in undermining the historical predetermination of projective values in architecture, or the representation of the past as evidence for those same values. The historian's role uncannily corresponds to the preoccupations of Tafuri's own practice, as we observed earlier, but insofar that this is true, they do they explain the framing of his more 'distant' subjects. One of his more interesting publications in the late 1960s is the book *L'architettura dell'umanesimo*, a study of the origins and deformations of the 'Renaissance,' principally in Italy but eventually in central and northern Europe. The book divides easily into two parts, the first concerned with a broad socio-religio-politico-cultural history of architecture in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the second elaborates historiographical themes pertaining to this development. Part One ('Le vicende storiche') corresponds directly to Tafuri's lengthy entry under 'Rinascimento' in the *Dizionario enciclopedico di architettura e urbanistica*, a series of volumes that also appeared 1969, under the direction of Paolo Portoghesi, which recounts those developments traditionally understood as the 'long-Renaissance' (stopping short of the Counter-Reformation). It 'exercises' many of the architectural examples and figures of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, though by and large

tonomy, is a device that emerges in the early *quattrocento*. The coincidence, then, between the life of architectural theory, the slow rise of the post-Feudal, capitalist society and the 'era' of representation, is consistently reinforced both in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and in later writing, right down to *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992). It is difficult, though, to recognise easily the consistency that binds these two books' disciplinary argument together. While this point can sustain further examination, we will not attempt it here. Useful references that underpin the basic theoretical development of a discourse on the orders are Hanno-Walter Kruft's *A History of Architectural Theory: From Vitruvius to the Present*, trans. Ronald Taylor, et al. (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994); John Onians, *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Joseph Rykwert, *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998).

avoids restating that material covered by his slightly earlier *Architettura del Manierismo* (1966).[15] The historiographical treatment of the Renaissance, which he would later reassess vigorously in *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985) and in *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992), are readily summarised by his title-themes: 'Architettura e città,' 'Architettura e ideologia,' 'Architettura e simbolismo,' 'Architettura e teatro,' 'Trattatistica, tipologie, modelli,' 'Antirinascimento, Anticlassicismo e Mannierismo' and 'Architettura, scienza, tecnologia.'[16] His scope, then, is vast, but serves to introduce as an integrated problem *both* the historical material of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries *and* the historiographical prejudices that determine its presentation and institutionalisation as research. The inclusion of 'ideology' among his historiographical themes is not, therefore, outstanding, even if it is a departure from 'traditional' preoccupations. However, we shall see that the terms of its introduction and elaboration resonate surprisingly with the more 'committed' line of his contemporaneous 'Marxist' polemical historiography.[17]

He begins the essay 'Architettura e ideologia' by observing that two postulates underpin the intellectual work produced under "the profound ideological character of classical Humanism": the identifications entwined around Nature and Reason; and the identification of classicism as a second and 'more perfect' Nature.[18] Brunelleschi, Alberti and (Coluccio) Salutati, he writes, are 'intellectuals' in a modern sense. The dome of S. Maria del Fiore (1421-1461) might respond architecturally to a new secularity proper in fifteenth century Florence, an artefact caught between artistic development and socio-political evolution. Yet it indexes the reclassification of the master mason as a thinker. Brunelleschi, a concept we will elaborate upon with reference to Walter Benjamin in a later chapter, distinguishes 'architecture' from 'city' as a theoretical move impossible outside the new tools inherent to a new artistic autonomy grounded in rationality and universality. What is more, it lends concrete structure, he writes, to an equivalent device in the arts, perspective structure, articulated in Alberti's treatises and enacted in the *œuvres*, for example, of Masaccio and Donatello.[19] Their work is ideological, Tafuri argues,

---

[15]   Tafuri, 'Rinascimento,' pp. 173-232. His entry on 'Manierismo' is more succinct, having already been the subject of *Architettura del Manierismo*.—Tafuri, 'Manierismo,' ed. Paolo Portoghesi, ibid., vol. III, p. 474; *L'architettura del Manierismo nel '500 europeo* (Rome: Officina, 1966).

[16]   Tafuri, *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architecurra* (Turin: Einaudi, 1992).

[17]   While we would not cite Arnold Hauser as an influence of Tafuri's historiography, we note, by way of comparison, that Hauser's critics were quick to judge his lack of direct political intention, 'hiding' Marxist critique in historiography. In this sense, like Tafuri's 'Renaissance' work, Hauser's historiography of art was not seen as committed because it internalised Marxist referents rather than deploying them openly.—Cf. Arnold Hauser, *Social History of Art*, 4 vols. (London: Routledge Keegan Paul, 1951-1978); 'Hauser, Arnold,' *Dictionary of Art Historians*, http://www.lib.duke.edu/lilly/artlibry/dah/hausera.htm (accessed December 16, 2005).

[18]   In 'Il mito naturalistico nell'Architettura del '500,' Tafuri considers the interplay between Reason and Nature that dominates architectural discourse of this century. The later construction of Mannerism as a new 'value' rather than a counter-value appears to confirm his observations therein.—*L'arte*, no. 1 (1968): 7-36. The phrase cited above reads, in Italian, as "il profondo carattere ideologico dell'Umanesimo classicista."—our trans.

[19]   Tafuri, 'Architettura e ideologia,' p. 317; Leon Battista Alberti, *De pictura* (Florence: 1435), trans. John R. Spencer as *Treatise on Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966).

"in intervening to modify the bourgeois city by welcoming the lesson of history."[20] As lessons (in turn), history allows 'theory' to build upon apparently sturdy foundations. They are (Tafuri implies) arbitrary reconstructions advancing a specific notion of rationality, grounded upon an equally arbitrary (though programmatic) view of 'nature' as containing, for example, evidence of 'divine' proportions.[21] Brunelleschi is able to, he suggests, hold artistic conversations with Antiquity, but by introducing objects into the medieval city as bearers of newly rediscovered standards of rationality, to which the remainder of the city must rise, he declares Florence as the heir of ancient Rome's cultural wealth.[22] "History, for him, is not a reservoir of abstract canons."[23] Rather, in lending architectural form to a 'bourgeois commitment,' Tafuri writes, Brunelleschi manipulates the distance between intellectual work and reality, so that the architectural Renaissance is at once bound into an ideal image constituting a 'civil proposal.'[24] He continues: "The formerly philosophical historicism and the universalism of Alberti manifest ideolgical justifications for an urgently felt cultural and political crisis."[25]

As an historical source, Tafuri notes, Vitruvius' *De architectura* came quickly to assume the same status for architectural theoreticians as Aristotle's writings for neo-scholastic thought.[26] If the 'crisis' of the humanistic revolution spawned the figure of the modern intellectual, a second artistic 'crisis' occurs with the internal programme advanced by that same figure. This involves a conflict between, on one hand, the advocates of rationality, rule bound, prescriptive with reference to a pure classical formalism (itself explicitly subject to an historiographical image); and on the other, exponents of an intellectual freedom rooted in naturalism, couched as *anti*-intellectualism. He suggests, in other words, that the principal intellectual conflict of sixteenth century architecture is one of nature versus reason, wherein the provocation remains the degree of 'honesty' with which intellectuals involved in architectural culture (architectural theorists) 'represent' nature. Is nature ultimately rational, or 'rustic'? The 'mannerist' revolt hinges precisely on this equilibrium between the conflicting authorities of Man and Nature: "Nature is no longer absorbed by Reason."[27] Bound into the availability of knowledge to abstract images (into myth Tafuri would write elsewhere), is the role of the 'homogenised

---

20   Tafuri, ibid. The passage originally reads: "nell'intervenire a modificare la città borghese accoliendo la lezione della storia."—our trans.

21   Ibid., pp. 317-318.

22   Ibid.

23   Ibid., p. 318. Orig. phrase: "La storia, per lui, non è un serbatoio di astratti canoni."—our trans.

24   Ibid.

25   Ibid. Orig. passage: "Lo storicismo già filologico e l'universalismo dell'Alberti sono manifestazione compensazione ideologiche di una crisi culturale e politica sentita in modo impellente."—our trans.

26   On the development of a Renaissance Aristotelian tradition, we refer to the work of our colleague Lionel Devlieger, whose dissertation considers the theoretical development of 'conception' in architectural and artistic discourse of the sixteenth century.—Lionel Devlieger, 'Benedetto Varchi on the Birth of Artefacts: Architecture, Alchemy and Power in Late-Renaissance Florence,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Ghent University, 2005. Cf. Vitruvius, *On Architecture*, trans. Frank Granger, 2 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931, 1934).

27   Tafuri, ibid. Orig. wording: "La Natura non è più assimilata dalla Ragione."—our trans.

past'—history *per se*—in informing architecture's aspirations: the 'project.'[28] The instrumentality of historical representation is thus cast, in sixteenth century debate, against a second *argomento* that reveals the artificiality of representational knowledge proper to architectural theory. Vignola's *Cinque ordini* is thus a 'dehistoricisation' of artistic practice, differentiating the unmediated experience of 'historical' architectural 'knowledge' and programmatic intentions proper to architectural theory.[29] "The intellectual bases of Renaissance architecture from historicism to neo-Platonic ideology, which were at the heart of theories of 'imitation' and spatial unity, set them tacitly aside."[30]

Tafuri asserts that on the whole, architects of the middle to late sixteenth century respond to this theoretical development in one of two ways. Either, as in the case of Michelangelo, they contest the arbitrariness of the rules determining architectural invention; or, like Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane, Vignola or the late *cinquecento* Scuola romana they remain indifferent, apparently stirred to a form of practice that ignores the architect's loss of a place among the civil 'avant-guard.' Palladio, though, describes the possibility of designing architectural works neither according to the unmediated yet unstructured modes of *naturalità,* nor in the arbitrary rigours of Vitruvius' late disciples, but rather in terms of an autonomous *architectural* ideology, new themes "dictated by the economic and social development of the upper classes."[31] This development, Tafuri asserts, underpins the development of two centuries worth of architectural movements to follow, based (he argues) upon an ultimate tendency towards anti-rhetoricism and functionalism. He concludes 'Architettura e ideologia' by observing:

> At the end of the sixteenth century, the high moral and civil Humanist mandate
> of which architecture had completely comprised, and the strained attempts at
> individual redemption testify to the sudden fall of the fifteenth century illusions
> of autonomous rule, class leadership through intense intellectual activity and,
> contemporaneously, the crisis of the 'cosmopolitan' vocation of the Italian
> Renaissance intellectual.[32]

---

28 Writing several years later, Tafuri describes thus the relationship between architectural ideology and the 'project' in Renaissance architectural culture thus: "The 'project,' understood in the philosophical sense of the term, is the most typical result of the age of Humanism. And characteristic of every project is a foretaste of the future at the expense of the present: many of these Renaissance innovations [the subject of his Gropius Lecture at Harvard] will require several centuries to mature."—Tafuri, *Humanism, Technical Knowledge and Rhetoric* (unpaginated).

29 He refers to Giacomo Barozzi Da Vignola, *Regole delle cinque ordini d'architettura* (1562); *Canon of the Five Orders of Architecture*, trans. and intro. Branko Mitrovi (New York: Acanthus Press, 1999).

30 Tafuri, 'Architettura e ideologia,' p. 320. Orig. passage: "Le basi intellettuali dell'architettura del Rinascimento, dallo storicismo all'ideologia neoplatonica che era stata alle basi delle teorie dell''imitazione' e dell'unità dello spazio, vengono tacitamente messa da parte."—our trans.

31 Ibid., pp. 320-321. Orig. phrase: "dettati dagli sviluppi economici e sociali dei ceti avanzati."—our trans. Palladio's distinguished status within this trajectory perhaps explains Tafuri's ongoing preoccupation with his thought. Cf. n8 of this chapter.

32 Ibid., p. 321. Orig. passage: "Alla fine del '500 l'alto mandato morale e civile che l'Umanesimo aveva all'architettura à del tutto compromesso, e gli sforzi tesi a riscatti individuali testimonio il crollo dell'illusione quattrocentestca circa il ruolo autonomo e attivo degli intellettuali intesi come clas-

Tafuri claims that the consequences of distinguishing the practice of building from an artistic practice *concerned* with building by the introduction of an *architectural* ideology are two-fold for the 'Renaissance.' Firstly, this development introduces a distinction between 'Architecture' and city, or 'Architecture' and building, that is intellectual rather than inherent. This capacity to differentiate (theoretically) architectural objects from their context authorises the emancipation of the architect as an artist. However, it conversely demonstrates that 'Architecture' is not necessary to the city, that it exists beyond the exigencies determining the cities operation. By extension, 'architectural' ideas are subject to depreciation relative to the moral and civil workings of the early modern city. A second consequence pertains to history, enacted either as representation (as a rational classical code) or as free knowledge (naturalistic, in opposition to that same code). He introduces a form of historiography as intrinsic to the devices available to a newly autonomous 'Architecture' discipline, both programmatically differentiating itself *and* in critique of earlier acts of historical representation.[33]

❧

This confrontation of Nature with Reason has different implications for 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' also (and more famously) published in 1969. He introduces the essay with an argument that in the Enlightenment city, the construction of Nature as a second ideology with respect to Reason (as in the sixteenth century) transforms Nature into a rational, rhetorical ordering device for the city. Laugier, he claims, 'launches' Enlightenment architectural theory with his *Observations sur l'architecture* (1765), opening up a line of debate that conflates, by the end of the eighteenth century, picturesque discourse and discourse on the city.[34] Elaborating on a theoretical strategy principles proper to the folly garden and to the earlier picturesque landscape designs of Lancelot 'Capability' Brown and others in Great Britain, France, Germany and elsewhere, the naturalised architectural object, as fragment, was rendered equivalent to the fragment as either an index of rationality *or* as a mirror expressing as rational means of its subjugation.[35] Giovanni Battista Piranesi would argue, in his depictions of the Campo Marzio (1765), for the reassigned status of the fragment in the city as a kind of natural agglomeration within a 'Baroque' principle of variety.[36] Those landscapers who, across the second half of the eighteenth century, gave expression to vast samplings of all the world's architecture, just as they would construct orangeries, aviaries and ruins, all acted to formalise the intentions of Quatremère de Quincy's *Enciclopédie méthodique*.[37] Tafuri

se-guida e, contemporaneamente, la crisi della vocazione 'cosmopolita' dell'intellettuale italiano del Rinascimento."—our trans.

33   Ibid.

34   Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' pp. 32-34.

35   Ibid., pp. 36-37.

36   Ibid., pp. 38-39.

37   Ibid., p. 37. He refers to Quatremère de Quincy, *Enciclopédie methodique*, 3 vols. (Paris: 1788-1825).

suggests two outcomes of this broader socio-cultural phenomenon upon the diverging paths of Enlightenment architectural theory: the architectural *type* and *architecture parlante*.[38] Tafuri predicates the ideological roles afforded the architect upon a direct translation from 'natural' to urban settings of ideas proper to the picturesque. He observes that the "formation of the architect as ideologue of the 'social'" follows an extra-'disciplinary' or extra-'technical' discourse, and, rather than informing its internal theoretical debates, subsumes it.[39]

Consequently, Tafuri suggests that while we can see the agglomeration of folly gardens of the late eighteenth century, as a formal development, an experiment of whimsy, he notes a broader ideological stance that implicates, but which does not emanate from architecture:

> The whole fashion of invoking Gothic, Chinese, and Hindu architecture, and the Romantic naturalism of landscape gardens in which fantasies of exotic pavilions and false ruins are inserted without irony, is theoretically connected to the atmosphere of Montesquiei's *Lettres persanes*, Voltaire's *Ingénu*, and Liebniz's caustic anti-Western positions. To integrate rationalism and critical philosophy, one confronted the European myths with anything that might, by contradicting them, reconfirm their validity.[40]

Not explicable in their own terms, such architectural enterprises (argues Tafuri) were swept up in a broader debate on social justice and knowledge. The internal critical capacity was limited, therefore, to the self-contestation noted above and to a positivistic 'autopsy' of architecture's past, while also presenting itself as "an alternative to the nihilistic prospect clearly discernible behind the hallucinatory fantasies of a Lequeu, a Bélanger, or a Piranesi."[41] The explicit politicisation of architecture from the nineteenth century, either as aspiration or critique informs, Tafuri notes, propositions that are either un-buildable or available only as models (as in the outscaled designs of Boullée) for realisable architectural intentions. It pursues, he continues, the terms assigned it by Quatremère, seeing to "the salubrity of cities," guarding "the health of man."[42] However, in being ordered by an extraneous socio-cultural ideology of 'freedom' and 'nature,' architecture alters the terms of its (original) artistic emancipation (with the 'Renaissance'). While the fifteenth century witnessed architecture's differentiation from the city in relation to an historical representation of the past, activated in its present,

---

38   Tafuri, ibid.

39   Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), p. 6. This theme, while it is not our principal concern, is intelligently addressed in John Macarthur's work.—'The Butcher's Shop: Disgust in Picturesque Architecture and Aesthetics,' *Assemblage*, no. 30 (1996): 32-43; *The Picturesque* (London: UCL Press, forthcoming 2006).

40   Tafuri, ibid., p. 9.

41   Ibid.

42   Quatremère de Quincy, cited in ibid., p. 10.

informing the architectural project, in the eighteenth century, architectural production returns to terms defined by the city, but as "part of the structures of the bourgeois city, dissolving itself into the uniformity ensured by pre-constituted typologies."[43]

Tafuri cites from Francesco Milizia at length in contemplating the differences between the Baroque city and the Enlightenment city. Where the latter manifests a concept of "*unity in variety*," he argues, the Enlightenment city is predicated on an ordered Nature: "order and chaos, regularity and irregularity, organic unity and inorganic disunity."[44] The proliferation of architectural 'fragments' in Piranesi's documentation of the Campo Marzio, then, prompts Tafuri to observe that "Piranesi does not have the tools to translate the dialectics of contradiction into form," instead limiting himself to proclaiming that the "new problem is the balancing of opposites, the appointed place for which must be the city, lest the very notion of architecture itself be destroyed."[45] However, in arguing, as Tafuri claims that Piranesi does, for the vast number of 'exceptions' to the 'image' of history in his own images of *Roma antichità*, each negating of architecture's autonomy, his observation prefaces another concerning the complete relegation of the architectural object (and thus of architectural ideas), to the structures of the city, and of the American city in particular.

In complete contrast to the European city, observes Tafuri, the American city (from the mid-eighteenth century) "explicitly sided with the forces that spurred the morphological transformation of the cities."[46] With a "pragmatic approach entirely foreign to European culture," such cities as Philadelphia and Washington, D.C., apply an arterial grid to the city as a commanding structure within which the architectural fragment enjoys "absolute freedom."[47] The fragment does not shape the city; the city does not deform the fragment, which remains nonetheless within the limits that the city imposes. "The American city gives maximum articulation to the secondary elements that shape it, while the laws governing the whole are strictly upheld."[48] This development signals not only the divorce of architecture and the city (or, more precisely by now, urban planning), but underwrites an entire cultural phenomenon. Within the grid, architecture can be anything; it thus becomes *everything.* "Free-trade ethics thus met up with the pioneer myth."[49]

For Tafuri, this failure of limits provokes a crisis of form, in which the architectural object gives over its semantic value to the city itself as an 'autonomous organism.' The city, in turn, sets aside the park as model (at least, for Laugier) to become "an open structure

---

43   Ibid. Daniel Sherer picks up this topic in his essay 'Typology and its Vicissitudes: Observations on a Critical Category,' *Precis*, no. 13 (n.d.), http://www.arch.columbia.edu/Pub/Precis/site/13/dsherer.html (accessed January 14, 2005).

44   Tafuri, ibid., p. 11.

45   Ibid.

46   Ibid., p. 13.

47   Ibid.

48   Ibid.

49   Ibid.

in which any search for a point of equilibrium became a utopian proposition."[50] Thus any architectural form that sought to overcome the city rather than operate freely within its limits tended towards a blind utopianism: ideals conceived in their own terms, untested beyond the closed structures of architectural debate. We might understand the rise of architectural eclecticism as a half-hearted response to this condition, Tafuri writes, but this development is an assertion of ambiguity as a value of urban architecture, a cloaked return to a case that Piranesi had made "taken to its highest level" a century earlier. Romantic eclecticism articulates with disarming clarity "the merciless concreteness of the commodified human environment, filling it with particles of already worn-out values presented as such."[51] Highly cognisant of the lost innocence of 'authenticity,' the programmatic value of ambiguity lies in its reach for "final ethical redemption by displaying its own in-authenticity."[52] Eclecticism in architecture emerges, therefore, as little more than a disciplinary manifestation of a general nineteenth century predilection for collection. As a general condition, the "anxiety" that bourgeois art accepts and internalises (Tafuri notes by way of introduction) is met by the rise of political and social utopianism. The correlations between political theorisation and realisation tended to be as obscure and indirect as architecture had shown that it, too, could be.[53]

The architectural utopianism embedded in the garden city discourse of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century had indirect (at best, suggests Tafuri) links to the social movements that historians would later position as intrinsic to their formulation. Architecture's capacity to propose a 'destiny' that could *overcome* the city (as a site of bourgeois 'destiny') depended upon its relationship with the mechanisms of that same city. As the nineteenth century metropolis shifted from being an expression of bourgeois destiny to being a mechanism for the production of *things* as realised destiny, social utopianism (as an abstract political expression) gave way to the "*politics of things*". The architectural object, far from integral to social aspiration or to the function of the city or urban life, became subject to an ideology that "was left with the utopia of form as a project for recuperating the human Totality in ideal Synthesis, as a way of mastering Disorder through Order."[54] Acceptance of this new state informed an architectural ideology that sought to implicate itself across all spectra of human activity, "a comprehensive Project aimed at the reorganisation of production, distribution and consumption within the capitalist city."[55] This development underpins the utopianism of the early twentieth century modern movement, in which "architectural ideology becomes the *ideology of the Plan*." This approximation, suggests Tafuri, remains intact until 1929 and the Crash.[56]

---

[50]   Ibid.

[51]   Ibid., p. 14.

[52]   Ibid.

[53]   Ibid., p. 6.

[54]   Ibid., p. 15.

[55]   Ibid.

[56]   Ibid.

❧

For Tafuri, following Benjamin and Baudelaire, an ideology of consumption "must offer itself as an ideology of the *correct use* of the city."[57] Yet while the path of Baudelaire's *flâneur* (and his art, and his *things*) absorbs and internalises the 'shock' of industrialisation, Tafuri indicates two channels of the early twentieth century artistic avant-garde as evidence of the capacity for an artistic ideology to act against 'the Plan' as a negation of capitalist forces. De Stijl, he writes, opposes the Chaotic *laisser-faire* city with "the principle of Form."[58] Dada, conversely, "plunged into Chaos" by confirming (with irony) its reality.[59] "Chaos and Order were thus sanctioned by the historical avant-gardes as the 'values,' in the proper sense of the term, of the new city of capital."[60] Yet in contrast to the conflicting values of Nature and Reason in the Enlightenment, in which Nature merely simulated Chaos within a tightly controlled (and thus contrived) social order, Chaos existed for these and other artistic avant-garde movements as a 'true' value. But like Order, in the capitalist city Chaos evolves into a *value* to which the arts must aspire, rendering it (ironically) a *utopian* value, an ideology (as they all are) of the future, constructed against the present. Even for De Stijl, whose Order transcends the city, the nomination of an ideology of Order defines that Chaos in which Dada revels. Yet, suggests Tafuri, in offering an ideological critique of the industrial city, the artistic avant-gardes struggled nonetheless to bridge the intellectual space dividing 'ideology' and 'reality.' The emergence of the architectural 'avant-garde' (although Tafuri rejects that term immediately he employs it to write of architecture) offered a way to solve this impasse: the critiques advanced by the Bauhaus, or by Le Corbusier's *Plan voisin* corresponded to real critical incursions into the capitalist city.

If the artistic avant-gardes expressed the 'anxiety' of industrial life, then architecture fulfilled its brief as a 'bourgeois art': "to dispel anxiety by understanding and internalising its causes."[61] However, Tafuri writes, the evolution of the Bauhaus describes the transformation from ideology applied to the city, to an ideology inherent in a new responsibility shouldered by design to work as a "method of organising production more than of configuring objects."[62] Architecture thus realigns itself from alongside the object, now subject to the exigencies of the city plan, to involvement with the plan itself, both metaphorically and literally through a 'genuine' engagement with urban planning. Yet Tafuri notes a contradiction: "starting from the building sector, architectural culture discovered that only by linking that sector to the reorganisation of

---

57   Ibid., pp. 16-17.

58   Ibid., p. 19.

59   Ibid., p. 56.

60   Ibid, p. 20.

61   Ibid., p. 6. Tafuri writes: "It was at this point that architecture was able to enter the scene, by absorbing and overcoming all the demands of the historic avant-gardes—and indeed by throwing them into crisis, since architecture alone was in a position to provide real answers to the demands made by Cubism, Futurism, De Stijl, and all the various Constructivisms and Productivisms."—p. 20.

62   Ibid.

the city could preestablished goals finally be met."[63] In other words, the utopia-inclined architectural avant-garde was forced to conceal its knowledge of the impossibility of realising an architectural ideology on its own terms. Its fulfilment depended on an agreement between architectural and capitalistic terms (as Tafuri would later show of the Rockefeller Centre). Architecture contributed 'content' to a *piano capitalistico* but subject to that same plan's forces.[64] Conversely, architecture exposed itself to the ideology of industrialisation. "The forms and methods of industrialised labour became part of the organisation of design and were reflected in the proposed use of the object."[65] The establishment of architecture's new objective as the concretisation of the design process constitutes an important example. It corresponds to the processes of industrialisation and is thus subject to architecture's economic underpinnings, its status in the capitalist city, its internal dialectic between the object (utopia, or order) and its context (the real, or chaos), as well as its capacity to retain as 'technique' an essentially architectural ideology, embedded within the terms of its artistic emancipation.

Ludwig Hilberseimer, notes Tafuri, argued the dual influence exerted by the domestic unit upon the city through an extrapolation, on one hand, of the room to the unit to the block to the neighbourhood to the city as an expanding organism; and on the other, of the city's 'planimetric structure' upon the room through an inversion of that same process.[66] Such architects as Hilberseimer, Ernst May or Otto Wagner, in their respective cities, applied architectural processes (implicating the architectural object) to an external ideological structure. "Between the destruction of the *object*, its replacement by a *process* intended to be experienced as such … and the exasperation of the object, there could be no real dialogue."[67] Therefore, while Nazi propaganda called May's Frankfurt "*constructed socialism*," lending form to socialist ideology, Tafuri proposes a more accurate epithet, "realised social democracy."[68] His housing blocks do not express socialist ideology architecturally (as its translation into architecture) so much as they represent an ideology that is no longer, in any sense, architectural. However, for other architects, like Hugo Häring and Hans Scharoun, the dislocation between the architectural object and the new extra-architectural ideologies determining the urban systems to which design was

115

---

63   Ibid.

64   Recognising, in brief, the historiographical consequences of such a correlation, Tafuri elsewhere asks (in his discussion of the art of Viktor Šklovskij): "What are the limits within which form is analysable in its own specificity? Is it possible to put forward hypotheses about the transformation of artistic languages without recourse to their internal laws? Once we have recognised that there exist no linear relations between forms and socio-economic contexts (which do nonetheless condition their existence), how can one write *history* on the basis of the vicissitudes of form alone? These are some of the questions which trouble today's historian, faced as he is with artistic experiments which are symbolic of an attitude that favours language rather than participation in the practical world."—Tafuri, 'The Uncertainties of Formalism: Viktor Šklovskij and the Denuding of Art,' special issue, 'On the Methodology of Architectural History,' ed. Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, no. 6-7 (1981), p. 73.

65   Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' p. 21.

66   Ibid., p. 21.

67   Ibid.

68   Ibid., p. 23.

now subject constituted a problem entirely proper to architecture's intellectual work.[69] Yet what (if anything), following Benjamin, might enact the recovery of architecture's 'aura'?[70] (This question, Tafuri might well note, returns his essay to reflect on architecture's artistic survival.) In any case, it is important for our broader topic that the operation of ideology both within and beyond architecture occurs, from around this moment, in the city. Shaped, in the first instance, by forces foreign to architecture—politics, defence, economics, infrastructure, trade, etc.—the city offered a model (through the plan) for the survival of the architectural project. That those 'projects' concerned most with the architectural object (and thus with an architectural ideology) maintained a discourse outside of the city (by which they were inevitably subsumed) constituted a 'crisis' of intellectual work in architecture.

Tafuri advances an image of Le Corbuser as one who *engages* with the crisis neither by internalising its underlying causes (as bourgeois art) nor by claiming either Order or Chaos as operative mechanisms (as the avant-garde). Rather, Tafuri suggests that he recognised that the role of 'architect as organiser' demanded three acts:

> (1) by addressing an *appel aux industries*, and a choice of building typologies, to business and industry; (2) by pursuing the search for an *authority* capable of reconciling construction and urban planning with civil reorganisation programmes through the institution of the *CIAM*; (3) by exploiting the articulation of form at its highest level in order to make the public an active and conscious user of the architectural product.[71]

To this extent, Tafuri positions Le Corbusier's work from 1919-1929 as a series of 'experiments' "intuiting the correct dimensions in which the urban question must be considered."[72] As such, his most important contribution (Tafuri argues) is the disruption of the architecture-neighbourhood-city 'associative chain' that had dominated German and Central European architectural polemics from the end of the First World War. Rather, he pulled his focus back to understand the availability of landscape and the geographical formation of urban territories as 'material.'

> took the old Casbah, the hills of Fort l'Empéreur, and the coastal inlets as raw materials to be reused, veritable, gigantic ready-made objects to which the new structures defining them would offer a previously nonexistent unity, overturning their original significations.[73]

---

[69]   Ibid., p. 25.

[70]   Ibid.

[71]   Ibid.

[72]   Ibid, p. 26.

[73]   Ibid.

Le Corbusier, therefore, identifies a new role for the architect that is neither as designer of objects, nor as one subject to the vicissitudes of extra-architectural ideology (capitalism, for instance). Rather, Le Corbusier enacts a claim upon the dominant organising ideologies of the city and appropriates them *as* architectural, this predicated on a notion of the city as machine, and of the architect as its inventor and mechanic. On this authority, the public cannot escape *its* role in architectural affairs. Users of the city, they utilise (while being subject to) a specifically architectural form of organisation. Tafuri openly admits the impossibility of treating Le Corbusier's experiments as anything but that: "in no case can a laboratory model be translated *tout court* into reality."[74] And he freely acknowledges "failure of Algiers, and Le Corbusier's 'failure' in general," as a condition inherent to an intellectual apprehension and treatment of the new discursive and polemical problems encountered by architecture in the early twentieth century.[75]

❧

Recalling the central theme of this dissertation, Tafuri's concluding remarks in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' return us to a specific challenge in the historiography of modern architecture that has implications (though indirect) for a broader reflection upon his own historical practice. His theory is complex in its elaboration, but disarmingly simple as an abstraction. Architecture's artistic emancipation called for an intellectual and utopian differentiation between architecture and the city (or even more abstractly, architecture and 'not architecture'), a differentiation enacted in terms of a 'super-historical comparison' with Antiquity. While a 'naturalistic' counter-claim surfaced in the sixteenth century, the debate remained internal to a theoretical discourse proper to architecture. The close integration between architecture and society, religion, economics, and so forth from the height of the Florentine city-state ensured that architectural ideas resonated beyond architecture. With the Enlightenment and the superimposition of an image of Nature as a highly socialised and visualised landscape upon structures previously dominated by architectural ideas, particularly the city, architecture gradually lost control of its 'territory.' The history of the nineteenth century American city—one well-treated by the 'Venice school' study *La città americana*—teaches that architecture can enjoy complete autonomy *within* the confines of the city, which in turn is determined along economic lines. Attempts, over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, to wrest control of the city from economic forces resulted in a series of enduring discursive

---

74 Ibid., p. 28.

75 Ibid. As we noted earlier (n34), Tafuri continues to treat Le Corbusier's 'case' in these terms, lending weight to what Hélène Lipstadt and Harvey Mendelsohn characterise as Tafuri's preoccupation with Le Corbusier's lesson.—Lipstadt and Mendelsohn, 'Philosophy, History, and Autobiography: Manfredo Tafuri and the "Unsurpassed" Lesson of Le Corbusier,' *Assemblage*, no. 22 (December 1993): 58-103. Tafuri's own writing on Le Corbusier extends from the 'pragmatic' to the 'profound.'—Tafuri, 'Le Corbusier,' *Enciclopedia della scienze, lettere e arte italiana*, app. 3 (1949-1960), vol. I (Rome: Istituto della enciclopedia italiana, 1961), p. 973; '"Machine et mémoire." La città nell'opera di Le Corbusier,' *Nuovo corrente*, no. 87 (1982): 3-32; republished (in two parts) in *Casabella*, no. 502 (May 1984): 44-51 and *Casabella*, no. 503 (June 1984): 44-51.

dichotomies centred around a central (though utopian) Order and (equally utopian) Chaos. However, any architectural theory that takes its own imperatives as foreground will fail, as did Le Corbusier in Algiers, to bridge the gulf that divides "architecture as the *ideology of the Plan*" from "the *reality of the Plan*."[76] The latter sweeps away the former in "the moment when the plan came down from the utopian level and became an operant mechanism."[77]

While this judgement formalises Tafuri's own historical analysis of the status of theory in modern architecture and as such extends into specific terms, including methodological, in his writing on modern architecture in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, the abstract disciplinary mechanisms bound up in the architect's relation to the Plan have historiographical repercussions. The "*reality of the Plan*" of which he writes corresponds to realities shaped *outside* of architecture, those same influences that (abstractly) define the city and its regional infrastructure. Those forces, he notes, are 'chaotic,' but not in the value-laden sense of the word employed by the avant-garde. The perceptible lack of order "contains unexplored riches, unlimited possibilities to be turned to account, bright shining values to be presented as new social fetishes."[78] His object, in concluding, is the proposal of a type of class critique of architecture that might lend power to the concretisation of a critical architectural practice that simultaneously takes class (as a socio-political ideology) and architectural ideology as targets.

There are two points that are extremely important (as noted) here, which ought not to be confused. Firstly, Tafuri remains unsure if the introduction of a new politico-economic dimension to architectural historiography will result in an 'avant-garde' or 'rearguard' action. In the concluding pages of 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' he attributes the 'crisis' of modern architecture not only to its ready utilisation by the political programmes of Italian Fascism, Hitler's Nazism or Soviet Stalinism. Rather, he locates a change with the 1929 Crash and with the economic phenomena described in John Keynes's *General Theory*. He conflates Keynes's worldview with Antonio Negri's articulation of modern art's *raison d'être*: "To free oneself from the fear of the future by seeing that future as present."[79] The projection of the future as a dimension of the present is entirely proper to the architect's own worldview as Tafuri constructs it. However, this is not only true of the twentieth century. Extending Tafuri's case and returning to our invocation of 'Architettura e ideologia,' this observation implicates architecture's

---

76   Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Idelogy,' ibid.

77   Ibid. This thesis, in our view, remains central to an historiographical model that one might call Tafurian with respect of his historico-theoretical work in the late 1960s, rather than the more commonly emulated methodology that offers a class critique through architectural historiography *in lieu* of an identification of a class architecture. Tafuri points towards the latter possibility in his preface to the fourth edition of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1976). It was quickly taken up by the group of American scholars represented by *Architecture, Criticism, Ideology*. We have made our own attempt to explore the thesis referenced here.—Leach, *Campus Confessions: Architecture and the Central Institute of Technology* (Auckland: Balasoglou Books, 2004).

78   Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' p. 29.

79   Ibid., p. 28 (and n24). Tafuri references Antonio Negri's citation of Keynes in Negri, 'La teorie capitalista dello stato nel '29: John M. Keynes,' *Contropiano* 1968, no. 1, p. 3.

intellectual construction by means of architectural theory since the Renaissance. Hence it implicates the representation of the past in the present, and thus historiography.

As a principle determining the translation from historiographical to architectural terms of a class critique, Tafuri's analysis has been well-attended by those anxious to develop (supposedly in his wake) terms of a Marxist architecture or a Marxist critique of architecture. We prefer not to enter into an analysis of those efforts, except to note that Tafuri was understandably baffled by their form and substance alike.[80] Rather, it is important to note that he claims the possibility of a Marxist criticism of architecture, liberating an entrenched architectural culture to a form of action that is both proper to architecture and that enables a form of class criticism, which is to say, that provokes an architectural act with consequences *beyond* architecture. This closely corresponds to the forms of operativity available to architects upon enacting a divorce between instrumental criticism and critical practice, as considered in the previous chapter. We do not intend to locate Tafuri's own brand of Marxism as an aspirational ideology, necessarily preoccupied with 'action' and formalised in the parties. However, as a removed disciplinary device, which we turn over readily to a Marxist discourse—or at least, we find it necessary to argue this point outside of the debates surrounding Marxist doctrine, even if this risks undermining the complexity of Tafuri's thinking—one incentive becomes clear: the capacity for a detached though informed critical practice clearing the way (ideologically speaking) for action by architectural practice. This action, in turn, remains utopian (one way or another), but affects real conditions.

This brings us directly to our second point. Tafuri's argument for the necessity of a critico-historical practice in the face of architecture's 'crisis' calls for an analytical practice that can, he claims, convince its audiences that the contradictory, imbalanced, chaotic interactions that characterised the contemporary city are inevitable, but are not problems that demand solutions. This role for an historical practice is not unfamiliar in light of the examples and essays considered previously , but it is intriguing to consider the relationship between a political message (as an homogenising image), and an historiographical practice (principally concerned with the production and problematisation of the historical image), in light of their conflict, to which Tafuri ultimately alludes in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.' However, does Tafuri's appreciation of the historian's role as one who undermines historical images that can be activated as theory stem solely from a Marxist critical discourse? Or does the nature of his Marxist critique of modern architecture follow critical concerns pertaining to a broader disciplinary view? Insofar as a preoccupation with 'ideology' traces readily back to a Marxist critical tradition, does Marxist discourse lend the language and critical apparatuses to a disciplinary act that precedes and extends well beyond his direct interest in politics?

We do reintroduce these questions as a further negation of the earlier decision not to deal with the politico-ideological referents against which those most interested in

---

80   Tafuri, letter to Joan Ockman, reproduced in 'Venezia e New York' / 'Venice and New York,' trans. Cioni Carpi, 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Vittorio Gregotti, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995), pp. 70-71.

this dimension of his bibliography traditionally hold him. Rather, expressing some unassuaged curiosity as to what traffic potentially exists between (speaking abstractly) a political ideology and a disciplinary practice, we note that the values of the former, as action, are integral to the construction of the latter. Rather than demanding that we reconcile these fields, beginning (as we have) from an acknowledgement that the identification of theory as an abstraction and thus as a target for the historian's practice is already loaded. That is to say, implicating the historian in a disciplinary scheme whereby one consequence (on the part of the architect, to be clear) is a projection of the future from the present, then an engagement with 'ideology' is at some level inevitable. Tafuri's mode is 'critique,' following Tronti (in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica'). As for Tronti, though, the nature of Tafuri's critique is one that holds architecture to higher standards, not one that seeks to destroy. The critique of ideology—whether that ideology be architectural, social, political, economic, religious or otherwise—is a critical gesture hoping that the exposure of 'untenable myths' (abstractions upon which one builds a 'firm future') liberates the practice concerned with the future to do a better job, unfettered by 'false hopes.'

The locked, concrete terms of Tafuri's reception as, to quote Hubert Muschamp, "the Marxist of Venice," forces us to risk (perhaps artificially) this divorce of the political context of his writing from his historiographical practice.[81] Through this action, we turn immediately to those disciplinary concerns that raise the spectre of ideology, those that we perceive as more longstanding. Are we able to determine correspondences between this proposition of an explicit *critica dell'ideologia architettonica* and the implicit subversions present in the contemporaneous *L'architettura dell'umanesimo*? And how can we then explain the equivalence of the terms invoked by means of a contemporary Marxist vocabulary, proper to the discourses of *Contropiano* and *Quaderni rossi*, with the disciplinary schemes that surround Tafuri's initial 'choice' for history, and that extend into his mature historical practice, widely perceived to have left aside his 'militant' Marxism? These questions circumnavigate a vacuum that we have deliberately left as such, a gesture that we believe is necessary for reading Tafuri today, even if it only allows us to thoroughly test the relationship between politics and historiography, between ideology and its critique, which we are repeatedly told, are inseparable in his work. In order to overcome this *image* of Tafuri the 'ever-political,' we propose a second construction, in which his articulation of a critique of ideology extends properly from his choice for history, and thus comprises an intellectual practice in which we can perceive more continuities than fissures. This is the same gesture that allows us to negate the construction of a periodised Tafuri, a tendency that, above all, implicates the rendition of history as image and its propensity to flatten out the complexities of the past.

❧

---

81   Hubert Muschamp, 'Nocturne for the Marxist of Venice,' *New York Times,* May 8, 1994, p. 37.

With one further example, then, we can test (in brief) this hypothesis: the monumental historical study of Rome's via Giulia, written with Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro. It corresponds, chronologically, to the publication of *Progetto e utopia* (1973), also taking up the utopian theme. However, insofar as it foreshadows a series of later 'philological' studies in which Tafuri would assume a key role—on Palladio, Raffaello, Giulio Romano, Jacopo Sansovino, Francesco di Giorgio Martini—*Via Giulia* forms an important counterbalance to the more obviously polemical essay we have just assayed. If the study of architecture's place relative to the ideological systems of the twentieth century is a research project proper to *IUAV* and Tafuri's collaborations in Venice, both inside the Faculty and in the broader politico-cultural *milieu*, then *Via Giulia* reminds us in no uncertain terms that Tafuri's research was not limited to this single setting. The book investigates the evolution of a single street drawn across Rome's medieval fabric in the *piano di ristrutturazione* of Pope Julius II (Pope 1503-1513), executed between 1508 and 1511 under the direction of Donato Bramante (1444-1514). Structured into two main sections, the first part articulates the historical problem of via Giulia under three themes: Julius II's 'urban' politics ('La politica urbanistica dei Papi e l'origine di via Giulia,' by Spezzaferro); the street as an urban 'structure' ('Via Giulia. Storia di una struttura urbana,' by Tafuri), and as a site of artistic enterprise ('Pittori, scultori e mecenati in via Giulia,' by Salerno). The second conducts a site-by-site documentary analysis testing the theoretical and historiographical structures of Part One against the documentation of each palazzo, church and casa (and prison, and hospital, and 'college'). Each site 'document' responds only to the level of available historical material, lending a highly variable flavour to the second, most substantial part of the book. In addition, the volume articulates a vast amount of highly specific information pertaining to the street's development from inception to the time of writing (their chronology concludes in 1972): diagrams, maps, documentation of building permits, etc.

In Tafuri's treatment of this historical 'case,' the theoretical theses of *Progetto e utopia* meet the historiographical theses of *Architettura dell'umanesimo*. Under Julius II, Bramante enacted the urban infringement of the via Giulia upon an existing fabric, replicating in 'fact' an intellectual gesture that parallels Brunelleschi's intellectual incursions into Florence seventy years earlier. Yet in enacting this formidable dislocation between the *architectural* and the *urban*, between (to recall the terms of 'Architettura e ideologia') project and context, or architecture and everything else, Bramante also fulfils a political function. "*Renovatio Romae* was observed more often as an expression of the programme of *renovatio imperii*: as symbol—of the conquest of the bourgeois city-state and of the ambiguous dualism of the medieval Church-Empire."[82] The utopian act of imposing street upon fabric, carving, as it were, a programmatic space into that same fabric, follows the basic formula of Brunelleschi's act, but (for the city) is an inversion.

---

82 Tafuri, 'Via Giulia. Storia di una struttura urbana,' *Via Giulia*, by Tafuri, Salerno and Spezzaferro, p. 65. Orig. passage: "*Renovatio Romae* come espressione del programma delle *renovatio imperii*, è stato più volte osservato: come simbolo—del superamento dello Stato-città borghese e dell'ambiguo dualismo medioevale Chiesa-Impero."—our trans.

The dome of S. Maria del Fiore imposes an object upon the city (as the 'real,' to invoke a concept in the same terms with which we will return to it in Chapter Six), that does not belong to that same city; by its constitution as an intellectual act, it is a projection *for* the city while negating that which is present. Conversely, Bramante's via Giulia imposes the negative space of the street upon the city, generating a vacuum that, as a project, pulls the present into the 'future' by force. The cumulative celebrity of via Giulia's architects and the importance of their works on this site is evidence, in part, of the success of this strategy. That the vast majority of its most consequential monuments appear after the deaths of Julius II in 1513 and Bramante in 1514, and therefore under the papacies spanning from Leo X (Pope 1513-1521) to Sixtus V (Pope 1585-1590), indexes this gesture's momentum.[83] Yet is via Giulia an intellectual act that belongs properly to architecture, and by extension to architectural theory as the 'projective' dimension of architecture-as-art? Or is it properly a political act, expressing (as Tafuri indicates) the *Renovatio Romae* of Julius II?

Tafuri ultimately disputes Andrea Guarna da Salerno's characterisation (in his *Simia* of 1517) of Bramante as Julius II's hand-puppet, suggesting the synchrony of "Bramante's epicurism and gigantomania" with the Della Rovere Pope's own megalomania.[84] Yet if we *can* classify this as a synchrony, Tafuri suggests, then the street is above all an "ideological superstructure."[85] It embodies, in a single, clear gesture, two concordant 'projects': that of Bramante as an agent of the architectural 'Renaissance,' advancing its claim for artistic emancipation; and that of Julius II and *his* attempt to realign temporal and spiritual power. Both are circumscribed by the 'not-yet' in their formulation, demonstrating 'real' power in their initial execution. However, the complication of both visions over a short time demonstrates a conflict with an evolving 'present' (or, for posthumous Julius II, with the French). The street, as an urban construction, remains (at this scale) a perfectly straight line between two points of the Tiber, yet the study of documentation and close visual analysis of the street in *Via Giulia* suggests that at the *human* (we could venture 'real') scale of direct experience it becomes infinitely more complex. Tafuri alludes to this in his ironic conclusion, observing that Bramante's gesture in its purity simply (ultimately) sets up a 'master view' of the new Rome Hilton, as much a symbol of the contemporary Roman capital as the initial action was of the Julian city-state.[86]

Historiographically, the study leads us elsewhere. Treated as a purely ideological critique, Bramante's designs and Julius II's religio-political utopianism comprise a fine target. Critique of the ideological underpinnings of this street, as Tafuri enacts in the first of the study's five sections, is relatively straightforward; Tafuri's major contribution to this endeavour is his questioning of the easy depiction of Bramante's artistic dependency on Julius II, posing it rather as conditional, concurrent autonomy, agreeing with Julius II's

---

83 Ibid., pp. 76-118.
84 Ibid., p. 65. Orig. phrase: "l'epicurismo e la gigantomania di Bramante."—our trans.
85 Ibid. Orig. wording: "sovrastruttura ideologica."—our trans.
86 Ibid., p. 152.

own political intentions.[87] Yet neither Tafuri's historical analysis nor the book's structure rest upon this simple critical manoeuvre, however well deployed. Via Giulia lends itself, by dint of its development over time (and especially in the seventeenth century), to an historiography that accounts for change over that time, that sets Borromini alongside Raffaello alongside Antonio da Sangallo. Yet within this historiographical choice resides a second strategy that recurs in a series of Tafuri's exhibition projects, beginning a decade later. By laying out the materials of history, *showing* documentation as it rests in archives, the three authors of *Via Giulia* demonstrate a fundamental theoretical position that is intrinsic to Tafuri's 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.' Namely: just as ideology tends towards homogeneity, the 'city' tends towards complexity. Such a blatantly utopian project as via Giulia, a street superimposed upon the city against its 'will' becomes subject to entropic deformations as soon as direct control is removed from the 'project.' That is to say, no matter how high the degree of ideological investment with which the initial act is imbued, as soon as the unidirectional forces pulling the project into an unrealised future disperse, so too does the project confront the vicissitudes of reality.

<div align="center">❧</div>

Without unpacking a second example, we note that the architectural history of the Soviet Union, on which Tafuri and his colleagues wrote over the course of the 1970s, provides a provocative counterpoint to *Via Giulia*. Through its operation as an index of the hopes that, even in Italy, were pinned on communism as an alternative to capitalist society, as well as its unfolding in real time, the historical study of the ideological underpinnings of the USSR was not without its complications. The difficulty with which the group of researchers working with Tafuri in Venice elaborated the results of their research renders this study and its ever-expanding bibliography substantially more complex than *Via Giulia*, exposing, as they did, a tendency towards entropy after the initial phase of the Five Year Plans that parallels the 'after-life' of the via Giulia.[88] We can note the relationship in both projects between an explicitly politicised *critica dell'ideologia*, implicating the capacity for 'hope' in the present, and an historiographical application translating these terms into a profound disenchantment that does not, then, enact a

---

[87] The section is entitled 'Via Giulia nel piano di ristrutturazione di Giulio II. Un'ipotesi urbanistica e il suo fallimento (1508-1511),' ibid., pp. 65-76.

[88] We refer to the complexity of their 'return' to a receptive 'present.' Over the course of the 1970s, Tafuri publishes a number of studies on the architectural history of the Soviet Union, often in collaboration. Besides *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS, 1917-1937*, noted above, we include the following: Tafuri, 'URSS-Berlin. Du populisme à l'"internationale constuctiviste",' special issue, 'L'architecture et l'avant-garde artistique en URSS de 1917 à 1934,' *VH101. Revue trimestrielle*, nos. 7-8 (1972): 53-87; 'Les premières hypotheses de planification urbaine dans la Russie soviétique, 1918-1925,' special issue, 'Sozialistische Architektur? UdSSR' / 'Architecture socialiste? URSS, 1917-1932,' *Archithese*, no. 7 (1973): 34-41; republished in Italian as 'Le prime ipotesi di pianificazione urbanistica nella Russia sovietica. Mosca, 1918-1924,' *Rassegna sovietica* 74, no. 1 (1974): 80-93; 'Verso la "città socialista". Ricerche e realizzaioni nell'Unione sovietica, fra la NEP e il primo piano quinquennale,' *Lotus*, no. 9 (February 1975): 76-93; and Tafuri, Jean-Louis Cohen and Marco De Michelis, eds., *URSS 1917-1978. La città, l'architettura / La ville, l'architecture* (Rome: Officina; Paris: L'esquerre, 1979), which includes Tafuri's essay, 'Avant-garde et formalisme entre la NEP et la première plan quinquennal,' pp. 16-92.

relationship with the future. To restate: while we can harbour few doubts about Tafuri's commitment to political discourse (especially after his move to Venice), using this to 'explain' the historical discourse of *Via Giulia* seems perverse, an automatic response with no real justification in the material itself. Yet in restating the question as one of 'hope,' we go directly to consider a series of dialectical points that we perceive as proper to Tafuri's thinking about historical practice: between hope and irony, image and fragment, action and criticism. Each of these receives a measure of attention over the course of this dissertation, but for now it is useful to indicate that each opens up to the capacity for provisionality in the historian's discipline, a capacity that, especially after 'Il "progetto" storico,' assumes the added dimension of 'interminability' (in the Freudian sense, as we will see).

This observation resonates with the position that Tafuri ascribes to the historian within architectural culture in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Exposed to the same disciplinary corpus as the architect, he asks how historical practice might eschew hope, turn away from the future, in order to deliver to the present an impression of the past that resists emulation. Despite, or perhaps because of, the parallels that pervade a comparison between the modern American city and the post-War Italian city for the Venice group, especially under the 'economic miracle,' the American city could never be an historical object open to emulation. It could never, put otherwise, be advanced as a model of practice for the Italian present. The Soviet Union, as a model of society held up by the *PCI* membership *and* a body of architectural and planning practice acclaimed for delivering form to that society, offered a rather more tempting proposition for the present. However, treated with the irony that we, following the exhortations of Cacciari's funeral oration, perceive as proper to the profile of the historian that he constructs in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, even these historical images crumble under the burden of proof.[89] We rightly ask a question that reverberates through Tafuri's own *œuvre* and into the tools and tasks that he, in turn, projects on to the historian: how far can one take 'knowledge' of architecture without succumbing to its aspirations? For Tafuri, *any* critique of architectural ideology (as an historiographical device)—that is, any confrontation of history's images—implicates a secondary critique of historiographical ideology, of those disciplinary tools facilitating the communication of research into the past to the present. For as long as that research locates audiences able to find in history some motivation for reaching into the future, who are able to translate history into theory, Tafuri holds the historian responsible for upholding the disciplinary value of entropy.[90]

---

89   Massimo Cacciari, 'Quid Tum,' *Domus*, no. 762 (July-August 1994), p. 38.

90   While we do not set out to construct a matrix of references that support this position, we note the relationship between this objective and the cutting self-reflection of Georg Lukács *The Destruction of Reason*, which Tafuri indicates (in the Passerini history) was an important book for his determination of the values of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*.—Lukács (Italian catalogues name him György following the original Hungarian formulation György Szegedy von Lukács), *Der Zerstorung der Vernunft* (1952); Ital. ed., *La distruzione della ragione*, trans. Ernaldo Arnaud (Turin: Einaudi, 1959); Engl. ed., *The Destruction of Reason*, trans. Peter Palmer (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press; London: Merlin, 1980); Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 28. The book operates as a model of auto-criticality from *within* a system that purports to be critical. Sykes considers the importance of Lukács to Tafuri's wider position on 'the real,'

This returns us, finally, to the historian's own relationship to the future and to the principle of 'hope.' What, in effect, are the wider consequences of a critico-historical practice in the present that moves this same present forward 'productively' into the future? This implicates Tafuri's general disciplinary conceptual framework for the past, present and future; history, criticism and theory, wherein lies the ideological (and thus 'hopeful') dimension of the *historian's* own practice, independent of the 'ideological' target of architectural theory. It is not insignificant that the theoretical referents informing Tafuri's nuanced understanding of the operations of ideology in architecture come *not* from his Roman *milieu*, but from 'Venice,' a city from which he would later claim to view the world, of which (to him) it is not truly a part. This issue of detachment, otherwise called 'critical distance,' is important here, implicating the precise place of the historian between past, present and future. Antony Vidler—borrowing a formulation that Robert Maxwell applied to Reyner Banham— describes Tafuri as an historian of the immediate present, neither properly of the past nor of the future. In this observation, the epigraph of *Ricerca del rinascimento* is exceptionally poignant, citing William Carlo Williams's poem *El hombre*:

> It's a strange courage
> You give me, ancient star
>
> Shine alone in the sunrise
> Toward which you lend no part![91]

The principal of abstract hope that pervades Tafuri's work is here crystallised in a perfectly formed metaphor that draws together the themes of hope, disenchantment and 'the real.'[92] The 'strange' moment in which the morning star signals the coming of day readily casts itself in a revolutionary hue. Yet unlike the sunrise itself, which would (following the revolutionary possibilities of this image) constitute the first rays of the day itself, the morning star is merely an *index* of hope, neither properly of the night, nor present in the dawn. The star, we propose, is Tafuri's historian, who carries his or

---

    offering a considered reading of his traces in Tafuri's thinking in the 1960s and 1970s.—Ibid., pp. 196-200. However, she does not go so far as to consider *Der Zerstorung der Vernunft*, mentioned by Tafuri himself as a model; it does not appear in her bibliography.

91   William Carlos Williams, 'El hombre,' *Al Que Quiere!* (Boston: The Four Seas Company, 1917).

92   While the parallels are not entirely defensible, we observe something in Tafuri of the 'crisis' portrayed by the figure of Don Fabrizio, Prince of Salina, in Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa's novel *Il gattopardo*. Caught between knowledge that he would not belong to the future and certainty that the past was closed to him, with Garibaldi and the *Risorgimento*, Don Fabrizio regards tradition and 'right' with irony; while not forcing the future, he regards it with inevitability yet also detachment. Towards the end of his life, he observes the 'morning star,' noting its presence at the announcement of a day that it will never see.— Giuseppe di Lampedusa, *Il gattopardo* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1958). Di Lampedusa writes: "At a crossroad he glimpsed the sky to the west, above the sea. There was Venus, wrapped in her turban of autumn mist. She was always faithful, always waiting for Don Fabrizio …. [He] sighed. When would she decide to give him an appointment less ephemeral, far from carcasses and blood, in her own region of perennial certitude?"—Giuseppe di Lampedusa, *The Leopard*, trans. Archibald Colquhoun (New York: Pantheon, 1960), pp. 272-273.

her own burdens and hopes, but does not pretend that these will exist in the future. Compared to the sun, it is a symbol of disillusionment; its irony nonetheless signals that a day will follow, of one description or another. It is a reflection of that day to come, but is locked into its own solitude. The brightness of that star reveals how closely it reflects the future, but the brighter it shines, the more irony it embodies, for the future can not be predicted from history, and neither can the historian nor the architect—argues Tafuri vociferously—anticipate that which follows the present.

Following on from the first portion of this dissertation, we can begin to construct an historical context around Tafuri's decision to 'choose' history in relation to the institutional, professional and cultural settings of his early practice. These properly include his biography, his experience of early 1960s Rome, the polemical field concerned with the place of the university in contemporary culture, the politics of the post-War *centro sinistra* in Italy, and so on. However, insofar as we are preoccupied here with the broader mechanisms of historical practice and Tafuri's response to the ethical challenges of architectural historiography—relative to architectural practice and its adherent theoretical discourse—we draw some benefit from further positioning his writing of the later 1960s in reference to the grand context of modern thought. In suggesting this, we do not intend to test Tafuri thoroughly against the rigours of a Freudo-Marxist philosophical tradition, integral to the nature of thought in the modern world, even though such a test would prove interesting and informative. However, in reading his work of the later 1960s, we perpetually encounter evidence of his considered debt to these two giants of twentieth century knowledge, as well as an engagement, slight or sustained, with the arguments of their 'descendants.' We cannot intend to consider Tafuri's intellectual and 'private' encounters with such figures as Marx, Freud, Benjamin, or Sartre (as we will go on to do) with a view towards definitively positioning him in the trajectory of a School. We quickly realise that any claims to do such a thing are programmatic and artificial. Whatever epistemological traces we find in Tafuri's work that lead back to one key figure of modern thought or another are, we surmise or understand, the results of a complicated balance between experience, intellectual engagement and methodological self-determination. In invoking intellectual legacies, we ultimately remain bound in the irrecoverability of Tafuri's own 'choices.'

His intellectual debt to Marxist and Freudian traditions—central to these two chapters—is less our concern, therefore, than the elaboration of those epistemological conclusions he draws from his encounters with the themes of ideology, as we have considered in the previous pages, and of memory, our present concern. We use the idea of 'epistemological debt' deliberately, because our aim is not to identify the true colours of Tafuri's Marxism, although others have embarked upon such a quest. Neither is our charge the placement of Tafuri within a discourse on Freud or his disciples. Accordingly, these chapters ask how the abstract notion of a Freudo-Marxist intellectual meta-system *informs* Tafuri's architectural historiography: both in its analytical process and in the presuppositions that underpin the *reasons* for historical practice, and which thus uphold the claim for autonomy made by Tafuri on behalf of the architectural history 'discipline,' as well as our counter-claim for this autonomy's conditionality. The issue is thus not one of Tafuri's philosophy, though this is clearly inseparable from the issues of method,

ideology and objective that introduce. However, the extrication of Tafuri's published work from his intentions and his motivations is as much in our frame of vision as it was in his. The historian's self-consciousness of method and imperative is a persistent undercurrent in his *œuvre*. Lucidly, he sums this up in 'The Uncertainties of Formalism' (1985):

> To reassess ones own relationship with the instruments of criticism is—in my view—similar to examining the role played by those instruments in the various historical situations which conditioned their very origin and development. Surely it is not 'method' as such that I refer to here. In a sense, the object of analysis itself determines the method or methods chosen. When I stress—as I have done in the past—the need for an *infinite* analysis, this is precisely what I have in mind: the possibility of interrogating everything afresh, always using analytical tools of a different kind.[1]

Returning to Tafuri afresh by commencing a discussion of memory's place in Tafuri's thinking is not, we must be clear, a plea for his entry into the contemporary field of memory studies in cultural theory. Rather, we recognise that memory comprises an intrinsic and vital dimension of Tafuri's entire conception of historical practice, one inevitably bound to ideology, and one that stands in challenge to the historian who is concerned with the boundaries between operativity and criticality defining his or her engagement with the world beyond their immediate pre-occupations. This theme, we will show, implicates not simply Tafuri's tentative position in the cross-currents of Freudo-Marxism, but also some basic coordinates that link together an intellectual appreciation of the structures and mechanisms of historical memory and its 'recovery' and the biographical dimensions that render Tafuri's deployment of this knowledge both fascinating and frustratingly evasive.

❦

We find interesting, then, the terms under which Spanish philosopher Tomas Llorens reproaches *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), admittedly the most programmatic (but equally the most 'exposed') of Tafuri's methodological writings, in an issue of *Architectural Design* (1981) dedicated to the theme of architectural historiography. Declaring the book a 'palimpsest,' he argues that it is so elaborately overwritten as to disguise any of its original intentions. Llorens took exception less to its content *per se* than to his suspicion that the author systematically deflected readers from a 'real' agenda, this thoroughly concealed.[2] We know, from Passerini's oral history and from several other interviews

---

[1]   Tafuri, 'The Uncertainties of Formalism: Viktor Šklovskij and the Denuding of Art,' ed. Demetri Porphyrios, 'On the Methodology of Architectural History,' special issue, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): p. 73.

[2]   Tomas Llorens, 'Manfredo Tafuri: Neo-Avant-Garde and History,' ed. Porphyrios, ibid., p. 85. Llorens

with Tafuri on the subject of this book, that he prefers to avoid equating *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* with his choices, turning aside from a reflexive analysis that draws disciplinary form from biography.[3] Nonetheless, his elaboration of a serious breadth of historical and methodological knowledge secured and thus launched his teaching at *IUAV*, along with such books as *L'architettura del Manierismo* (1966) and his earlier works on Quaroni, Japanese modernism, Borromini, and other topics. We note, though, that Llorens takes the book at face value, questioning neither its intellectual nor (we hesitate to suggest) biographical corollaries. For him, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is clearly a critical action within an architectural culture that is, for Tafuri, in a state of crisis. He does not stop to consider—and nor would we necessarily expect him to—that the book itself, as a work of historiography, might express another type of crisis, pertinent to the practice of history itself within the broad historical judgements we can find therein. The possibility of the crisis diagnosed in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, reflecting a crisis sensed by its author, for different reasons and with different consequences, does not enter the picture. Llorens never fully engages with the nature of 'crisis' at work in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, nor does he advance a theory classifying Tafuri's thought within a conventional methodological approach. He suggests but does not pursue a hidden and complex agenda resting somewhere between Tafuri's personal, institutional and intellectual lives.

When Tafuri remarked in passing to Françoise Very that *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* was full of autobiographical notations that were more important to understanding the work than anyone had noticed by then (1976), he offers a vital clue to a reading of this book that circumvents the burdensome frameworks of 'late Marxist critique,' 'crisis' and architectural mortality, that tend to enmesh Tafuri's later readers in obfuscating, critical language.[4] A study of his footnotes, and his historiographic references, tempered by his own later reflections on this moment (despite the problems that they pose in their own terms), indicates that *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* operated on at least two levels: as a critical meditation on his historical scholarship to date (roughly to the summer of 1967), and its reliance on existing historiographical models; and as a manifesto for the practice of architectural history relative to its tools and tasks, the institutionalisation of which he would oversee in Venice from 1968. Central to this conception is an idea that architectural history at that moment maintained a practice *beyond* disciplinary form, that it simply sustained a provisional scheme shaped by disciplinary 'responsibilities' and by the tools available to the historiographical analysis of architecture. 'Provisional'

---

refers to Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968).

3   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (1999), pp. 34-36.

4   Interview with Manfredo Tafuri by Françoise Very, *AMC. Architecture, movement, continuité*, no. 39 (June 1976): 64-68, republished as 'I mercati della cultura' / 'The Culture Markets,' trans. French-Ital. Bruno Pedretti; French-Engl. Kenneth Hylton, ed., Vittorio Gregotti, 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 36-45. We refer to a passage on p. 37. Very's interview coincides with the French translation of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* in 1976.

remains, then, a key word in our reflections on Tafuri's own reticence to articulate disciplinary form, permitting our resistance to any idea of a 'permanent present,' in which problems are solved and the future assured. Yet Tafuri's notion of architectural history's responsibilities towards architectural practice advance an idealised notion of historiography's location *solely* in the present, capable of delivering evidence that will undermine those futures conceived by architects. His argument thus advances three untenable notions: that history contains 'answers' to the future; that simplistic models of signification and causality can result in fixed historical images; and that architecture is an autonomous art form, open to assessment independent of its historical contexts.[5]

On such precepts, according to Tafuri, neither the aesthetic, formal, symbolic or connoisseurial approaches offered by the historiography of art applied to architecture—though he does conditionally defer to such art historians as Giulio Carlo Argan, Ernst Gombrich, Erwin Panofsky, and Rudolf Wittkower—nor the 'utopian' architect-historians—Zevi arguing for an American-styled democracy, the 'operative' Siegfried Giedion historically justifying the efforts of *CIAM*—offered a sustainable model for an emancipated practice of architectural history.[6] Tafuri thus judges the body of practitioners working within the field of architectural history to be in a position analogous to the state that art historians found themselves in a century earlier, merely drawing on disparate traditions and shaky disciplinary foundations, united by little more than a subject held in common interest.[7] Tafuri's self-assigned task to develop an open theoretical field of operations for architectural historiography—part of which undertaking is undoubtedly opposed in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*—sought two outcomes: firstly, the clear identification of a corpus of historical material under the

5   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, particularly the chapters 'Gli strumenti della critica' and 'I compiti della critica.' Llorens rightly identify that Tafuri himself is guilty (though we would say, to an extent) of testing "the operative potential of general historical concepts on the drawing board of the artist or architect." He cites, for example, Tafuri's studies of Borromini from the 1960s through to the 1972 publication of his contributions to the 1967 conference *Studi sul Borromini* at the *Accademia nazionale di San Luca*—Llorens, 'Manfredo Tafuri: Neo-Avant-Garde and History,' p. 85. However, as we show in a later chapter, the programmatic dimensions of these studies pertain more to historiographical rather than to architectural practice. That said, the trajectory of his articles in *Italia nostra*, *Casabella-continuità* and *Superfici* and *Comunità* are rightly open to criticism for being 'instrumental' within his immediate setting. We offer the reminder, though, that these writings emerge from a moment when Tafuri was actively engaged in architectural, operative practice.

6   We should, in passing, note Tafuri's admiration for the historiography of Gustavo Giovannoni, though he does not make this explicit until late in his life; for this reason Françoise Choay can accuse him, among others, of overlooking Giovannoni's significance in her introduction to Giovannoni's *L'urbanisme face aux villes anciennes*, trans. Ital.-French Jean-Marc Mandosio, Amélie Petita and Claire Tandille (Paris: Editions du seuil, 1998), pp. 26-27. Cf. Christoph Thoenes, 'Bramante-Giovannoni. Il Rinascimento interpretato dall'architettura fascista, Manfredo Tafuri su Giovannoni,' *Casabella*, no. 634 (May 1996): 64-73.

7   Donald Preziosi describes well the nineteenth century consolidation of the art historical discipline in 'Art History: Making the Visible Legible,' *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Preziosi (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 13-18. It is important to note, in this regard, that the disciplinary 'crisis' observed by Tafuri was not widely felt; there is no new body of disciplinary writing exposing substantial epistemological or methodological issues demandingimmediate redress. For a summary of issues and challenges observed contemporaneously within the discipline, see Marcus Whiffen, ed., *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture: Papers from the 1964 AIA-ACSA Teaching Seminar* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1965).

banner of 'architecture'; and, secondly, the articulation of a practice within which these materials might be 'disciplined' in a new way by the community of scholars (for which Venice is a model) subscribing to Tafuri's historical and theoretical assessment. Of the options before him, Tafuri wrote:

> A critical method can be established in many ways: one can start from the philosophy of art and deduce historiographic methods from it, go to already well established methodologies, to a more or less rigorous empiricism, or to fashionable analytical methods. These choices must, however, be judged on their degree of penetration into the reasons for history.[8]

In searching out the foundations of a critical method proper to both the theory of disciplinarity that he belies in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura and* to the specific tasks he regards as intrinsic to the historian's place in architectural culture, he plundered his private library, both literally and metaphorically. The historiographical implications of such writers as Panofsky, Gombrich, Georg Hegel, György Lukács, Walter Benjamin, Hans Sedlmayr, Bertold Brecht, Umberto Eco, Roland Barthes, Gillo Dorfles, Max Bense and Claude Lévi-Strauss enter architectural historiography as interference patterns.[9] His motivation, he later stated to Very, was two-fold: to "use the discipline [architectural history] as a means of testing its tools" and—following his assessment "that 'the discipline' itself was rotten to the core"—to reconstruct a theoretical foundation for architectural history, starting again from the beginning. Declaring architectural history to have unquestionably entered a disciplinary crisis—"we were," he wrote, "locked in a castle under a spell, the keys were lost"—he asks how historians themselves might overcome this 'crisis.'[10]

---

8 Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Giorgio Verrecchia, 4th ed. (1976, London: Granada, 1980), p. 171.

9 We cannot say this, of course, of Panofsky or Gombrich; however, it is their interest in artistic symbolism and iconography in the light of a fashionable linguistic discourse in architecture that here draws Tafuri's focus. Jean-Louis Cohen notes a mechanism of reception in France by which the 1976 translation of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* introduces Barthes, for instance, to French architectural culture.—Jean Louis Cohen, 'The Italophiles at Work,' trans. Brian Holmes [from 'Les italophiles au travail. La coupure entre architectes et intellectuels, ou les enseignements de l'italianophylie,' *In extenso* (1984)], *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), p. 509. Cohen goes on to suggest that by means of Tafuri and his colleagues in Venice, 'the Italians' also introduced French architectural culture later to Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze (though by the late 1970s, *IUAV* had a more direct channel to French intellectual culture through the agency of Georges Teyssot and Cohen himself.

10 Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' ibid. Massimo Cacciari later suggests it problematic to apply the word 'architecture' to the field at all.—Massimo Cacciari, 'Eupalinos or Architecture,' trans. Stephen Sartorelli, *Oppositions*, no. 21 (Summer 1980): 106-116. Though Tafuri is ready to use the word crisis here, he later comments: "Much has been written about [the crisis of modern art] over the last few years, and I am becoming suspicious. Continually raising the spectre of this crisis could be a way of exorcising something we find disturbing and, in fact, of transforming the crisis into merely fashionable, social chit-chat. We might wonder if the crisis hasn't gone into crisis itself. What's this crisis all about? Our entire culture is based on a tradition of doubt and circumspection rooted in the nineteenth or even eighteenth century. And our century's most attentive and perhaps tragic forms of cultural awareness have always insisted that we work our way through this crisis, rather than lulling ourselves to sleep within it."—Tafuri, interviewed by Giacinto Di Pietrantonio, *Flash Art*, no. 149 (March 1989), p.

While Tafuri posed such deep, searching questions in his intellectualisation of architectural historical practice, in his private life he was undertaking his first course of psychoanalysis. It is difficult to put Tafuri's experience of analysis into direct play with the disciplinary investigations pervading *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*; its consequences are well beyond our ability to judge. Neither Freud nor his disciples figure in the well-populated field of Tafuri's methodological referents therein. Nonetheless, Tafuri does identify the origins of this book with a moment of personal anguish, starting from a difficult decision (itself couched in a personal 'crisis') to 'abandon' architecture in favour of history, climaxing—along with his resolve to begin a course of psychoanalysis—with his securing a position over Leonardo Benevolo through Zevi's intervention. His writing of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* "followed several years of reflection (beginning in 1964). It restitutes, so to speak, the fixed point one has to create for oneself at certain times in one's life. That's why it's so crammed with autobiographical notations nobody has noticed … but which are there nonetheless."[11] We propose that among these, though never explicit and always balanced by other questions, other referents, Tafuri evidenced deep consideration given to the implications of his psychoanalytic experiences in his intellectual work.[12]

There remains, at a very basic level, a chronological coincidence of the first of Tafuri's two courses of Freudian psychoanalysis (1966-1969) with the preparation and publication of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and its 'sequel,' 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.'[13] Extrapolating this coincidence into a theory of Tafuri's reception of psychoanalytic ideas is tempting, but over-speculative. However, tempered with his own prompts, via Passerini, to reflect on the place of psychoanalysis within his field of methodological referents, as well as a clear epistemological indebtedness to a mode or modes of historical analysis in which 'health' and 'progress,' 'completion' and 'conclusion,' 'answers' and 'closure,' 'recall' and 'memory,' are important poles, we regard as legitimate our referenceto his personal experience of psychoanalysis, *and* his intellectual reading of Freud. Tafuri admits (though barely) the latter through direct citation. For instance, Chapter Five of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 'Gli strumenti della critica,' twice references Gombrich's November 1953 lecture to the British Psycho-Analytical Society, 'Psychoanalysis and the History of Art,' in which, as the title suggests,

---

67.

[11]   Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' p. 37.

[12]   The possibility of 'testing' Tafuri's historiography in terms of Freud and psychoanalysis has been introduced to a limited extent by Pierluigi Nicolin ('Tafuri and the Analogous City,' pp. 18-19), Evelina Calvi ('Oublier Tafuri?' pp. 23-24) and Mark Wigley ('Post-Operative Criticism,' p. 52), ed. de Solà-Morales, ibid. In the same issue of *ANY*, Antony Vidler also recalls encountering Tafuri on the train between Rome and Venice: "He was, behind the clouds of smoke, both charming and interesting as he noted his new position on Foucault and Freud."—Vidler 'Disenchanted Histories: The Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri,' p. 35.

[13]   Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79.

Gombrich considers the difficulties of directly translating psychoanalytic technique into art historical practice. In first citing this lecture, Tafuri notes "the limited field that Gombrich, quite rightly, sees as valid for such an alliance."[14] In a second instance, he repeats a quotation by Gombrich of Ernest Jones, but framed in a notion of "the double process of probing into a system of values and the critical leap towards new values, typical … of every human institution."[15]

This marginal reference to the general aims of psychoanalytic method is hardly, we readily admit, sufficient to place Freud among those referents informing Tafuri's ongoing theorisation of historical practice in architectural culture. (Conversely, if it were, then several dozen other figures of thought would also, perhaps rightly, draw our attention for their parenthetical appearance.) However, we enter a more productive discussion by asking how Tafuri might see, in psychoanalysis, a prototypical model for architectural history as an analytical practice. Two texts suggest that Tafuri's intellectual—as opposed to personal—engagement with psychoanalysis was more advanced than a surface reading of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* initially suggests. The first is Passerini's record of Tafuri's oral history, in which Tafuri explicitly positions psychoanalysis among the tools assisting his approach to the personal, professional and intellectual issues at stake as he wrote *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. We find a second, rather different, entry in 'Il "progetto" storico' (1977), where he raises Freud to co-prominent status among an equally numerous, but less diverse field of theoretical references. While this latter publication corresponds to the start of Tafuri's second course of psychoanalysis (1977-1983), it also coincides with an emerging collaboration with the philosopher Franco Rella, a colleague at *IUAV* whose lengthy introduction to the book *La critica freudiana* (1978) offers some useful clues for understanding Tafuri's intellectual apprehension of Freud's implications to the problems of historical practice.[16]

We can propose three potential modes for Tafuri's translation of a Freudian model of psychoanalysis to historiography: historical research conducted as a psychoanalytic 'session,' an interpretational model applied equally to individuals or society (implicating *l'histoire des mentalités* of the later *Annales*); history treated as analogous to psychoanalysis, as a process determining historical causality; and psychoanalytic practice appropriated, interpreted and transplanted into an historical method, independent of its intended operation within psychoanalysis itself. Over the course of his bibliography, Tafuri dabbles with each of these three perspectives. *Progetto e utopia* (1973), read with awareness of such a framework, seeks out the 'reasons' for a contemporary crisis of architectural theory; *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985) likewise makes the clearest claim of all his books upon the historiography of the *Annales*. However, the most enduring consequences of Tafuri's

---

[14] Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 220n27. Tafuri references Gombrich's 1953 lecture 'Psychoanalysis and the History of Art,' reprinted in *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and other Essays on the Theory of Art*, 4th ed. (1963; London: Phaidon, 1985), pp. 30-44.

[15] Tafuri, ibid., p. 222n66.

[16] Franco Rella, 'Introduzione,' *La critica freudiana*, ed. Rodolphe Gasche (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1977). We will return to this collaboration and to the broader implications of this later importance of Freud in Chapter Six.

engagement with Freudian psychoanalysis and with the writings of Freud are found in his independent development of an analytical method proper to architectural history that nonetheless draws direct correlations with the intellectual frameworks and intentions of Freud's psychoanalytical process. Such terms as crisis, analysis, burden and recovery assume meanings foreign both to Freud and to existing commentary on Freud when seen through this lens.

The exact nature of the 'personal' lessons that Tafuri draws from his years in psychoanalysis remain beyond our knowledge; his analyst's notes are necessarily confidential, and in any case we would unlikely find in them an explanation of Tafuri's thinking on historical practice. Nonetheless, Tafuri claims *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as "more important than any of [his] other books" precisely because "it binds [his] personal experience to the histories of individual and collective crisis together in a sort of complex knot."[17] He consulted one dottoressa Nascimbeni of the *Società italiana di psicanalisi* ("very serious Freudians") from 1966 to 1969; he does not give a different name for his second course of the 1960s and 1970s. In reflecting briefly on these courses with Passerini (whose affinity with the psychoanalytic method and its implications for historical subjectivity are well documented), he formulaically recounts (repeating from Chapter One) an antagonistic relationship with his parents: his father withdrew from the battles that engaged Tafuri; his Jewish mother broke with tradition in favour of agnosticism.[18] He describes his life as basically solitary, tracing to his childhood a condition later manifest in intellectual isolation in the University and in a play between his complete withdrawal or his inclusion in 'isolated' minorities.[19] He couches his 'choice' for architecture, too, by clearly indicating his youthful preoccupation with Freud and psychoanalysis. As an adolescent, he toyed with a career in psychoanalysis; the study of architecture curiously wed his interests in the mind and with art.[20] He would copy paintings from the Vatican collection (as we have noted); in painting, he claims, he could understand the intersection between an artist's intentions and his work. Despite a passing interest in architecture, he could not 'interpret' buildings as he could art. In studying architecture, though, he remained drawn to "the intersection of history,

---

[17]   Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' p. 37.

[18]   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 10, 13, 14-15, 18-20.

[19]   Tafuri, ibid., p. 41.

[20]   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 15. He cites the idea of having to study medicine as the main reason for not pursuing this vocation. Freud's books available in Italian in the mid-1950s included *Casi clinici*, trans. Mauro Lucentini (Turin: Einaudi, 1952); *Delirio e sogni nella Gradiva di W Jensen*, trans. Gustavo de Benedict (Naples: Vittorio Idelson, 1929); *Dottrina generale delle neurosi*, trans. M. Levi Bianchini (Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazionale, 1922); *Il disagio nella civiltà*, trans. Lorenzo Giuso (Rome: Scienza moderna, 1949); *Il sogno*, trans. Irene Bernardini and Enza Maccarone (Naples: Il Manicomio, 1919); *Il sogno e la sua interpretazione*, trans. G. L. Douglas Scotti (Milan: Dall'Oglio, 1951); *Inibizione, sintomo e angoscia*, trans. Emilio Servadio (Turin: 1925, 1951, 1954); *Introduzione allo studio della psicoanalisi*, trans. Edoardo Weiss (Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazionale, 1922, 1947, 1948); *Mia vita ed opera*, trans. Joachim Flescher (Rome: Scienza moderna, 1948); *Mose e il monoteismo*, trans. Arrigo Ballardini (Milan: Pepe Diaz, 1952); *Psicopatologia della vita quotidiana*, trans. Maria Novella Pierini (Roma: Astrolabio, 1948, 1951); *Sommario di psicoanalisi*, trans. Sante David (Florence: Edizione universitaria, 1951, 1953); *Sulla psicoanalisi*, trans. Edoardo Weiss (Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazionale, 1915); *Totem e tabu*, trans. Edoardo Weiss (Bari: Laterza, 1930, 1946, 1953).

philosophy and history of art." If, he said, "it was possible to read architecture as a human fact, or as a history of human labour and subjective religiosity," then its meaning might be accessible.[21] His adult life, he suggests to Passerini, reflects a sense of "deracination or uprootedness," both personally and intellectually, characterised by a choice to live always between places, moving always between Rome and Milan, Rome and Palermo, and finally Rome and Venice.[22] The tendency to regard his career as broken by a 'shift' or 'return' to the *Rinascimento* reinforces the kind of language that leads us to look for bio-historical causes and explanations.[23] However, while each of these observations reinforce a caricature of psychoanalytic 'results' and while they may be interesting as background to Tafuri's biography, they shed little light on his historical practice or his theorisation of history's place in architectural culture.

<div align="center">❧</div>

While 'Il "progetto" storico' is the first text in which Tafuri explicitly invokes Freud and psychoanalytic process as part of a range of theoretical referents for the practice of architectural history, his interview with Passerini thus indicates that his knowledge of Freud preceded his first session on Nascimbeni's *divano* by some years.[24] While we should not suggest that this connection, however long-term, indicates that Tafuri's historiography of the late 1960s was already underscored by Freudian 'insight,' we wish to consider the possibilities of an intellectual appreciation of Freud and a mode of historical analysis conducted in terms of *his* analytical method. Historian and psychoanalyst Peter Gay writes, in *Freud for Historians* (1985), of Freud's importance to his own historiography. Rationally, he comments, "the psychoanalytical history of ideas [forms] the counterpart of the social history of ideas, the one complementing and completing the other." Study of the mind thus forms, for Gay, a logical, though overlooked, extension to the historical imperative to "grasp ideas in all their contexts." The most mundane events of the past are steeped in, thus indexing, "their particular, immediate, as well as in their general cultural surroundings," but they are likewise subject to "instinctual needs, defensive manoeuvres, anxious anticipations."[25] An appreciation of Freud's theories of the mind

---

21   Tafuri, ibid., pp. 15-16.

22   Ibid., pp. 12-14, 62.

23   See, for example, Sabatino's review of *Theories and History of Architecture* in *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 19 (Fall-Winter 2003-2004), p. 105; Francesco Paolo Fiore, 'Autonomia della storia' / 'The Autonomy of History' (pp. 106, 108) and Howard Burns, 'Tafuri e il Rinascimento' / 'Tafuri and the Renaissance' (pp. 114-121), Gregotti, ed., ibid; George Teyssot and Paul Henninger, 'One Portrait of Tafuri' (pp. 11, 14-15) and Peter Eisenman, 'The Wicked Critic' (p. 70), de Solà-Morales, ed.; Keyvanian, 'Manfredo Tafuri: From the Critique of History to Microhistories,' *Design Issues* 16, no. 1 (Spring 2000), p. 13; Daniel Sherer, 'Tafuri's Renaissance: Architecture, Representation, Transgression,' *Assemblage*, no. 28 (1996), p. 13.

24   Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Casabella*, no. 429 (October 1977): 11-18. This essay developed a theme introduced even earlier but under different terms in 'Architettura e storiografia. Una proposta di metodo,' *Arte veneta* XXIX (1975): 276-282. 'Il "progetto" storico' later introduced *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980).

25   Peter Gay, *Freud for Historians* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. xiii-xiv.

and behaviour helps 'uncover' individual patterns or recurrent cultural responses within a body of evidence or accounts of an historical moment. However, Gay suggests that an intellectual knowledge of psychoanalysis falls short of the insights that an analysand brings to historical study through the 'devious' lessons of analysis. "My analysis and my courses," he writes, "did not generate whatever historical imagination I possess, they stimulated it. The profits of Freud came unexpectedly, undramatically, building on what was already there." For Gay, the greatest dividends lay in the "study of seemingly unfamiliar material" and in the capacity to render "opaque artefacts" usable.[26] The historiographical idea invoked by Gay is that of a global truth, for which psychoanalytic insights provide keener insight. The history of ideas, thus conceived, completes historical study rather than complicating it.

While some of these observations ring true for Tafuri, he, in contrast, never subscribes explicitly to such a relationship between history and psychoanalysis. His reception of Freud's ideas and his application of psychoanalytic method to historiography occurs at a highly selective level, ignoring, for instance, the medical correlation to psychological questions—hard-wired biological causality—that Gay regards as fundamental to a truly psychoanalytic approach. However, among the themes of Tafuri's work there remain several loosely shared with psychoanalysis. Foremost of these is that of 'crisis,' often invoked by Tafuri (and his readers, after him). *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, as we have see previously, reconstructs the trajectory of architecture's withdrawal from an integral position it once held amongst politics, the arts and religion. From the end of the *cinquecento* onwards, he locates the increasingly internalised concerns of architectural theory as one cause of this 'crisis' state, proposing historical tools to understand this development and exposing its inner workings. 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' too, develops the theme of modern architecture's dislocation from historical complexity at the level of 'architectural ideas,' identifying those moments where architecture assumes importance beyond itself to be in terms of capitalist development.[27] In other words, both texts confront the thesis that architecture had entered, in the mid-twentieth century, the final stages of a 'crisis' of discipline, of architecture's *raison d'être*, that commenced four hundred years earlier. (Note that we couch this trajectory in rather different terms in the following chapter; for now it is useful to play this perspective through.) Tafuri's response, as we have see so far, involves unearthing evidence of this 'crisis,' passing it from 'historian' to 'architect' in a 'present' territory that is (theoretically) critically detached from employment of that knowledge in architectural theory. Yet, even for Tafuri, these disciplinary distinctions are delicate. The severe terms in which he castigates Zevi in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* provides some insight into the intensity of the "ferocious autocritiques of everything [he himself] had done."[28]

---

26   Ibid., pp. xiv-xv.

27   While *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* establishes this trajectory from the *cinquecento*, in *Progetto e utopia* it commences from the eighteenth century and Marc-Antoine Laugier.

28   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 58.

As an operating principle, we begin to conceive of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as couched in a kind of disciplinary 'doubt.' Some of its devices, in turn, correspond directly to those of psychoanalysis. This book records an elaborate debate in which the author positions himself between architecture and history in an auto-analytical dialectic. As in the psychoanalytical setting, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* relies upon the bodily presence of a counterpoint 'listener' who remains disengaged from conversation. Tafuri records an open monologue on the origins of modern architecture's undoing with respect to its critical tools, while the analyst's role is neither curative in itself nor receptive, as audience. In lying beyond the patient's sight, Tafuri's readers become a catalyst for an open and self-reflective flow of language; their presence—within a Freudian analytical model—provides motivation (through guilt, for example, or a desire to please) to perpetuate the analysand's words. The burden of speech always rests with subject rather than analyst under this model. For Tafuri, the *fact* of his audience—he once noted, "the book was targeted at a public that was me, and a particular discipline"—renders him responsible for investigating to the greatest depth possible those issues emerging from his internalised 'conversation.'[29] As (again) in the psychoanalytical setting, Tafuri addresses, one by one, those issues that arise, irrespective of their immediate irrelevance. The format of the book lends an artificial structure to this exploration, yet the iterative approach that we quickly identify therein suggests that its resolution is provisional and not entirely proper to the analysis therein at stake. Despite this technical hurdle, he appears to pursue this analysis without letup, drawing in evidence that complicates both his picture of the present and its underpinnings in the past and the methodologies that allow this evidence to rise to the 'conscious' surface of his study as documentation.

Llorens's reading is less generous, accusing Tafuri of constructing in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* a fragmented and conflicting account of modern architecture. He characterises Tafuri's writing as a river that "preserves in its waters fragments and trophies from whatever regions it has traversed," whereby ideas and paragraphs ("not only in the content, but in the letter as well") from one moment re-appear completely 'out of context,' seemingly discordant with an evolutionary idea of Tafuri's intellectual development. Llorens suspects Tafuri of keeping his notes on a vast range of themes "in a range of assorted shoe boxes, ready to be used." He imagines Tafuri scooping an idea from the 'river' to employ some 'fragment' in a book or an article, only to return it for future use. As a result, he argues, Tafuri's readers "should take each paragraph not as a link in a chain, but rather as a shot in a series aiming at a distant and not always discernable target." One has "the distinct impression," he writes, "that the author has never thrown away one item of his pre-written material."[30] Thus the palimpsest: Tafuri's

---

29   Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' p. 41. The identification of Tafuri with the specific idea of an architectural history discipline that his work incubates introduces a theme both in his more difficult reflections on disciplinary method, etc., and in our later characterisation of a choice for history being bound into an existential 'choice-on-behalf'—Tafuri *choosing* for himself on behalf of this specific action of disciplinarity. In many important respects, they are one in the same, hence the immediately apparent artificiality that we sense in any construction of a 'Tafurian' historiography.

30   Llorens, ibid., pp. 93-94n14.

writing as a "document where the successive and often contradictory discourses of a crisis are superimposed rather than fused."[31] If Llorens's analysis stands unchallenged, the result is a book that is impossible to read in a conventional manner, containing an argument that few can follow, logically circular and linguistically complex. Nonetheless, some sense of value placed in the fragment by both Tafuri and Freud readily accounts for what Llorens identifies as methodological flaws in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Where, for him, fragments of language and historical 'evidence' are faults that prevent Tafuri's audience from gaining access to the work, for Tafuri himself—who is also his own audience, in one sense—appreciates the *critical* value of fragments, which "have an open meaning, and thus can be infused with multiple meanings."[32]

The epigraph of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*—two stanzas from Peter Weiss's play *Marat-Sade* (1965)—adds evidence to the suspicion described above further signalling, in different terms, the nature of Tafuri's 'conversational' model. This quotation extricates it from our specific reference to psychoanalytic theory, yet the open investigative method implicated therein is embedded in the format of a psychoanalytic session.[33] In the reconstructed diptych opening *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*—the two literary 'fragments' are decontextualised and out of order in terms of the play itself—Jean-Paul Marat declares it necessary to "pull ourselves out of the ditch," to "turn inside out / and see everything with new eyes." The Marquis de Sade is more circumspect: "When I think I have discovered something / I begin to doubt / and I reject it / Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions."[34] Tafuri balances these two conflicting roles: the ideologue, set for action, and the introspect, who settles easily neither on meanings nor values. By denying history its own tendency to homogenise the past into narratives, images or trajectories—the production of myths, Tafuri would say—his perpetuation of a self-reflective and open investigation proceeds always at two levels: of the material itself, and of the analytical terms to which he subjects it.

138

---

31   Ibid., p. 85. We find a striking example of such a superimposition, which we will discuss at length in Chapter Six, in the 'transition' between Tafuri's essays 'Architettura e storiografia' (1975) and 'Il "progetto" storico' (1977), in which an evolution of ideas and shifting field of referents is brought together often in stark contrast: between invocation of a basic 'critica dell'ideologia' and the argument that this simplicity no longer suffices; between identification of the 'pyrotechnical send-ups' of the 'operative critics' and his admission that his views on instrumental criticism have been inflamed for affect; between the dialectical constructions that position the field of architectural historiography between abstract and concrete labour and the translation of that dialectic into the terms of a deconstructive analysis à la Derrida, Cacciari, or as Jean-Louis Cohen suggests, Freud.—Jean-Louis Cohen, 'Ceci n'est pas une histoire,' ed. Gregotti, ibid., p. 49.

32   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 53.

33   Panayotis Tournikiotis reads Tafuri's 'open analysis' in different terms again, this time framed by the operation of Brechtian poetics.—Tournikiotis, *The Historiography of Modern Architecture* (Cambridge and London: MIT Press, 1999), pp. 214-219.

34   Peter Weiss, *The Persecution and Assassination of Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charenton under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade*, 5th ed. (1965; London: Calder and Boyars, 1970), 1, 15, 12 (pp. 35, 39). The text cited here is translated to English (in *Theories and History of Architecture*) from the rather more poetic Italian translation (cited by Tafuri in the frontispiece of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*) of the text *Die Verfolgung und Ermondung Jean Paul Marats Dargestellt Durch die Schaulspielgruppe des Hospizes zu Charenton unter Anleitung des Herrn de Sade* Frankfurt: Surhkamp Verlag, 1964. This 'coupling' is apparently Tafuri's own; it appears in neither the published drama nor, as we once suspected, Peter Brook's film (which introduced Tafuri to the play)— *Marat-Sade*, dir. Peter Brook (MGM, 1967).

If *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* appears analogous with the psychoanalytic scenario in terms of Tafuri's crisis of discipline, then 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' employs the same strategy in order to recover the 'origins' of a modern 'crisis' of architectural theory. This essay, as we have seen, follows a trajectory from eighteenth to twentieth centuries, over which (he argues) architecture enters into an untenable state as a result of the distance it maintains from the 'real,' rendering it irrelevant to the city, to capitalist development, to building *per se*.[35] Here, too, doubt impels Tafuri's analysis. Beneath this process is a clearly expressed desire to better understand the present moment; he searches for those terms in which architecture can become 'independent' in its own context.[36] His essay assesses a crisis within architecture that admits the dislocation of the architectural profession and its theoreticians from such 'fundamental' issues: planning, housing, regional development. (This theme has clear connections, we might observe, to his earlier 'professional' struggles in Rome.) He writes as much in the essay's opening words.[37] If the *raison-d'être* of bourgeois art is the 'understanding and internalising' of anxiety, then its analysis might facilitate the 'comprehension and exposure' of that anxiety's mechanisms. Too often cited as a fatalistic declaration of architecture's demise, this essay also operates as an account less intent on exercising 'judgement' than on pursuing the historical kernels of his present moment in architecture, this amidst—in his view at that time—an unabated 'crisis.' Tafuri does not obviously set out to celebrate a death of Architecture so much as to share his insights with architectural culture, including architects—who, he suggests, ought to know what to do with such knowledge—so that it may proceed unburdened by the historical conditions and abstractions by which they are otherwise unwittingly shaped.

Teorie e storia dell'architettura and 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' both subscribe specifically to ideas shared by psychoanalytic process, without themselves *being* psychoanalytic. While Tafuri effectively puts both his subject—the historical trajectory of modern architecture from the *cinquecento* to the present day—and his historical tools—his practice—into an analytical situation, he frames the tacit goal of this practice as the 'health' of both architecture and its historiography in the 'present.' This observation, though, lends unnecessary weight (and may be unnecessarily misleading) to a psychoanalytical historiography, to a 'task' of history as the recovery of the burdens of memory that prevent a full and 'normal' life in the present. As we have seen earlier, any re-construction of Tafuri's thinking on such simplistic grounds plasters over the situation's complexity, yet we might pause to appreciate the rather crude translations

---

35 Tafuri, 'Note to the Second (Italian) Edition,' *Theories and History of Architecture*, unpaginated.

36 Compare Freud's notion of 'enough' analysis in 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable,' trans. Joan Riviere from 'Die Endliche und Die Unendliche Analyse' (1937, rev. 1950), *Almanach der Psychoanalyse 1938* (Autumn 1937), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, eds. James Strachey and Anna Freud, vol. XXIII (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1964), pp. 209-253.

37 Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' p. 31. As cited in Chapter Three, he writes: "Allontanare l'angoscia comprendendone e introiettandone le cause: questo sembra essere uno dei principali imperativi etici dell'arte borghese."

from a psychoanalytical model to an historiographical model that this observation implies (even if, as we have often noted, tempered by other factors of equal or surpassing importance).

Under such provisos, we observe that *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* belies something of the methodological consequence of the psychoanalytical scene: the provocation of a continuous flow of language, the governing principal of 'doubt,' the search for a 'healthy' exit to ease the burdens felt by historical practice. That Tafuri excoriates nearly all of his disciplinary 'fathers' from his own methodological referents—and even those who remain do so provisionally, on warning—constitutes a direct move to unburden the discipline to better accomplish its tasks as articulated in the final chapter of the book. Likewise, *Progetto e utopia* constitutes a theoretical lesson drawn from psychoanalytical methodology, the most overt—and thus the most problematic, methodologically speaking—attempt at recovering the *causes* of a disciplinary 'crisis.' Though this pamphlet, as we have seen, operates on several other levels, as an historiographical move it identifies the burdens of modern architectural practice as lying directly with the entry of architecture into—or appropriation of architecture by—capitalist economic forces, in sympathy with the *Annales* (we would add, in this vein, in the post-Feudal era); by demonstrating its 'origins' in a series of moves undertaken from the start of the Enlightenment, he offers up such knowledge as might give architectural culture a controlling hand in its own 'destiny.' This is a simplification, of course, and sets aside our earlier plea to treat 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' as one of a series of reflections on the position of architectural historiography as a critical practice within the setting of architectural culture's operative practices. However, when we identify in this essay moves and frames 'proper' to Freud—at least insofar as we project his mediation by Tafuri into the field of architectural historiography—the theoretical debt to a mode of historiography therein as the recovery of burdens, intentions and causes is, in part, inescapable.

<center>❧</center>

We indicate, therefore, two dominant 'streams' within Tafuri's close consideration to the implications of a Freudian analytical methodology and of his own theory of memory and its burdens anchored to Freud's writing. They extend well beyond Tafuri's first experience of psychoanalysis, beyond his youthful reading of Freud, beyond his own personal and disciplinary crises (these not, we propose, necessarily distinct events). Over the course of the 1970s, though, and especially towards the end of that decade (during years in which he entered another course of analysis), Tafuri proceeded to refine the limits of application of psychoanalytic processes to his research, insofar as they appeared relevant. Later, he would reflect on his second course as something that led him to "the idea of history as psychoanalysis of society."[38] (This, we note, would be an evolution from those of his initial hypotheses pertaining to the 'origins' of a modern architectural

---

[38]   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 38.

crisis.) *Venezia e il rinascimento* documented the most significant of Tafuri's new research, building upon a productive collaboration with Antonio Foscari—co-author of *L' armonia e i conflitti* (1983)—to break open the fields of Venetian history and historiography of the Renaissance.[39] Putting a notion into play of historiography as psychoanalysis alongside one of the most useful concepts introduced by the *Annales*, *l'histoire des mentalités*, Tafuri set out to document the relationship between evidence and mentality, artefact and intentions. While we might regard *Progetto e utopia* as a crude application of Freudian themes to the question of architectural ideology, the mature handling of such issues as memory and mentality are, in *Venezia e il rinascimento*, an important advance on Gay's model invocation of psychoanalytic insights in historical study. While, for Gay, mentality 'joins the dots' (fills in) the picture, for Tafuri mentality complicates it. Extra-evidentiary insights thus keep the historical field open, and do not lead the historian to a more 'truthful' conclusion. *L'histoire des mentalités* as understood and applied (in a limited way) by Tafuri, is not, then, entirely the same phenomenon as we find in the French historiographical tradition after Bloch and Febvre. Neither, conversely, is the notion of memory conceived in robustly Freudian terms, entirely independent of the *Annales* scholars' referents.

Tafuri's treatment of Freud's themes from the late 1970s does not, then, comprise (if it ever did) the simplistic application of Freudian theory to historical problems conceived whole. It implicates a complex realm of thinking on the topic of memory and its recovery that treats history as both patient and context. Tafuri's application of the psychoanalytic model to history involves being within history itself, and thus exerting effort towards some form of 'health' in which the historian, too, is implicated. Yet just as Freud's methods set aside the burdens of knowing what form that 'health' should take, so too Tafuri sets aside the task of constructing the future. To accept a position *within* history is to accept that one can never conceive history *as a whole* and that it is therefore impossible to either reconstruct or judge it. Nonetheless, regarding a perpetually historical present as the setting for historical analysis raises the fraught issue of balancing burdens in the present (analytical or historiographical ideologies). These, in turn, shape the reconstitution of the past *in* the present. Together with the burdens of the past, they introduce discordances in the *manner* that historical artefacts can be available for historical analysis.

To the degree that these issues are intertwined, for Tafuri, from the mid-to late 1970s, we note his transition from an intuitive mode of receiving Freud's ideas and methods—albeit that this reception derives from an intuition that is both extremely

---

39   Tafuri's collaborated with Foscari on several publications on Sansovino.—'Un progetto irrealizzato di Jacopo Sansovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani sul Canal Grande,' *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* XXVI, nos. 1-4 (1981): 71-87, republished as 'Un progetto irrealizzato di Jacopo Sansovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani a S. Samuele,' *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, special issue 'Natura e cultura. Viaggi, paes-aggi, giardini e panorami fra '700 e '800,' no. 15 (1981): 69-82; 'Evangelismo e architettura. Jacopo Sansovino e la chiesa di S Maria a Venezia,' *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* 82, nos. 1-4 (1982): 34-54; *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983).

sharp and inventive in its deformations—to one bounded by a refined theoretical understanding of the implications of Freud's thought to the problems of historical practice. In particular, we can observe a change in the tenor of Tafuri's exploration of Freud's implications for analytical methodology—accepting that this formulation gives the misleading appearance of Freud's predominance as a referent at this moment—in 'Il "progetto" storico,' wherein his status shifts from being an intuitive, implicit reference to comprising one of the constellation of (largely new, or at least substantially revised) theoreticians who appear in this essay. When it first appeared in *Casabella*, Tafuri was in the first year of his second course of psychoanalysis. 'Il "progetto" storico' took his earlier essay 'Architettura a storiografia' as the starting point for a strikingly broad revision of the reasons and referents for contemporary historiographical practice. It was published in *Arte veneta* (1975), effectively refining and revising the main themes of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, which would be published in its fourth edition the following year; the introduction of political themes in his 1975 essay corresponds to the reflections Tafuri was already making in the book's second edition (1970).[40]

Given the timing of this series of publications, we should regard 'Il "progetto" storico' as truly independent of Tafuri's second course of analysis and therefore not prematurely influenced by his own 'treatment.' This 'reception,' then, comprises a phenomenon distinct from his earlier translations of Freud's ideas and methods into architectural historiography. Freud's entry into 'Il "progetto" storico' was heavily indebted to a collaboration between Tafuri and Rella. We will return to their specific interactions surrounding 'Il "progetto" storico' in Chapter Six, yet for now we wisely note the synchronies between Freud's presence in Tafuri's 1977 essay and Rella's reflections on Freud's importance to the field of contemporary critical thought in his introduction to the edited collection *La critica freudiana*, published in the same year.[41] Tafuri and Rella co-taught a seminar in the 1976-77 academic year, on which 'Il "progetto" storico' (on Tafuri's behalf) reflects, as does Rella's far briefer essay 'Il paradosso della ragione' (also 1977). Already, then, Tafuri regarded his text as part of a collaborative process. We do little harm to this image to bring Rella's elaboration of Freud and his themes to bear upon Tafuri's theoretical appreciation of these 'lessons' of psychoanalysis to analytical practices.

❧

---

40 'Architetture a storiografia' takes up the themes of both *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and *Progetto e utopia* in order to locate in contemporary architectural discourse the mechanisms for the construction of meaning. Restating criticisms found elsewhere—on the superficiality of periodisation, on the redundancy of a direct importation of linguistic theory—and situating the modes of ideological engagement possible in historical writing—un'ideologia 'progessiva,' un'ideologia 'regressive,' and "un'idealogia che insistente direttamente sulla riforma di instituzioni" (p. 278)—Tafuri locates his own practice as one of institutional critique, à la Foucault. In this case, the institution is not modern architecture, but history itself.

41 In treating Rella directly, we set aside the importance of Massimo Cacciari, whose work during the 1970s on *fin-de-siècle* Vienna is extremely important. However, insofar as Rella's exchanges with Tafuri bring to the surface all of those preparatory arguments (of which, it is clear from the abundant footnotes and acknowledgements by both Tafuri and Rella) we limit our discussion thus.

The *Casabella* publication of 'Il "progetto" storico' included, among its illustrations, images of Freud's divan, of Freud pictured with his daughter Anna (dated 1913), and of their house in Hampstead. In the English edition that appeared in *Oppositions*, the editors rearranged these illustrations, siting the photograph of Freud's couch as its frontispiece; it shows the couch set in his consulting room at Berggasse 19, his chair and footstool clearly visible.[42] We don't know how much say Tafuri had in this selection, but the image sends a clear signal that what follows—for its editors, at least—privileges Freud's place among its methodological references.[43] This signal aside, the text itself indicates that Freud's position is finely inscribed—albeit amongst a large and diverse company—in the methodological foundations that inform the practice of architectural history described therein.[44] Tafuri discusses two of Freud's own texts: 'Der Mann Moses und Die Monotheistische Religion' (1939) and 'Die Endliche und Die Unendliche Analyse' (1937).[45] He writes of the agreement between Freud and Nietzsche on history's ambiguous role with respect to truth, and its challenge to "cut away the barriers history itself erects, in order to proceed and surpass itself."[46] He considers the construction of historical meaning, in the case of Moses, as revealed through language and its vehicles. He invokes, therefore, not the Freud of 'Eros and Thanatos,' but the Freud who recognises "*the limits of language*," who understands that complete meaning "has been historically destroyed."[47]

Freud's 'Der Mann Moses und Die Monotheistische Religion' offers Tafuri a case for the construction of a mythology through language and unchallenged historicity. In the three essays comprising this study, Freud tests systematically, on historical, linguistic and cultural terms, the foundations of a monotheistic Jewish nation under Moses' leadership, differentiated by a 'rejection' of Egypt. The traditional account, he argues,

---

42   Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' p. 54. In the Italian version, the photograph of 'il divano di Freud' appears embedded in the body of the essay, accorded the same level importance as any other image, and neither placed nor dated—Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' [*Casabella*] pp. 14-15.

43   By way of reasons to suspect that the decision belonged to somebody besides Tafuri is that the images in *Casabella* and *La sfera e il labirinto* (which, in accordance with Einaudi's practice, groups images together in the back of the book on glossy paper stock) do not place the same visual emphasis on Freud. Tafuri arguably had more say in the appearance of these latter articles; also, it should be noted that 'The Historical "Project"' follows a standard *Oppositions* formatting formula in which a provocative image is placed as frontispiece. Some evidence to support a heavy editorial hand is that all images excepting the frontispiece are drawn from the article in Casabella; the frontispiece image is rather taken from Edmund Engelmann's *Bergasse 19* (New York: Basic Books, 1976).

44   This does not alter, in terms of our present argument, that Tafuri himself placed some weight on Freud's psychoanalytical models. For further evidence of Rella's contribution to Tafuri's argument, compare Rella, 'Il paradosso della ragione,' *aut aut*, no. 60 (1977) and Attilo Brilli, et al., *Ricercare interdisciplinare sulle practice significanti* (Verona: Bertani, 1977).

45   Freud, 'Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays,' trans. Joan Riviere (Amsterdam: Verlag Allert de Lange, 1939 [1934-1938]), *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. James Strachey and Anna Freud, vol. XXIII (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1964), pp. 1-207.

46   Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' p. 59.

47   Ibid., pp. 60-61.

has been subjected to revisions which have falsified it in the sense of their secret aims, have mutilated and amplified it and have even changed it into its reverse; on the other hand a solicitous piety has presided over it and has sought to preserve everything as it was, no matter whether it was consistent or contradicted itself.[48]

However, writes Freud, "the distortion of a text resembles a murder: the difficulty is not in perpetrating the deed, but in getting rid of its traces."[49] In addressing a long-uncontested system of myths posing as 'the past'—which Freud argues is the case with the Moses myth, and which Tafuri suggests is the tendency, over time, of all historical accounts—the analyst must unpick the threads of distortion to which evidence is inevitably subject. Freud writes:

> We might well lend the word '*Enstellung* [distortion]' the double meaning to which is has a claim but of which to-day it makes no use. It should mean not only 'to change the appearance of something' but also 'to put something in another place, to displace.' Accordingly, in many instances of textual distortion, we may nevertheless count upon finding what has been suppressed [*das Unterdrückte*] and disavowed [*das Verlergnete*], hidden away somewhere else, though changed and torn from its context. Only it will not always be easy to recognise it.[50]

The close examination of language and its limits—and by extension of knowledge and the representational systems that contain and convey it—is one model for Tafuri's application of psychoanalytic ideas to architectural history under the terms of 'Il "progetto" storico.' Importantly, this differs from the semiotic theory deferred to by many of his contemporaries of the 1960s and 1970s. In the latter case, Tafuri identifies an uncomplicated reception of one discipline's practices, played out for their own ends. He is rather more concerned with the possibilities of an open investigative tool through which signifying systems that cloud meaning and mask intentions may be undermined and set aside in order to test historical materials. Psychoanalysis, as the historiographical analysis that Tafuri constructs in terms parallel to Freud's, operates counter to answers and conclusions. It is necessarily inconclusive ('interminable,' to cite Freud) and not, in itself, adaptable to secure either a therapeutic solution or a definitive source of contemporary neuroses and crises. Tafuri, too, understands that "you can't cure society with historiographic analysis."[51] The balance between analysis and cure is important here, a theme that is not limited, for Tafuri, to a theoretical response to Freud. Rather, this observation connects us directly to the 'reasons for history' identified by Tafuri in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and to another interchange, pervading Tafuri's thought,

---

48 Freud, ibid., p. 43.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid. Cf. Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' p. 15.
51 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' pp. 47-48.

between operativity and criticality. In other words, Tafuri remains concerned with the limits of curativity in analytical practices. What, he implicitly asks, are the proper limits of the analyst in defining 'health'? He asks, in parallel: what are the historiographical ethics of defining the future by means of historical analysis? Or, insofar as all historical knowledge is a conveyance from the past to the present, how can the construction and mechanisms of the analytical process neutralise the utilisation of said knowledge in architectural practice, this in turn intimately concerned with the future?

❦

In 'Der Endliche und der Unendliche Analyse,' Freud addresses the fine balance required to determine the moment at which a patient has undergone 'enough' analysis to return to 'normal' life. He recognises the potential endlessness of analysis, reasoning that under each 'symptom' lies another, and another; 'true' causes are unrecoverable, thus the analyst must persist with unending layers of trace evidence. Yet analysis, as Freud conceives of it, cannot form an infinite pursuit of 'truth.' To be worthy of its model, the analysand must return to the regularity of everyday life rather than remain in the isolated reflective condition inherent to psychoanalytic treatment. This balance involves understanding the past and its forward reach into the present (as affect) as well as the capacity for 'cure' (as neutralisation), thus distinguishing between an "*incomplete* analysis" and "an *unfinished* one."[52] Freud sets his goal as the mental mastery over environment, broadly defined. The patient's memories and language, the analyst's enduring presence and direction: this setting works to unravel those memories that, through repression, make daily life difficult. Tafuri explains: "one is never 'cured'; rather, the analyst sets the patient free to be himself, to be able to think from one hallucination to another. But it's an hallucination that instead of inhibiting action, enables it."[53] The process seeks neither truth nor resolution: a 'concluded' analysis is inevitably an 'incomplete solution.'[54] Tafuri continues:

> However implicated historical criticism is by the objects and phenomena it analyses, it must know how to balance on the razor's edge between detachment and participation. This is where the 'fecund uncertainty' of analysis itself is located, its interminableness, its need to return always and anew to the material examined, and at the same time, to itself.[55]

Freud, too, positions analytical interminability as vital to mental health:

---

52   Freud, 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable,' p. 219.

53   Tafuri, ibid.

54   Cf. Freud's discussion of Ferenczi's argument on 'conclusion' for psychoanalysis.—Freud, ibid., pp. 247-250.

55   Tafuri, ibid., p. 48.

> Analytical experience has taught us that the better is always the enemy of the good [*le mieux est l'ennemi du bien*] and that in every phase of the patient's recovery we have to fight against his inertia, which is ready to be content with an incomplete solution.[56]

For Freud and memory, as for Tafuri and history, completion is a deceptive state, ultimately at odds with their respective practices. Artificial and fraught, it sets aside (as Tafuri would see it) all of those 'reminders' that fall beyond the strict confines of the resolved images of history.

<div align="center">❦</div>

Turning now to Rella, the discourse on *la critica freudiana* is likewise conscious of the critical space formed between the texts of Freud and their up-take by other disciplines. In concluding his lengthy introductory essay to Gasche's book of the same name, he suggests that a properly Freudian criticism would account for the abstract mechanisms exposed by Freud (referring to the mind), but observing their possibilities, as tools, elsewhere. In this vein, he writes of the relationship between 'image' and 'margin' as one which bridges the Freudian subject *and* Freud *as* subject, pointing towards the possibilities of an analytical method which is Freudian in one sense, but not beholden to either the rigours, intentions or original settings of Freud and his disciples.[57] Two sections of his essay have a particular bearing upon the themes we are presently treating. The first returns us to 'interminable analysis.' In writing on this topic, Rella offers an open reading of the possibilities of agreement for psychoanalysis between Id, Ego and Super-Ego, the unconscious operations of the Ego pervading all other fields of decidability.[58] Rella makes this point not to explain the basic mechanisms of the mind as theorised by Freud, but to draw a line from Freud's work to its implications in other forms of analysis: "These three formations already meet within a conflict that they themselves comprise, between nature and history, between internal and external instances, between instinct and culture they find their hostile meditations in the pulsion."[59] In reading analysis as a general critical action, the ultimate irreconcilability of these three components corresponds to a parallel problem for psychoanalysis and general analytical work: the Super-Ego, insofar as it contains and motivates aspiration (at a subconscious level) extending to the full extent of

---

56   Freud, ibid., p. 219.

57   He writes: "'L'immagine' di Freud che ne risulta è certo un'immagine 'marginale' rispetto a quella tradizione del Freud clinico, del Freud terapeuta (anche rivoluzionario), e anche del Freud rivelatore di nuovi orizzonti attraverso l'applicazione della psicanalisi all'arte. Sono convinto però che questi margini siano in realtà ciò che è stato 'emarginato' dall'ideologia dominante, a se costituiscano come lo spazio da cui bisogna partire analiticamente per ripercorrere criticamente ciò che è stato rimoso, per (ri)costruire il testo freudiano in tutta la sua complessità critica."—Rella, 'Introduzione,' p. 56.

58   Ibid., p. 43.

59   Ibid., p. 44. Original passage: "Queste tre formazione si scontrano già all'interno di un conflitto che le comprende, quello tra natura e storia, tra istanze interne e istanze esterne, tra istinto e cultura che trovano la loro meditazione conflittuale nella pulsione."—our trans.

'being,' operates according to its own 'ideology,' observes Rella. The Id, and the Ego, in their recoverability, remain tempered by the operations of the Super-Ego.[60]

We restate Rella's point not to introduce a new dimension of Freud's thinking into the reference field that we have already established for Tafuri. However, where for Tafuri the issue of analytical interminability connects directly to a balance between operativity and criticality, to the ethical space between detachment and engagement, for Rella it involves the conflict of Super-Egos. That is to say, Rella's terms correspond to Tafuri's insofar as they both argue, methodologically, that the operations of analysis—psychoanalytical, critico-historical, or otherwise—involve a mechanism working at a level that relates, for Freud, to the subconscious. In Tafuri's terms, as in Rella's, this directly corresponds to 'ideology.'[61] Rella argues (and we do not imagine that Tafuri would disagree) that the targets of analysis are not external to the rational dimensions of the analysand, but rather internal. Couched in critico-historical terms, Rella's point implicates the exchanges that occur between internal ideological formation and its exposure to external realities.[62] Brought into play with architectural historiography, the interaction between an architectural ideology and an external ideology—Humanism, for instance, or capitalism—is entirely elusive, can never be resolved. Hence, for Rella, the interminability of analysis relates directly to the evolving elisions that determine the shifting status of objects in the world, as well as the conditions of their formation and, by extension, the strategies available for their analysis. He writes: "Analytical work must be positioned also as a task of 'reclaiming' (and thus of analysing) those roots that the ideologies of the Super-Ego sink into the Id, the *real* propulsive force of ideology."[63] Translating from psychoanalysis to 'applied' analytical practices, he continues: "Its task must properly be the analysis of socio-ideological formations in history and in culture. That is to say that also the borders, *the limits*, must be analysed."[64]

Rella characterises this as Freud's great importance to all forms of analysis (including, he says, political analysis), extracting Freud from all his contexts and constructing, as a response, a 'Freudian theory' that surpasses, in fact, Freud himself. Rella describes this as an 'ideology of liberation'; it is clearly grounded in the 'freedom' of Freud's 'terminability,' but quickly extends into those fields that Tafuri, too, could readily translate into terms proper to the practice of architectural history.[65] Here, Rella and Tafuri agree implicitly on the next theoretical step: "The efforts to transform Freud, the theoretician of the *Ichspaltung*, of the construction of the inner subject, in a theoretician of 'free' subjectivity,

---

60   Ibid.

61   Ibid., pp. 44-45.

62   Ibid., p. 45.

63   Ibid., p. 46. Orig. wording: "Il lavoro analitico dovrà porsi come compito anche quello di 'bonificare' (e quindi di analizzare) quelle radici che le ideologie del Super-io affondano nell'Es, la *reale* forza pulsionale dell'ideologia."—our trans.

64   Ibid. Orig. wording: "Dovrà porsi il compito, propriamente, di analizzare le formazioni ideologiche sociali che sono nella storia e nella cultura. Vale a dire che anche il confino, che *anche il limite*, *deve essere analizzato*."—our trans.

65   Ibid.

I make an effort to remove Freud."[66] In displacing Freud from the equation, the analytical models from which Tafuri and Rella commence, which he constructs in specific response to a psycho-medical practice in the specific contexts of early twentieth century Vienna, the implications of his ideas are divested of a burden of historical specificity (while, admittedly, entering another).

The persistent theme of ideology, then, comes full circle for Rella and implicates *la critica freudiana* in the wider theme of these two chapters, indeed in one of the central themes of this dissertation. In the subsection of his introduction that follows on immediately from 'L'analisi interminabile,' entitled 'Analisi "come" la critica dell'ideologia,' Rella closes the space between memory and values, motivations and imperatives. Friedrich Engels, he identifies as describing a case in parallel to Freud's, the two figures meeting at a 'node' (Rella's introduction comprises a series of such nodes) in which ideology and conscience come to assume equal measure. Engels, to Franz Mehring (1893), writes of ideology as a product of conscience, but a false (bourgeois) consciousness.[67] In their 'historical efficacy,' such ideological 'falsehoods' (masks, to put it elsewise) correspond to the distortions of memory of which Freud writes. In those specific settings defined in ideological terms, the internal contradictions of those 'images' at stake are exchanged for a coherent and internalised construction, in which ideological mechanisms (like memory) function to homogenise otherwise (we could say 'truly') heterogeneous fields.[68] This, argues Rella, is the proper role and target of critical analysis, which enacts a *"trasformazione reale"* upon the analysand. The analytical act, insofar as it exerts force through the object of study—and not as an action made upon the object—is not, Rella writes, *"irriducibile a una stile*, a un fatto puramente linguistico."[69] He directly implicates, then, the role of the analyst. Freud, by now, is held at a remove; his ideas reframed independent of their 'proper' role in psychoanalysis.[70] This projective elaboration of Freud's project along theoretical lines is sustained here by the clear identification of both memory and ideology as ideological constructions, made either consciously or subconsciously, but which in either case are subject to a combination of internal and external forces. Freud's own practical exigencies, binding his observations and theories directly to medicine and to the practice of psychiatry, are readily overcome by deploying his ideas as *analogies*: to society, to knowledge, to memory, to all manner of intellectual constructions. The availability of Freud, argues Rella and demonstrates Tafuri, does not necessarily lie in the direct engagement of a Freudian psychoanalytical operation upon the object of study, as a psychoanalytical historiography, for instance. A Freudian critical analysis extends Freud's own terms of reference, therefore, while remaining proper to him as an original point of

---

[66] Ibid. Orig. phrase: "I tentativi di trasformare Freud, il teorico dell'*Ichspaltung*, delle contradizione dentro il soggetto, in un teorico della soggettività 'liberata,' sono di fatto tentativi rimuovere Freud."—our trans.

[67] Friedrich Engels, London, July 14, 1893, cited by Rella, ibid., p. 47, http://www.marxists.org/archive/mehring/1893/histmat/app.htm (accessed November 28, 2005).

[68] Rella, ibid., p. 47.

[69] Ibid., pp. 47-48.

[70] Ibid., p. 48.

departure.[71] The ease with which Rella argues the similitude of memory and ideology thus depends on one key point: the availability of critico-analytical models independent of and thus capable of holding accountable the 'burdens' imposed by 'memory' of the worlds of their production.

❦

At the same time as Tafuri, in a sense, leaves Freud aside, one of Freud's own examples provides an enduring clue as to an application of his ideas that bridges psychoanalysis and architectural history, both in the most general of senses. In the first chapter of *Civilisation and its Discontents*, he illustrates the complexity of recovering evidence of the past and reconciling it with memory by invoking *la città eterna.*[72] He describes a Rome in which each moment of the city's entire history can be seen simultaneously, constructing a virtual composition of the Palazzo Caffarelli and the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, but also that site's earlier Temple, replete with Etruscan forms and "ornamented with terra-cotta antefixes." He also conjures up an image of the Piazza della Rotonda, before which stood Agrippa's Pantheon, the Santa Maria sopra Minerva "and the ancient temple over which it was built" all in coexistence with Hadrian's monument, available as an historical accumulation 'available' to the present-day.[73] The mind, Freud reasons, does not systematically ('reasonably') consider one artefact at a time, but rather contends with the entire depth of its 'history' as a single construct. Tafuri arguing that this model of historical perception is not restricted to psychology, describes, in addition, the way that the past exerts force (as historical memory) upon the present. Indeed, Rome herself stands as the archetypal repository of complex and contradictory pasts, ever present. Freud's analytical method seeks to unlock memory and allow the simultaneous perception of multifarious and inherently contradictory pasts to invade, though not necessarily shape, the present as contemporaneous 'facts' that are at once not *of* the present. His case studies, one after the other, demonstrate that long-suppressed memories appear in fragmented, unexpected reconstructions; so too, Rome (at times) provides mere glimpses into its past, never fully visible in the present nor offering (even) an unmediated inheritance of any static moment from its past; a singular, definable, defensible image of Rome is lost to the past.

Following Freud and the theme of 'Der Endliche und der Unendliche Analyse,' those who conduct a form of analysis that encounters this rift between evidence and the irrecoverability of a true past, must likewise understand how their contemporaneous burdens influence the status and values (in an ideological sense) of memorial fragments. Freud describes how the *analyst* ought to, himself, undertake regular analyses to retain

149

---

71   Ibid., p. 50.

72   Tafuri references this text in Passerini rather than in 'Il "progetto" storico,' but his awareness of this book is important in the setting of this Chapter.

73   Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, translated by Joan Riviere and James Strachey (1930; London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1973), p. 7.

the open and subjective character of the analytical process, to avoid constructing personally or institutionally subjective defaults that would, without such constant vigil, transform naturally over time into ideological burdens, additional weights operating *against* the notion of 'solution.'[74] The relationship between analyst and analysand is not, therefore, simple; both figures regularly co-exist in one individual who attempts to uncover meanings and motivations through open conversation and to treat both subject and analytical process at once with 'fresh eyes.' Likewise the historian's imperative in 'Il "progetto" storico,' the force of disciplinary ideology as a burden *of* analysis rather than a burden *addressed* by analysis.

In other words, the notion of critical detachment built into such arguments as we find in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is demonstrably impossible. Given the place that Tafuri ascribes himself therein, he evidently cannot avoid engagement with such a 'close' subject, especially when the analytical course involves the perpetual testing of the analyst's own responses to the material, even if those responses remain neither verbalised nor 'instrumentalised' within the analytical conversation between historians and architects that is at the heart of this book. The clear identification of Tafuri's position in his works on modern architecture during the late 1960s consequently results in a *faux* detachment in his studies of the *Rinascimento* from that moment and his absence from an architectural history of the post-War era. His research into figures and works from the *quattrocento* to the *settecento*—from Alberti to Piranesi—during the 1960s and 1970s repeatedly extracts lessons and warnings for a contemporary architectural culture and contemporary historiography. Tafuri's interests in this period are thus far from inexplicable, or indeed at odds with his investigation of modern architecture. His 'historical' interests can be readily rationalised—though Tafuri does not do this himself—in terms of Freud's duty for the analyst to "secure the best possible psychological conditions for the functions of the ego." In providing a sound basis of historical interpretation for the normal operation of everyday life—or practice, in the architectural context—unhindered by ill-resolved or repressed moments from its past—or architectural history as mythology, for instance, otherwise couched by Tafuri as architectural ideology—"it has discharged its task."[75] For Tafuri, applying the theory of the psychoanalytic setting to research in architectural history, the troublesome present moment that modern architecture had in his estimation reached, manifest as a full-blown crisis of status in the fields of planning, regional development and architectural production. This required a more profound knowledge of the first moments of that crisis. Furthermore, it called for an understanding of the relationship—not necessarily causal, recalling the introduction to his essay on Šklovskij, but neither casual—of one moment to the other.

❧

---

74   Freud, 'Analysis Terminable and Interminable,' pp. 248-249.
75   Ibid., pp. 249-250.

While Tafuri never stopped writing about architects and architectural works of the early modern era, his perceived 'gravitation' towards moments, figures, urban interventions, and architecture of the 'high Renaissance' takes on a different impetus from the later 1970s, though not for the reasons often advanced in explaining his so-called 'retreat' from contemporaneity. He recalled that "although my spirit tended very much toward the contemporary in order to understand where we come from, where we are, where we are going, another part of me longed to understand the birth of the modern world."[76] He had already identified in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* that Brunelleschi's urbanism signalled an important shift in the status of the architectural object and its theorisation in terms of the religious, economic, urban, and political contexts in which it 'performed.'[77] Yet it appeared that there was no singular cause, but rather a complicated convergence of factors, behind his 'crisis' diagnosis. The extended analytical process as Tafuri positions it exposes even more conflicts and contradictions, word by word, document by document. From the late 1970s, Tafuri carried out an 'interminable' testing of the connection "between that period and our present situation."[78] The insights on contemporary architecture in *Venezia e il rinascimento* are a crucial moment in Tafuri's 'development' of the themes of memory, mentality, analysis and evidence. While the broader goal of understanding the origins of the modern world may have carried Tafuri's research programme to an extent, the operative dimension of the problem would quickly take over. If origins are recoverable, or at the very least, can be circumscribed historiographically, then one can enact them to address the present. Conversely, if the 'lesson' of history is the past's irrecoverable complexity, predicating a rejection of the historical 'image,' then the very structures of historical enquiry denounce the historian's supposed (nineteenth century) task to 'discover' origins or truths. Tafuri summarises that which remains to historical practice in his Gropius Lecture (1986):

> The contradictions and conflicts experienced in the Venice of the *cinquecento* remain highlights of a process that qualifies the 'modern' world as a system of contradictions and differences; a system of partial and falsifiable truths, the recalled events which, when interpreted discerningly, constitute historically recognisable beginnings.[79]

As an historical study, but equally an historiographical meditation, *Venezia e il rinascimento* keeps these lessons open, *in*conclusive. Tafuri identifies a series of situations through which the historically constructed meanings of both 'Venice' and 'Renaissance' are undermined by their convolutions and contradictions. In practice, Tafuri reveals through the Venetian State Archives both the complexities of—to repeat his subtitle—religion,

---

76   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 61.

77   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, pp. 24-26.

78   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 61.

79   Tafuri, *Humanism, Technical Knowledge and Rhetoric: The Debate in Renaissance Venice*, Walter Gropius Lecture, April 30, 1986 (Cambridge: Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 1986), unpaginated.

architecture and science, but also those of institutional power structures and technical knowledge. He invokes his historiographical 'fathers' ("Simmiand, Bloch, Febvre") "to remember that history is called upon to create its own plots out of men, their interactions, and their mentalities."[80] *L'histoire des mentalités* of the *nouvelle histoire* contributes to the overall task of finding a critical mechanism for interrogating evidence in an endlessly questioning operation. Justifying his own approach, quite distinct (we must be clear) from the *Annales*, Tafuri accepts that identifying the precise moments of decisions, complications, motivations, and conflicts through the study of such documents as letters, meeting records, diaries, and so forth invokes a subjective perception of values, collective wisdom, world-views contemporary to the writer, rendered accessible as a new form of historical material. None of these latter exist in architectural drawings or contracts in any readily accessible manner; rather they *index* mentalities and a world or production that exists as an additional dimension—but also complication—within a wide body of evidence. Cristoforo Sabbadino's conservative report to the *Magistratura alle acque* 1557 is widely regarded—we learn in *Venezia e il rinascimento*—as a direct response to Alvise Cornaro's technologically adventurous proposals to 'transgress' the limits enforced by the Venetian ruling class in the treatment of the lagoon. But to bind Sabbadino's objections to an economic or political cause would completely ignore the expression of his naturalistic world view anchored, for him, to ecological and environmental concerns around the development of the lagoon over several hundred years.[81]

Tafuri writes: "As a collective apparatus, mentality obliquely cuts across groups and individuals, involving unreflective behaviours, ignoring oppositions and struggles."[82] In confronting *l'histoire des mentalités* with the 'history of ideas and conflicts'—which Tafuri regards as its 'direct rival'—and in confronting world-views with individual subjectivities, Tafuri does not articulate an interpretative programme for individual motives and desires within the disciplinary programme of architectural history.[83] Rather, he writes that his objective is the elimination of historiographical prejudices, "toward liberating the history of architecture and the city from the suffocation and provincial ghetto to which some of its scholars have tended to confine it"[84] In understanding the limits of meaning in very precise terms—through language and thought and their relation to more specific fields of action, history may exist in a far richer field of ideas, unresolved, but open. Tafuri alludes to this in an interview with Nicola Soldini:

> It is true to say that mentalities have strong moments of viscosity. I am interested
> in mentality as 'super language.' Rather than a collective unconscious, it acts as
> a sort of superior language, informing all the specific languages, from everyday

---

80 Tafuri, *Venice and the Renaissance*, trans. Jessica Levine (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989), p. xi.

81 Ibid., pp. 214-217

82 Ibid., xi.

83 Ibid.

84 Ibid.

art, to sexuality, to religion … to the 'interior' that moves us. The mentality that interests me above all, for now, is that of our own codes, which we cannot know, which we express [*parlons*] rather than speak [*parlent*]. For we speak by our mentality, thus it speaks to us.[85]

Within this 'super langage,' the status of the fragment rises to the surface as an important figure of historical evidence. Tafuri writes that in leaving conflicts (read, research) open, the historian invites "a proliferation of hypotheses and endeavours." Their synthesis or documentation produces history, but according the same value to "anticipations" as to "resistances, delays, anachronisms."[86]

While we will return to these examples in the final chapter, Tafuri's methodological consciousness along lines privileging the capacity of the fragment to index the past and to disturb homogenous historical images pervades his historiography from the start of the 1980s, especially with reference to individual architects of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His research of this moment describes a process of unearthing and combining fragments, searching for evidence to complicate simplistic historical interpretations through a documentary trail of archives, public and private. With Foscari and later Manuela Morresi, Tafuri systematically addresses the work of Jacopo Sansovino.[87] Three major exhibition projects undertaken by Tafuri with scholars principally of the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* and *Bibliotheca Hertziana*, involving a host of related archives and research institutions, expose the *œuvres* of Raffaello (1984), Giulio Romano (1989) and Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1993).[88] Tafuri's research on individual *œuvres* and architectural 'projects' from *L'armonia e i conflitti* onwards—an extraordinary publication record—attempts to present swathes of archival evidence, aired and framed by open-ended themes identified by Tafuri and his collaborators. Despite building upon an enormous body of scholarship and expertise, the projects aim less to resolve historical problems than to describe, in depth, the field of material in which the problem sits, at once articulating and exercising the historiographical tools by which the material either acquires significance or complicates it.

This distinction is important, for it rejects the historiographical model of establishing 'histories' that start and finish in tidy terms: influence, chronology, or consequence. The fragment—and the unexplained fragment above all—acts principally against

---

85   Tafuri, 'Histoire d'histoires,' interview by Nicola Soldini, *Faces. Journal d'architecture*, no. 3 (1986), p. 29. Orig. citation: "A vrai dire, les mentalités ont de forts moments de viscosité. Ce qui m'intéresse, c'est la mentalité en tant que 'super langage.' Plutôt que d'un inconscient collectif, il s'agirait d'une sort de langue supérieure informant tous les langages particuliers, de l'art au comportement quotidien, à la sexualité, à la religion … à l'intérieur desquels nous nous mouvons. La mentalité m'intéresse sur-tout en tant que moment des codes qui sont les nôtres, et que nous ne connaissons pas, qui nous parlent plutôt que nous le parlons. Car nous sommes parles par la mentalité, elle nous parle."—our trans.

86   Tafuri, *Venice and the Renaissance*, p. x.

87   Cf. Manuela Morresi, *Jacopo Sansovino* (Milan : Electa, 2000).

88   Tafuri, Christoph Frommel, Stefano Ray, et al., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1984); Tafuri, et al., *Giulio Romano* (Milan: Electa, 1989); and Tafuri, Nicholas Adams, Howard Burns, Francesco Paolo Fiore, et al., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993).

historiographical clarity. A fragment sits as a challenge to the whole, possessing meaning that the whole, as the theoretical resolution of all fragments, can never achieve. In this sense, the evidentiary fragment has the capacity to pose a direct challenge to historical theories in which the whole is projected. Recalling the epistemological notion built into psychoanalysis that 'truth' is inevitably superficial, Tafuri reconstructs the historical process to privilege the fragment above all. His strategy presupposes an awareness of how material itself can configure the outcome of historical research; the evidentiary fragment thus becomes a type of knowledge in its own right, though one that disrupts for resisting rationalisation in language. This corresponds, abstractly, to the status of the fragment for Freud: all fragments, regardless of their origin and potential reconciliation within a theoretical configuration, are significant in their own right. 'Der Unendliche Analyse,' as the open ended investigation of an historical field, necessarily subjects these fragments to documentation in books, articles, lectures, and so on, but they fundamentally resist any form of resolution.

<p style="text-align:center">❖</p>

We can find Tafuri's most conscientious example of these strategies in *Ricerca del rinascimento*. In its preface, he identifies in contemporary culture the sense of an "original sin that demands exculpation."[89] In the *debole potere* ('weak force') of historical analysis, "the unsolved problems of the past" haunt a present moment.[90] Rather than deploying *Ricerca del rinascimento* as a vehicle for identifying that 'sin,' absolving it or providing the means for its 'exculpation,' Tafuri starts "a dialogue with the era of representation."[91] He continues: "We will confront the *uses* of *representation* as they develop at the threshold of the era conventionally known as the modern: uses that are multiple and problematic, that vary from artist to planner to patron."[92] He begins by rejecting an idea—to which he, too, appeared to invest in at certain moments—the Renaissance as a simple historiographical construction bound in up a trajectory from the Humanism of Alberti to the Mannerism of Michelangelo. Example by example, Tafuri unearths the interactions of architects, patrons, religious and military officers, theoreticians, politicians, etc., describing nothing beyond the complexity that undermines the capacity for 'clean' histories. *Ricerca del rinascimento* no more 'explains' the relationship of past to present than it resolves a list of 'issues' that persist over the span of four centuries separating *cinquecento* from *novecento*. However, it reminds readers in the present that complexity has always pervaded the history of architecture, and will continue to do so. "[It] does not

---

89   Tafuri, *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architetti* (Turin: Giulio Einaudi editore, 1992), p. xix. Citing from Tafuri, 'A Search for Paradigms: Project, Truth, Artifice,' trans. Daniel Sherer, *Assemblage*, no. 28 (1995), p. 47.

90   Ibid., p. 48.

91   Ibid.

92   Ibid.

signify a lingering on the sweetness of memory."[93] Neither the psychoanalytic model nor Tafuri's approach to the historiography of this task sustains an 'incomplete solution' in the form of a 'finished' analysis. On the contrary, this approach demands an open study that documents responses without feeling the imperative to reconcile evidence within a theoretical framework. *Ricerca del rinascimento* does not, therefore, 'conclude' in any conventional sense.

While analysis in Freud's strict terms allows the recovery of memory through access to the fragment in a processes of regression, and while this might occur both for the individual and society, Tafuri applies the principles of psychoanalysis in a highly conscious manner, leaving Freud aside to fully explore the implications of his analytical theory. Considering the principles of the Freudian psychoanalytical setting—which appear in *Ricerca del rinascimento* as one part of a complex and multifarious historiographical *milieu*—two principles stand out as integral to Tafuri's understanding of the historian's practice. The first of these is the privileged role of incomplete evidence, of the fragment available solely on its own terms; the second is the pursuit of these fragments through an open analysis, identifying and sketching out a field that sustains (only) provisional relationships between the materials of research. In addition, true to the principles of psychoanalytic theory, but against the precepts of psychoanalysis itself, Tafuri argues also against the 'curative' powers of history. To restate: Freud is no more the 'answer' to Tafuri than the *Rinascimento* is the 'answer' to modernity. While Tafuri may have understood the possibility of societal psychoanalysis using architectural evidence, his broad and conflicting field of methodological 'advisors' resists settling upon a singular historiographical approach; this constellation rather works together, for Tafuri, in order to keep the discipline free of artificial (ideological) burdens, and out of the castles in which he found the discipline bound (his *reasons*). In this relentless approach to the historian's practice lies the interminability of Tafuri's own disciplinary analysis, richly informed by both personal experience and intellectual work. Freud may appear in Tafuri's theoretical *milieu* in trace, like the 'murder' of Moses, but without certainty.

Tafuri's relationship with Freud consequently offers us a model for the complexity with which his interactions with any number of the figures who feature in 'Il "progetto" storico' for instance are imbued. The uneasy transitions between a keen but youthful interest in Freud and psychoanalysis, to an intellectual knowledge of Freud's writing, to experience of the analytical setting Freud invented, to the possibilities open to the psychoanalytically initiated in historical practice, to the 'lessons' of Freud beyond Freud himself: there is no easy evolution from one state to another in Tafuri's treatment of the theme of memory and its ideological burdens. Rather, in Freud we have a superb example of a figure who is at once important to Tafuri and expendable, whose 'traces' remain, but might have been rather more difficult to discover had Tafuri himself not shone a black light over the scene. But in pointing to Freud, as he does in his Passerini history, Tafuri exposes representational mechanisms in historiography that are too readily translated

---

93   Ibid., p. 49.

into images with their own ideological dimensions. As we will now see, the relationship between ideas, values, memories and images retains a central place in Tafuri's thinking on history and historical practice. The iterations that this theme undergoes belies its prominence across his *œuvre*, yet its persistence under various guises—ideology, memory (as we have seen), image and language—lends weight to its ongoing challenges to Tafuri's preoccupation with history's own 'interminability' and the institutional and practical structures that house it.

Part Three
History and
Historical Practice

Chapter V
The Era of
Historical Representation

In 1976, Manfredo Tafuri told Françoise Very that he felt no need to explain the 'crisis of the object' because Walter Benjamin had already done so. He elaborated to say that *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* was written for art historians who ought already to have "assimilated" Benjamin's ideas via confrontation with contemporary art. However, this same audience, he noted, required an introduction more basic than initially anticipated, requiring "a lot of hard work to explain what {Benjamin} had said."[1] Tafuri expected readers of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* to be sufficiently conversant with Benjamin's ideas to sustain a second degree analysis of such thinking as applied to architectural culture. Such conversancy depended upon the ready availability of Benjamin's argument to this audience. While Tafuri perhaps imagined his readers as scholarly art historians, likely able to access Benjamin's writing in its original language, he previsaged many Italian architects and architectural writers joining his audience, particularly since several had sustained Tafuri's direct criticism therein. Fewer members of this latter community, conceivably, might have read Benjamin beyond that available in Italian translation. Yet it is entirely possible either that Tafuri accounted for this, or that this, too, described the limits of his own reading at this time. Prior to 1968, Einaudi published two Italian editions of Benjamin's essays: *Angelus Novus* (1962) and *L'opera d'arte nell'epoca della sua riproducibilità tecnica* (1966).[2] Tafuri's citations of Benjamin in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* do not extend beyond these two sources, exploring primarily the title essay of *L'opera d'arte*.[3]

---

[1] Tafuri, 'The Culture Markets,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Françoise Very, trans. Kenneth Hylton, 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Vittorio Gregotti, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): p. 41. The interview originally appeared in *AMC. Architecture, mouvement, continuité*, no. 39 (June 1976): 64-68, upon the publication of *Théories et histoire de l'architecture*, trans. Jean-Patrick Fortin and François Laisney from *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 4th ed., 1968, Bari: Laterza, 1976 (Paris: SADG, 1976).

[2] Walter Benjamin, *Angelus Novus. Saggi e frammenti*, intro. and trans. Renato Solmi (Turin: Einaudi, 1962); *L'opera d'arte nell'epoca della sua riproducibilità tecnica*, trans. Enrico Fillipini from 'Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit,' *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* V, 1, 1936 (Turin: Einaudi, 1966). The Italian edition *Angelus Novus* precedes the German volume (*Ausgewählte Schriften 2*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966) of the same name by four years. Instead, it corresponds to the first volume of *Schriften*, *Illuminationen* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1955). Essays in *Angelus Novus* include 'Tesi di filosofia della storia,' 'Di alcuni motive in Baudelaire' and 'Parigi. La capitale del XIX secolo.' Among the German-language editions of Benjamin also available to Tafuri by this time were *Berliner Kindheit um Neunzehnhunhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1950); *Einbahnstrasse* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1961); *Berliner Kindheit um Neunzehnhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1962); *Städtebilder* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963); and *Der Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963).

[3] Tafuri also comments briefly on Renato Solmi's introduction to *Angelus Novus*. Cf. Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Giorgio Vecchia from 4th Ital. ed. (London: Granada, 1980), pp. 69, 99. 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' was published in English only in 1968, *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (1968, New York: Pimlico, 1970). While the English edition of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* traces Tafuri's references to Benjamin to the German edition, the original version simply cites from the Italian *Angelus Novus* and *L'opera d'arte*. Thus Tafuri's Italian

Two factors suggest Tafuri's legitimate expectation for his audience to be familiar (in passing, at least) with the writing of this important theoretician. Not only were two essay collections edited by a prominent intellectual press, but Massimo Cacciari and Cesare De Michelis's youthful journal *Angelus Novus* had been in print since 1964, drawing critical attention to 'Benjamin's project.'[4] However, the Benjamin of these two settings is not quite the Benjamin Tafuri's analysis addresses. He translates Benjamin's assessment of a 'crisis of object' linked to the 'death of the aura' of the 'work of art' in the industrial age into the theoretical basis for a broad revisionist analysis in which Benjamin remains more as an analogy than a referent among the disciplinary foundations of architectural history. This reading is distanced from a 'pure' application of Benjamin to the question of either architecture or architectural history. In the following pages, therefore, we consider in detail both how Tafuri introduces Benjamin's thought into his own work, continuing to invoke Benjamin from this point onwards. His response invokes further theoretical questions that explain, in part, his rapid assimilation and interpretation of Benjamin's writing during the mid-1960s. From this standpoint we can draw clear distinctions between Tafuri's thinking and Benjamin's as applied to the relationship of production and representation to critico-historical practices under the broad banner of architectural culture. This basic argument of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* rests, in some way, upon Benjamin's *Das Kunstwerk*. However, the important distinctions separating these two essays are evidence enough to deny the early pages of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as merely a simple 'reception' of Benjamin's ideas.

Although since 1962 Tafuri had access to Benjamin's writing in Italian, his consideration of *Das Kunstwerk* (1936; Italian edition, 1966) in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (written 1966-1967) marks Benjamin's first appearance in his footnotes. Tafuri dedicates the first two chapters of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* to the historical preconditions of what he (unlike many others) saw as a contemporary 'crisis of history.' He positions this 'crisis,' as we have seen in different terms in earlier chapters, within an evolution of history's relationship with the architectural 'object,' a development spanning the five hundred years until his own historical moment. 'History' remains the core subject of the book, articulating the tasks facing contemporary historians of architecture its *raison d'être*. When Benjamin appears, therefore, it is in this specific context. Curiously, when Tafuri invokes Benjamin occasionally in the following decades, the basic terms of his reference rarely stray far from that initial reading of *Das Kunstwerk*. (An important exception, to which we will return, is the framing of his 1978 seminar on Borromini around Benjamin's 1928 study *Der Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiel*.) Consequently, when Tafuri draws fleeting attention to Benjamin in *Architettura contemporanea*, 'The Main Lines of the Great Theoretical Debate over Architecture and Urban Planning, 1960-1977,' *La sfera e il labirinto* and *Storia dell'architettura italiana*, *1944-85*, for example, he continues

---

audience had all of his references to hand in their own language.

4   Tafuri characterised the review *Angelus Novus* as "a continuation of Benjamin's work."—Ibid., p. 54. Its circulation was very small and its editors very young at the outset. However, it became, in time, an important reference in the Italian reception of Benjamin's writing.

to write about 'the object' and its production, the status of the 'author' and consequently 'aura' within 'the historical problem.' While Benjamin offers much to Tafuri's historical understanding of architectural phenomena in the 'age of mechanical reproduction,' his more enduring significance seems rather as a theoretical point of departure from which to consider another, far lengthier era of historical representation.

Teorie e storia dell'architettura locates the contemporary state of architectural history in its own historicity, rationalising what Tafuri understood as a methodological and ideological 'crisis' of that discipline relative to a long tradition of the 'availability' of historical memory to architectural practice. The adoption in 1964 of the 'historico-critical method' at Rome formalised history's utility for architectural design. The entrance of historians into the studio, or of architects assuming responsibility for history curricula indicated a murky apprehension of history's proper 'tools' and 'tasks' relative to those of architecture.[5] Tafuri's contemporaries did not, widely, share his pessimism; however, this he viewed as more proof of the extent of the discipline's 'poverty.'[6] His polemic deliberately undermines architectural historiography's two dominant models: the first treating history as a variant *architectural practice* through the mechanisms of *la critica operativa*; the second regarding it as an *information service*, formalising historical memories for those planners concerned with the heritage of historical town centres or the historicist practitioners of the 'new objectivity.'[7]

❧

Before posing anew the responsibilities and techniques of architectural history, Tafuri explores at length the historical reasons for its current state. His first chapter, 'L'architettura moderna e l'eclissi della storia,' therefore interrogates the parallel development of the representation of historical knowledge and of architectural theory from the fifteenth to twentieth centuries. He thus repositions a substantial body of research, much of which exercised in essays and books already in print before the publication of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. He either reshapes or synthesises this research into a coherent historical case. Thus he brings his bibliography of writing on such diverse topics as Mannerism, the *œuvre* of Borromini, the Enlightenment, the avant-garde, socialist architecture of nineteenth century England, May's work in Frankfurt and the Soviet Union and contemporary trends in the United States, Japan and Italy to bear upon one contemporary, disciplinary issue. The difference distinguishing the first appearance and

---

5   Bruno Zevi, 'History as a Method of Teaching Architecture,' Marcus Whiffen, ed., *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture: Papers from the 1964 AIA-ACSA Teaching Seminar* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1970), p. 12.

6   Indeed, the papers contained in Whiffen, ed., *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture* indicate no pressing crisis to overcome during the 1964 AIA-ACSA conference. Tafuri cites liberally from this book at the outset of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, indicating its 'telling complicity' in the 'problem.'—Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, pp. 19-24.

7   Aldo Rossi, *L'architettura della città* (Padua: Marsilio, 1966); Giorgio Grassi, *La costruzione logica dell'architettura* (Padua: Marsilio, 1967). Vittorio Gregotti's *Il territorio dell'architettura* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1966) was published the same year.

later representation of these texts in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is reducible largely to a new concern with the architectural work and a growing sense of cultural crisis implicating architecture and the theorisation of the past implicit to architectural theory. He renders his earlier research new and instrumental by questioning his own work as an historian in a moment of disciplinary 'crisis' not unrelated to that broader cultural phenomenon.

If Tafuri tries his own work, though, he pointedly directs the resultant judgements primarily towards the historian-critic in Italy, first, and universally by extension. Tafuri's own historical practice consistently outlines the limits and responsibilities of the historian *writ large*. As a starting point, to reiterate the model laid out in Chapter Two, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* interrogates the relationship between two practices and two figures: between architectural production (however defined) and the criticism or critico-historical analysis of that work; and thus between the architect and the critic-historian. In conceiving of architecture as a production, and that the conditions of that production implicate the history of architecture, Tafuri regards the basic case of architectural history as a discipline in a language similar to Benjamin's. However, Tafuri appears to see *Das Kunstwerk* as a *vehicle* for his own argument rather than its total theoretical imperative. For instance, the new conditions of the 'object' and its 'production' result, for Benjamin, from industrialisation and the response of artistic practices to systems of perception. The modern world starts with the first machine and the birth of mass labour; 'mechanical reproduction' becomes not only a governing model for the manufacture of objects and culture, but also an analogy for a new (and for Benjamin, problematic) mode of life. Consequently, human society experiences the subjugation and then loss of the 'individual' (in all its abstract senses) to the 'factory'; the 'age of mechanical reproduction' is at once a spectacle of technology and the fulcrum bearing the anxious weight of modern life.

Tafuri rather partially sets aside Benjamin's Freudo-Marxist search for the origins of contemporary human oppression and the terms of its elimination. While seeing industrialisation offer a specific challenge to both architectural production and to the status of historical knowledge, the mechanisms at stake in an immediate architectural application of Benjamin's writing had existed since the fifteenth century. Where Benjamin views 'mechanical reproduction' as a precondition of the death of the 'aura,' Tafuri understands 'historical representation' as an equivalent, but vastly different factor within a broad 'crisis of history.' The industrial age indeed offered a challenge to architectural production. However, for Tafuri the 'problem' of the factory, the 'death' of art and the aura, the translation of craft into mechanised production all succumb to a general condition in which representation poses a 'problem' long preceding that identified by Benjamin. The relationship between the two theoreticians thus becomes more complex than, for instance, Benjamin simply supplying Tafuri with means to theorise the architectural avant-garde.[8]

---

8   Esra Akcan has considered this topic in some detail—'Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde,' *Journal of Architecture* 7, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 135-170. However, she overlooks Tafuri's consideration of Benjamin in analysing the artistic developments of the Soviet avant-garde.—Tafuri,

Recalling that the object of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* is the figure of the architectural historian, Tafuri draws a clear distinction between this figure and the 'crisis of history.'[9] The 'crisis' involves the status of historical memory in architectural theory and the utilisation of historical knowledge in architectural production through the medium of a theoretical (or ideological) framework. Such structures, he suggests, inevitably abstract historical knowledge into images, which in turn become available as historically conscious authorising devices in the service of architectural theory. He begins from the 'problem' of history as posed by Brunelleschi and 'codified' by Alberti as a specific relationship between historical representation and the discourse underpinning architectural production. The architectural modern age commences in mid-*quattrocento* Florence, marked by two specific developments: architecture's emergence as a practice subject to its own theoretical programme; and 'history,' in turn, as a representation of the past subject to an identical theoretical agenda. The 'crisis of history' that Tafuri identifies in his own moment begins from historical representation and the degree to which architectural production knowingly manipulates the techniques of that representation in mediating between an abstract (and ideological) knowledge of the past and its application to architecture. Yet Tafuri regards the complexity of the past as recoverable through historical practice, just as he sees the 'complex present' as sustainable through the practice of criticism. In advocating for historical complexity over historical abstraction, Tafuri addresses the complicity with architectural production of those historians whose trade is in architectural ideology rather than its complication through historical knowledge.

❧

Tafuri begins by arguing that Brunelleschi, introducing a classical architectural language into medieval Florence through "a superhistorical comparison with the great example of antiquity," and Alberti, formalising a 'structure' for that 're-born' language, fixed 'history' as a new medium between past and the present.[10] It formed "the first great attempt of modern history to *actualise* historical values as a transformation of mythical time into present time, of archaic meanings into revolutionary messages, of ancient 'words' into civil actions."[11] The fifteenth century, then, ushered in a new basis for intellectualising, composing and positioning architectural works relative to the city, signalling the ready availability of historical knowledge as material capable of being reconfigured for future ends: in other words, abstracted historical 'images' circumscribed by architectural

---

'Il socialismo realizzato e la crisi delle avanguardie,' *Socialismo, città, architettura: URSS, 1917-1937*, ed. Tafuri (Rome: Officina, 1971), pp. 63-64, 68.

9   Tafuri was later critical of the constant repetition of such phrases as 'crisis of architecture' and 'crisis of history.'—Cf. Tafuri, interviewed by Giacinto Di Pietrantonio, *Flash Art* 149 (March-April 1989), p. 67. Nevertheless, 'crisis,' 'subjugation,' etc. is part of a basic vocabulary in this book.

10   Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 14. The examples invoked by Tafuri are Brunelleschi's Florentine projects for the dome of Santa Maria del Fiore (1420-1461), the basilicas of San Lorenzo (1421-1440) and San Spirito (1432-1484) and the Rotonda degli Angeli (1434); of Alberti, *De pictura* (Florence: 1435) and *De re aedificatoria* (Florence: 1450).

11   Tafuri, ibid., pp. 14-15.

theory. This evolution heralded the new status of historical judgements as partially to be 'absorbed' and elsewhere 'overcome': "History, according to this conception, cannot be represented by a continuous line, but, rather, by a broken line defined by an arbitrary yardstick that decides, each time, its values and goals."[12]

If history, it follows, succumbs to a theory of architectural production, then the 'memory' of classical culture describes an artificial distance distinguishing the past from its memory and thus

> between those who make use of the evocative power of *quotations* and *allusions* to substantiate an independent discourse in order to *build* a new reality, and those who try to recover the exact meaning of those quotations in order to cover up the disappointments of reality, to re-evoke the substantial structures of an heroic past in order to contrast them, polemically, with contemporary hypocrisies, to defend an artistic revolution that is in danger of locking it up in the ivory tower of an historicism become an end in itself.[13]

The burgeoning historicism of Brunelleschi and Alberti forms a fundamental character of the reference trajectory established in the 'Renaissance.' Rejecting the 'unmediated' exchange with the past, historical abstractions trade that experience for ideologically informed 'messages.' It introduces the dichotomy of architecture and context, replacing the notion of building indistinguishable from its urban form (even if this was hierarchically determined); there was no 'Architecture' because there was no building that assumed autonomous significance in counterpoint to or conversation with the medieval urban fabric. With the dome of Santa Maria del Fiore, 'Architecture' introduces autonomous meaning because it abstracts knowledge of the past and formalises the values of that 'history' in the present. In forming an object that stands apart from that complex field, it stands in judgement of that field to *which it does not 'belong.'* Tafuri identifies, as we saw earlier in considering 'Architettura e ideologia,' the origins of the architectural work as concurrent with the birth of historical abstractions informing the theoretical agendas that underpin the production of those same works.

If the reinvented classical tradition of the 'Renaissance' relies, then, upon the artificial recovery of classical codes, articulated through the architectural treatise, then a theoretical production defines 'architecture' as distinct from its contextual conditions, urban or otherwise. In the *quattrocento*, 'architecture' as distinct from building begins with 'history,' and the formalisation of 'history' a prerequisite to 'theories' governing architectural production. Codifying historical knowledge as a representation of the past, Alberti's *De re aedificatoria* facilitated the divorce of the architectural object from its broader urban, political, religious, economic and military environments.[14] The

---

[12]   Ibid., p. 16.

[13]   Ibid., p. 15.

[14]   Leon Battista Alberti, *De re aedificatoria* (Florence: 1452), English trans. by Robert Tavernor, Joseph Rykwert and Neil Leach as *On the Art of Building* (Cambridge and Lonon: The MIT Press, 1988).

manipulation of these codes further secures the emancipation of the architect as artist and author of architectural works. Introducing a 'tradition' within which to build involves the ideological representation of the past as 'history'; within this mediation, architecture is for the first time imbued with 'aura' and 'authorship' and available to an architectural discourse.

Taking stock of their historical knowledge, architects of the sixteenth century 'rediscover' historical contexts beyond the classical 'tradition'; the architecture of 'Mannerism' thus comprises a 'disturbance.'[15] Tafuri identifies in this century a number of anxious attempts either to reconcile the "*anti-historical code*" of the classical tradition with the compromised fragmentation of the Middle Ages—the 'ghost' that "continues to reappear, making the nightmares of Mannerism even more tormented"—or to reveal their ultimate incongruity.[16] Two tendencies problematise equally the perceived distance between a complex present that accommodates the entire accumulated past of the city, and a field of theorised architectural production that attempts to circumscribe its own place within a classical 'inheritance.' Raffaello, for instance, belies a "taste for *license* connected to the discovery of the ancient *grotesques*, which develops into an intentionally *theatrical* architecture," theatrical insofar as his challenge to the classical tradition is 'staged.' In the works of Palladio, Giulio Romano and Perruzi, he instead finds "a more destructive tendency towards *contamination*, towards a polemical deformation of the Classicist lexicon, towards its sadistic perversion by grafting it onto Gothic or Gothic-like systems."[17] The mannerists break beyond the classical tradition; their "polemical *deformation*" of classical codes reaches beyond and 'corrupts' them with historical 'counter-lessons.'

The programmatic deformation of the classical tradition assumes added significance with the Counter-Reformation. Reflecting that "an art that does not want to create new meanings" will shy away "from any temptation to compromise itself with historical verification,"[18] Tafuri is not surprised to find architects in the seventeenth century (and in Rome especially) continuing to question rather than 'exalt' the 'truth' of classicism. Borromini, for instance, "gives first place to the problem of history."[19] In contrast to Bernini, he searches for a theoretical programme within architecture itself, which: "must fold on itself in order to show its structure as a renewed instrument of communication,

---

[15]   Tafuri later claimed that he "would not [now] know what the word *mannerism* means," yet his 1966 book on this topic makes free use the term, as does *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. He recalls of the former book: "So, I did a horrible thing that weighed on my conscience for … well, perhaps it still weighs on me. I put together a horrible publication …. I put together and published this horrible book on mannerism with the small Roman press Officina …. It was totally immature; I only did it for the sake of the job."—Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 33; Tafuri, *L'architettura del Manierismo nel '500 europeo* (Rome: Officina, 1966). Cf. Tafuri's definition of mannerism in the *Dizionario enciclopedico di architettura e urbanistica*: "Con tale termine, molto discusso dalla critica del nostro secolo, si suole indicare il periodo artistico che segue l'età d'oro del Rinascimento: dalla data del sacco di Roma (1527) alla fine del secolo XVI …. Le loro architetture infrangono in più modi il codice linguistico vigente, basandosi su spazi poliprospettivi e frantumati, in cui si è voluto vedere espressa una poetica dell'ambiguità."—vol. III (Rome: Istituto editoriale romano, 1969), p. 474.

[16]   Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, p. 17.

[17]   Ibid., pp. 17-18.

[18]   Ibid., p. 18.

[19]   Ibid., p. 19. We will return to this claim in a later chapter.

has to stratify itself in a complex system of images and geometric-symbolic matrixes."[20] Borromini's attempts to "unify such a tangle of problems" result in a *bricolage* "of modulations, of memories, of objects derived from Classical Antiquity, from Late Antiquity, from the Paleo-Christian, from Gothic, from Albertian and utopist-romantic Humanism, from the most varied models of sixteenth-century architecture."[21] Yet while Borromini tends towards pastiche and theatre, he also engages the past through "a genuine *experience of history*" in which broken fragments of memory invoking the entire span of the past filter into the present, not as a single, linear inheritance, but with all the "complexity and variety" needed for a clear challenge to the Classical language.

> In order to carry on using them (as Borromini meant to do, in spite of all his destructive *fury*) it is not enough, as in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, to ignore the issue through an act of faith: now one needs to check, by plunging into history, by getting involved and soiled by it.[22]

By reconstituting history as a "*collage* of *memories*," Borromini explicitly problematises the mediated relationship of the past and its historical representation. To this, Tafuri identifies three distinct responses in Borromini's 'children': (1) ignoring his lesson in favour of a classical tradition untested against historical evidence, this practice comprises of classicist composition and the 'internal' extension of that tradition ("the critical eclecticism of Carlo Fontana and Fischer von Erlach"); (2) building upon his "historical synthesis of the opposites" through the development of "antithetical linguistic matrixes" and "*bricolage*" ("European Borrominism" manifest in the work of Guarino Guarini, Vittone and Johann Santini); and (3) experimenting with linguistic codes such as he unveiled, but without "the least polemical trace" (Christopher Wren, John Soane, Nicholas Hawksmoor, Thomas Archer and John Vanburgh).[23] Of the three, the second tendency demonstrates a preoccupation (if not central) in Baroque Europe with the historicity of architectural production. While Borromini's meditations ultimately acquired form in building, the increasing importance of a visual architectural culture, coupled with the archaeological 'recovery of history' from the early eighteenth century facilitated the increasing significance of architectural communication beyond building.

---

[20] Ibid. This easy opposition of Borromini and Bernini on the basis of Borromini operating according to a theoretical agenda while Bernini appears to follow Papal orders—and therefore working without a theoretical programme conceived in purely architectural terms—has more recently undergone serious revision. Consider the work of our colleague Maarten Delbeke on this topic.—'Antonio Gherardi e la questione dello stile,' *Antonio Gherardi artista aretino (1638-1702). Un genio bizzarro nella Roma del Seicento*, ed. Lydia Saraca Colonnelli (Rome: Artemide, 2003), pp. 79-83; *La fenice degl'ingegni: Een alternatief perspectief op Gianlorenzo Bernini en zijn werk in de geschriften van Sforza Pallavicino* (Ghent: Ghent University Engineering and Architectural Press, 2002). Also, Sabine Burbaum, *Die Rivalität zwischen Francesco Borromini und Gianlorenzo Bernini* (Oberhausen: Athena, 1999). Nonetheless, like several abstractions repeated here, we will leave this to be argued on another occasion, given that the importance of it here is in the development of Tafuri's 'case' for the historicity of his present moment.

[21] Tafuri, ibid.

[22] Ibid., p. 20.

[23] Ibid., pp. 22-24.

In this sense, Borromini's legacy rests properly upon Piranesi insofar as they both seek to challenge the language of a classical 'history' with a contrapuntal vocabulary of the past; they introduce these other pasts not simply as spectres, but with the full signifying power of the classical tradition. Of course, fragments signify nothing when presented in isolation from their 'wholes'; any attempt to extrapolate their meanings upholds the pretence of their capacity to operate within a coherent signifying system. Piranesi's *Parere su l'architettura* thus contains an "agonising dialectic," translated architectonically as the altar at S. Maria del Priorato:

> narrative, didactic and caustically late-Baroque—facing the public; abstract, anti-descriptive, and of haunting Illuminist symbolism—at the back, where a naked sphere is embraced by a geometrical solid figure, in a sort of allegory of the already achieved *eclipse of the sacred*.[24]

The allegory prefigures (though without programme) the dawning 'age of Enlightenment' and its mantra of a "cult of reason," itself compromised by an ideology of intellectual emancipation and other 'freedoms.' The classical tradition confronts the classical tradition with knowledge garnered from the archaeological recovery of Classical, Pagan Rome.[25] The translation of all knowledge to a scientific model forms the basis for the claim of reasoned, 'unmediated' knowledge. Within this claim, the trajectory of Tafuri's eclipse—of the past by historical representation *vis-à-vis* architectural theory—arrives at a new point. From the programmatic recovery of the classical in the *quattrocento*, to the 'deep suspicion' of the sixteenth century and the dialectical problematisation of history in Rome in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century, it returns to a claim of direct scientific knowledge, if entrenched in a rhetoric of reason.

Tafuri agrees with and extends Hegel's *Aesthetik* by arguing that the 'age of reason' and its capacity to normalise the 'work of art' connects his 'death of art' to a crisis of the 'object.'[26] For Hegel, the rise of the natural sciences and a discourse on intellectual freedom supplant "art as a super-individual institution and as immediate communion with the universe." The new capacity in Enlightenment architectural theory to make 'reasoned judgements' of a now encyclopedic historical knowledge does less to break through the artificial membrane enclosing architectural culture than to shore up the defence of that culture as a legitimate arbiter of historical value. Brunelleschi's historical 'isolation' of the *cupola* of S. Maria del Fiore—a 'triumph' of the classical over the medieval—is universally extrapolated in the positivistic model by which archaeological knowledge of Italy, Greece, the Levant, North Africa and so on is unearthed, 'published'

---

24 Ibid., pp. 26-28. Tafuri refers to Giovan Battista Piranesi, *Parere su l'architettura* (Rome: 1765); Piranesi, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Marriette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times*, trans. Caroline Beamish and David Britt (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002).

25 Tafuri, ibid., p. 26.

26 Ibid., p. 29. Tafuri refers to Hegel, *Aesthetik* (Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1965); Engl. ed. *Aesthetics*, trans. M. Knox (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

and appropriated by architectural discourse from the seventeenth century onwards. The 'battle' between idealised medieval and classical codes extending from the mid-eighteenth century to the start of the twentieth in such countries as France, England and the 'New Worlds' of North America and the Antipodes remains fundamentally utopian, eyes fixed on the future. In looking backwards *while* looking forwards, one denies both the past and the present as they might *actually* be.

<div align="center">❦</div>

Tafuri thus isolates the origins of the 'crisis of history' of his own moment in the degree to which historical representation and 'the past' as a real condition digress; this divergence, in turn, becomes problematic for being determined not by historical knowledge or research, but by an agenda set by the imperatives of architectural production. In other words, Tafuri's 'crisis of history' is quite different to a 'crisis of the object' exacerbated by the industrial-age 'murder' of the artistic 'aura.' Rather, it is precisely in conceiving of the architectural work as autonomous or formally explicable solely in the terms of architectural theory that history is 'eclipsed' by its sublimation to a disciplinary outlook that is inherently operative.

When, therefore, Tafuri cites at length from Benjamin's *Das Kunstwerk* to apply his 'painter' and 'operator,' 'magician' and 'surgeon' figures to contemporary architecture, he conducts an argument at two distinct levels. Firstly, he offers a concise and intelligent application of Benjamin's analogy to the architecture of the modern movement, wherein 'painterly' and 'operative' individuals appear in clear relief. On one hand are painterly figures, "faced by this new nature of artificial 'things,'" default to mimetic practices (Italian futurism and German expressionism, for example). They appear to "get close to the new world of industrial production but then withdraw from it immediately because of the use they make of it." On the other hand are the 'operators' who "identify the *new laws of the equipment*, and solve, by entering into it, its irrationalities and contradictions." They (Le Corbusier, Gropius, Mies van der Rohe, etc.) do not accept 'the new nature' as an external condition demanding their response, but as something already internalised.

His second tier of analysis applies Benjamin's analogy to the broader problem of historical memory relative to the production of architecture. The 'new laws of the equipment' undermine the abstractions that permitted the nineteenth century's historicism, insofar as industrialised reproduction draws architecture out of its auto-circumscribed territory and into confrontation with such fields as engineering (production) and cinematography (representation). The capacity to practice architecture through an engagement with such technologies is at once an ability to 'enter' modernity as equipment, and a facility to step beyond architectural theory and a classical model of the architectural object. Extending this application to consider 'the past' as analogous to the 'equipment' of Benjamin's illustration, Tafuri advances a similar choice available to architects: a mimetic practice responding to historical abstractions, or an operative

practice, 'entering' the past through direct confrontation with archives, monuments and (later) mentalities. These two manifestations of Benjamin's magician (or operator) achieve the same result: both breach the classical model of the object and the boundaries of architectural theory, pointing 'beyond' architecture to demonstrate architecture's self-imposed technical limits.

However, the translation from the identification of this historical, technical and ideological equipment into an architectural 'movement' with its own mythology demonstrates that an idealised historiography even within the 'equipment of architecture' undermines 'unmediated' production, rather providing sanctions on the basis of reconstructed tradition (Giedion) or historicity (Pevsner).[27] The 'operator' avant-garde thus takes the only possible stance, revealing its absolute historicity by denying history. Consequently, the relationship between architectural history and architectural production in the inter-bellum period is marked by the institutional rejection of history by the Bauhaus, laying down an oft-repeated educational model.[28] The later 'recovery' of history in the post-War years, rather than recovering the past, formalised a cult of the architectural object sustained by an internalised architectural theory.

In identifying these correlations of Benjamin's cases with contemporary developments in architecture, Tafuri's purpose clearly remains the recovery of architectural history as a critical discipline. In pointing to these fallacies in the current utilisation of historical memory for architectural practice, he argues that whatever form the discipline assumes, it ought to uphold a clear distinction between architectural programme and historical analysis. He thus rejects such tendencies as the justification of design through deployment of historical judgements; the historiographical insulation of architectural thinking from other intellectual, technological, economic, political and artistic contexts; the capacity for homogenisation in historical analyses; and the collusive reinforcement of the architectural object and its authors. Therein lies Tafuri's 'eclipse of history': the absolute mediation of knowledge of the past through architectural ideology compounding the 'crisis of the object,' the industrial-age 'loss of aura.'

The most 'operative' practices of the avant-garde—relative to the equipment of history—therefore lie in the intersection of Dada and De Stijl: "They fully coincide in their negation of any validity of the *object* and in their prophecy of the coming of collective reaction that will make up the new city."[29] In their deep suspicion of history as "a danger to the present," as something to be "suppressed," the avant-garde follows an almost predictable path. Rather than proposing a new set of values, it rather repeats

---

27 Siegfried Giedion, *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941); Nikolaus Pevsner, 'Modern Architecture and the Historian, or the Return of Historicism,' *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* LXVIII, no. 6 (April 1936): 230-240.

28 Though Marco De Michelis has more recently called the total revolution painted by the Bauhaus in a more complex light, revealing the presence of a history curriculum in its early stages.—Marco De Michelis, 'The Last Dream and the Total Work of Art: Art and Architecture in Weimar Germany,' *Architecture and Arts 1900-2004: A Century of Creative Products in Building, Design, Cinema, Painting, Photography, Sculpture*, ed. Germano Celant (Milan: Skira, 2004), pp. 53-58.

29 Tafuri, ibid., p. 36.

a very old response to the burden of the past (mediated or unmediated), though couched in a new language. Among architects, Frank Lloyd Wright demonstrates free use of 'the equipment,' interrupting the continuity of European history by absorbing into it "fragments of *anti-European* historical memories."[30] However, while Dada and De Stijl occupy the city *sans objet*, Wright, Le Corbusier and others demonstrably recognise the "historicity of their antihistoricism"—at the opposite end of this continuum—by considering the 'problem' of historical town centres.[31]

Tafuri's account commences with Brunelleschi opposing an idealised patrimony against a 'real' medieval town fabric; it concludes with the problematic assignation of historical centres as heritage, ambiguously inert elements in the contemporary city. Le Corbusier's reactionary *Plan voisin* forces this phenomenon, striping away all 'non-historic' context from around the monuments of central Paris and creating an historical park, sheltered from but available to the city. If Dada and De Stijl join in celebrating the 'death of history,' then the historical centres remain beyond their conception of the city. Le Corbusier and Wright both subject these objects to a 'new order' of urban relevance, accommodating their inertia as a condition of the 'equipment.'[32] They acknowledge the need for history and accept mediation as an inherent condition of a monumentalised heritage.

Nonetheless, a solution to this problem in either historical or architectural terms escaped both the modernist 'masters' and those who would turn their back on the *Chartes d'athens* to seek renewed continuities via a 'tradition of the new.'[33] For Vittorio Gregotti, "history … presents itself as a curious instrument whose knowledge seems indispensable, but that, once acquired, can't be used."[34] By rejecting the modern movement and defending the historical centres, he invokes the mythicisation and romanticisation that informed the nineteenth century's reception of classical and medieval codes.[35] Yet this defence of history is bound into the same search for history's use-value that characterises the reinvigoration of the 'historical method of teaching' in Italian architectural education. The problem, as Tafuri suspects that Gregotti understands it, lies in the reconciliation of architectural objects with planning and professional processes. For Louis Kahn, Tafuri suggests, and others concerned with the autonomy of architectural design, the problem lies with the availability of history in the production of a "*new objectivity*".

Tafuri remains clear that the history of the status of 'the past' relative to architectural theory has very real implications both for the discipline of architectural history—knowing, for instance, the limits and techniques proper to its own involvement with architectural production—and for the relationship of that discipline to actual production of architecture. Urban historical centres as architectural problems implicating historiographical choices

---

30 Ibid., p. 41.
31 Ibid., p. 42.
32 Ibid., p. 46.
33 Ibid., pp. 50-51.
34 Gregotti in Tafuri, ibid., p.55.
35 Tafuri, ibid., p. 58.

form just one example of the disciplinary negotiation inherent to architectural debates of the 1950s and 1960s. His 'crisis' of historical practice is thus akin to, though not embedded in Benjamin's 'crisis of object' and 'loss of aura.' If the industrial age corrodes the autonomy of the architectural work and undermines its signifying capacity within a purely architectural discourse, then two relationships need to be dramatically rethought: that of architects to their works; and that of history to architectural production. The problem of historical practice identified by Tafuri, at least of its disciplinary form in 1960s Italy, involves a widespread resistance to cultivating a critical historical consciousness. The discipline instead chose the easier path of substantiating historical myths readily endorsed by architectural culture itself, conceived and defended within an architectural ideology. The "dialectical role in respect of the architect" that Tafuri goes on to speak of is impotent unless the ambiguous status of the architectural work is resolved as a target of the historian's attention.[36] What, then, is 'architecture' in relation to its criticism or history? And to whom does the historian take 'constant opposition' in an era wherein neither author nor 'object' remain?

<center>❧</center>

The second chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 'L'architettura come "oggetto trascurabile" e la crisi dell'attenzione critica' scrutinises the 'object' as a subject of critico-historical analysis. Fundamental to this new 'problem' is the possibility of a balance between knowing the 'object' as a work produced within the bounds of architectural theory and as purely subjective, isolating that same theory in favour of contextual reading. The former rejects "even the relative possibility of objectivity"; the latter, the "specific qualities" of architectural design.[37] Tafuri alludes to the incongruity between the terms of an object's authorship and those of its reception; what ought to be a conflict is reduced to indifference because the incongruity is unintentional, not programmatic.

In such terms, the eighteenth century marks a change to the very concept of 'architecture,' from privileging a 'superhistorical architectural code' to lauding the knowledge and culture of man, reason, science and freedom. Enlightenment architectural theory "realises the impossibility of finding its own reasons exclusively in itself."[38] The new rapport, at this moment, between landscape and object neatly encapsulates the critical problem Tafuri identifies. Architectural fragments embedded in acculturated 'natural' settings—as with the picturesque landscape—elude understanding outside of their settings, despite their autonomous design as objects; thus, their ambiguity. If the 'age of enlightenment' accords value only relative to rational, secular culture, recognising neither inherent value nor tradition, then "the *things*, the *objects* must completely lose

---

36   Ibid., p. 64.

37   Ibid., p. 79.

38   Ibid., p. 82.

their symbolic charge in order to be perceived in their pure relational values."[39] When architecture appears incorporated into the field of everyday life, by extension, or into fields that are not its own, this "excludes the possibility of speaking of … architecture as *objects*: they are, rather, *happenings*, and in this sense the historicity of art is linked to the *crisis of the object*."[40]

Tafuri thus regards one consequence of the 'death of aura' and 'crisis of the object' as the transplantation of semantic values from the object into systems of representation. The entire context in which 'architecture' exists becomes "the field of a symbolic system."[41] Applied to the trajectory of the architectural object from the eighteenth to twentieth centuries, this field shifts from that of a rationalist, enlightened project into one of capitalist development, from Monticello to Manhattan. Analysis can no longer proceed solely in architectural terms. Tafuri argues—here implicitly, but later explicitly—that architectural traditions no longer govern the production and reception of architectural works, then the historical lessons delivered through the dialectical confrontation of historian and architect must expose the sources of that ambiguity in the conditions of architectural production.

Tafuri brings Benjamin to bear upon the new status afforded the architectural object in the 'enlightened' world. Citing at length, he recalls Benjamin's suggestion that the experience of architecture in the industrial era is primarily habitual, 'absent-minded,' indicating two modes by which architecture retains some status on its own terms in the 'age of technical reproduction': tectonically, through tactile experience, and optically, through visual perceptions. While Benjamin regards any tactile experience of architecture as reflexive, the 'indifference' of the architectural object lies in regarding architecture as media at the level of reception. Architects might persist in producing 'fields,' even in such complex cases as Le Corbusier's housing models or the *Siedlung*, yet the 'object' remains a touch-stone for the figure of the architect and the epitome of his or her capacity for production.[42] The tension between the mass subjugation of those objects to a perceptual field and the theorisation of those objects within architectural discourse prevents use of the term architecture with any consistency across any historical range. Such architects as Tange, Rossi, Kahn and Stirling programmatically resist the 'absent-minded perception' of architecture as being akin to the cinematographic representation of an architectural field. Yet the artificial reintroduction of the 'aura' to the architectural 'object' occurs in architectural theory, and not, as prior to the eighteenth century, in deference to sacrality or a superhistorical classical language, with all its cultural allusions and external relevance.

> Involved and rejected at the same time, [the observer] takes part in a drama performed by architecture: but he is simultaneously launched outside architecture,

172

---

39   Ibid., p. 84.
40   Ibid., p. 85.
41   Ibid.
42   Benjamin (*Das Kunstwerk*) cited in Tafuri, ibid., p. 87.

into a dimension that doesn't even touch the limbo of utopia. And as the critic, in the tradition of contemporary art, is nothing but a privileged observer, his position enjoys an even more accentuated ambiguity: from the position of committed collaborator he is pushed into the front row to witness, as a silent accomplice, the show offered by an architecture continuously splitting itself in an exhausting mirror game.[43]

The recovery of the 'object' purely in theoretical terms describes an 'indifference' towards modernity and its own traditions of historical representation, and a retreat into a game of perpetual self-referentiality:

The first two chapters of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* thus describe a basic context in which the historian operates; the subsequent discussion turns more specifically to the historian's tools and tasks. Yet Tafuri clearly links this contextual precondition for contemporary historical analysis to the challenges posed by the 'death of aura' Benjamin identifies. The historian's practice is thus entrenched in the representational impasse intrinsic to the 'crisis of history,' and therein we find Benjamin's most enduring relevance for Tafuri. In Tafuri's reading, Benjamin's *Das Kunstwerk* constitutes a sustained analogy, informing the basic model of his argument as one pertaining to the relation of historical representation to architectural production, and by extension, architectural theory (which is inherently ideological). In Benjamin, Tafuri also finds an extremely useful figure against whom to reflect on the tools and tasks of history in his own practice.

❧

Tafuri's consideration of modern architectural culture—in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and elsewhere—remains loyal to a Benjaminian problematisation of the 'object' and its 'production.' His tendency to 'internalise' referents—Tronti, Sartre, Heidegger, Lukács, Bloch, Nietzsche, Freud—means that his 1968 discourse on the 'crisis of history' prefaces all his subsequent analyses of contemporary architecture. So, too, does his Benjaminian model for considering the status of criticism and historical knowledge relative to architectural production. Benjamin does not disappear from Tafuri's writing, but is incited often through oblique references indicating his regard for Benjamin's theorisation of the 'problems' to hand as one of the basic continuities—balanced out and complicated by a plethora of other theoreticians—underpinning his own thinking. The widespread dissemination of Benjamin's work into the 1970s was doubtless closely followed by Tafuri, as were such secondary readings as those of Theodor Adorno and Hannah Arendt. Direct references to Benjamin permeate a range of Tafuri's writings from the late 1960s to the middle 1970s, these informing his analysis of variations of the dialectical role of historian to architect he

---

43   Ibid., p. 97.

sketches in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and tending to privilege Benjamin's theorisation of 'the object' in *Das Kunstwerk*.[44] Several examples bear this out.

In their 1976 *Architettura contemporanea*, Tafuri and Francesco Dal Co both index Benjamin.[45] In chapter 'Il Werkbund. L'architettura di fronte alla metropolis,' Tafuri identifies that the designed object loses its 'aura' in 'the factory'—specifically, in the workshops and machine halls of the *Allgemeine Elektricitäts Gesellschaft*. He remains loyal to Benjamin in arguing that a metropolitan 'productive life' results in "collective memory" being replaced by "the event, irrational in every aspect and devoid of history."[46] The very object of design reveals the irrecoverable 'continuities' of the pre-modern art work and the complete absorption of the "undifferentiated mass" whose "sole experience is that of shock."[47] By repeating this insight, locating the metropolis and the factory as an axis around which forms the 'shock of the modern'—workers as producers, returning daily to the *Siedlung*—he predicates an historiographical problem in the historical criticism of modern culture.[48] Following Benjamin's analyses, any attempt to recover historical knowledge related to *either* perception *or* production inevitably implicates ideological judgement.

> Faced with the 'disease' represented by the metropolis, the intellectuals have attempted to define a new role for themselves by appealing to an original purity, to the infancy of humanity, the mythical season in which man and nature were not enemies, to, in short, the mythical moment in which the communion of man with cosmos was permitted by the pre-capitalist relationships of production… Every project of conciliation was constrained to reveal itself as merely utopian.[49]

An instrumental approach to history confirmed the contextual poverty of architectural ideology as a self-referential debate endorsing the value of the object; yet it relied entirely on history 'produced' as a completely artificial construct.

In the later chapter 'Il contributo delle avanguardie storiche. Dal cubismo alla fondazione del Bauhaus,' he once more argues for the historicity of avant-garde anti-historicism. "[The] merit of the historical avant-garde is to have made us aware of those processes along with the ultimate consequences of those transformations for the practice

---

44   When, for instance, Giacinto Di Pietrantonio asks Tafuri to comment on authorship and political critique, he responds by referencing Benjamin's 'The Author as Producer'—where he "refers not necessarily to economics, but rather to a structure inside of which artistic systems play a role"—though adhering to a line of argument introduced in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and elaborated most famously in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.'—*Flash Art*, p. 68; 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79.

45   Tafuri and Dal Co, *Architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Electa, 1976), trans. Robert Erich as *Modern Architecture*, 2 vols. (New York: Rizzoli, 1979). The authors clearly divide the authorship of individual chapters, the conclusion jointly written. The following references indicate authors according to the scheme they themselves supply.

46   Tafuri, *Modern Architecture*, vol. 1., p. 87.

47   Ibid.

48   Ibid.

49   Ibid.

of art," he writes; yet it would be "quite wrong to read the course of the European artistic avant-garde as a straight line leading from the overcoming of Expressionist anguish to the art of technical reproducibility."[50] While Tafuri is rightly critical of Benjamin's *Das Kunstwerk* as historiography, he leans upon it heavily as a theory of modern (architectural) production. In its terms, Tafuri accounts for the 'indefinite' growth of the German city along the lines posited by May, Wagner and their contemporaries *vis-à-vis* the *Siedlung*, neither an expression of the systematic metropolitan life nor a recovery of *comunitas*. It represents, he writes in evident deference to Benjamin, "the victory of the type over the perception of the *unicum*."[51]

In their concluding chapter, 'Le esperienze degli anni '70,' Tafuri and Dal Co note two developments that cast contemporary architectural culture as a Benjaminian 'Angel of History' that *declines* to survey the wreckage of the past as it is drawn inexorably into the future.[52] The first involves Benjamin's thesis of the inherency of the 'aura' to traditional artisanship; its disappearance indexes Heidegger's pining for the past. Modern architecture is described by the *difference* between the autonomous work and its context. If, though, modernity itself eschews the very possibility of differentiating between works and the conditions of their production (following Benjamin), then architecture "is condemned to suffer its own myth of a single and unitary origin along with all the simultaneous but different demands made on it."[53] New relationships forged with technology, environment, planning, programme and the profession itself potentially present different entrance points into 'the equipment' of practice. Yet they dubiously regard the simultaneous act of entering the equipment *and* maintaining the distance necessary to delineate architecture in an autonomously significant sense. The second tendency rejects any traditional notion of architecture altogether in favour of a context comprising the conditions of architectural production, yet excluding the 'technique' of architecture. Such disciplinary nihilism is fertile ground for the complete isolation of architectural language and tradition enacted by Aldo Rossi, John Heyduk, Peter Eisenman and their contemporaries. However, they lack the informed indecision of Bonatz or Tessenow: caught between the preservation of the object and the conditions of its production.

<div align="center">❧</div>

Tafuri pursues this line of enquiry in slightly different terms in his recent history of architectural theory in *Architecture + Urbanism* (1979). He considers the construction of architectural signification on the part of critical and historical cultures within processes

---

50   Ibid., p. 124.

51   Ibid., p. 158.

52   Cf. Benjamin, 'Theses on the Philosophy of History,' *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zorn from *Neue Rund-schau* 61, no. 3 (1950) (1968, New York: Pimlico, 1999), p. 249.

53   Tafuri, ibid., vol. 2, p. 364. Cf Massimo Cacciari's sustained response to Tafuri and Dal Co's invocation of such thinking of Heidegger's, 'Eupalinos or Architecture,' *Oppositions*, no. 21 (Summer 1980): 106-116.

of architectural production. Benjamin, he writes, theorised the "demise of all referents" when speaking of the 'death of the aura'; the capacity to regard the architectural object as belonging to any field potentially considered homogeneous follows their end.[54] Historiographical devices including Pevsner's 'modern movement,' the Italian historians' 'continuities' (Zevi, Benevolo, Argan, Giovannoni), the *opera aperta* (Eco), the 'availability' of models (Kahn, Rossi, Venturi), or indeed any practice predicated on "coherence among linguistic elements" or on a super-structural value are all undermined by *Das Kunstwerk*.[55] Just as Tafuri's historian is responsible for revealing the past and present complexities that persist *despite* the historical abstractions invoked by architectural theory, Benjamin's 'operator' challenges any practice seeking the recovery of continuity, homogeneity and insulated authorial intent. Tafuri consequently accuses postmodern ('hypermodern') architecture of denying the seriousness of its own retreat into an internalised discourse. Its practitioners set aside architecture's critical tools (Benjamin's 'equipment') to secure an architectural language spoken by no-one but its theoreticians, determining both interpretation and formal (though not 'actual') architectural production. In the uncritical adaptation of 'historical' forms, they direct empty mimetic gestures at the 'equipment' of the past and its historical representation; they reconcile these new formal strategies as postmodern architectural criticism.

In *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*, Tafuri continues to apply Benjamin's analogy of the operator and equipment to his understanding of the architectural object and its relationship with historical representation in the architectural production of the 1970s and 1980s.[56] It reappears in the chapters written in 1985, addressing the period of the 1970s to the 1980 *Biennale di architettura*. Even if considered in less detail, it is evident that Tafuri continues to perceive the relevance of applying the 'magician' and the 'operator' figures to contemporary architectural production and to architectural engagements with the 'equipment' of the past. Relative to Benjamin's conceptualisation of 'works,' 'production' and 'authorship,' Tafuri identifies in the new economic, political and educational conditions of the 1980s a system subjecting the conditions of architectural production to itself as an authorial figure.[57] In 'La gaia errancia,' Tafuri lists Benjamin among those 'critiche del moderno' whose 'easy' absorption into architectural theoretical discourse provided the means to perpetuate a mimetic approach towards history without confronting the conditions of contemporary architecture. Such 'errancies'

---

54   Tafuri, 'Main Lines of the Great Theoretical Debate Over Architecture and Urban Planning 1960-1977,' *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 365 (January 2001), p. 144. The article first appeared in *A+U*, no. 100 (January 1979): 133-154.

55   Ibid., p. 150.

56   Tafuri, *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-85* (Turin: Einaudi, 1986).

57   Tafuri points specifically to Gregotti's argument for the profession as a system to be engaged as part of an architectural discourse. It is barely surprising, therefore, to find that Tafuri's analysis of Gregotti's project for Calabria University also deals with his polemics in terms of the 'object-production' language of Benjamin's *Ds Kunstwerk*.—Tafuri, 'Le avventure dell'oggetto: architetture e progetto di Vittorio Gregotti' / 'The Adventures of the Object: The Architecture and Designs of Vittorio Gregotti,' *Il progetto per l'Università delle Calabrie / alter architettura / The Project for Calabria University and Other Architectural Works*, by Vittorio Gregotti (Milan: Electa, 1981).

as *Roma interrotta* (1978) or the 1980 Biennale form a logical consequence of the poor assimilation of historical and philosophical knowledge, combined with the withdrawal from the equipment of architectural 'production' then faced by the Italian profession.

❧

These few references are not the total extent of Tafuri's quotation of Benjamin, yet they indicate the small debt Tafuri's owes to Benjamin for one persistent line of his thinking on the relationship between historiography and architectural production.[58] While *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* successfully argues for an historiographical strategy that approaches the past as Benjamin's 'operator' engages his 'equipment,' in 'Architettura e storiografia,' he emphasises two 'immediate consequences' to the practice of history *after* Benjamin, who provides the means to strip away the innocence of historiographical mimesis. Historians must attend to the 'classic historiography,' he insists, reassessing periodisation and 'authority' to account for the analysis of works according to a complexity embedded in the production of the works themselves. (And this complexity is not by any means restricted to the architecture of the industrial age.) He also calls for the separation of 'artistic language' from production itself with a view towards *"putting on trial, in every instant, the historical legitimacy of the capitalist division of labour."*[59] In other words, conscious of the artificiality of architectural ideology (read theory), the historian must understand it as one of many conditions of architectural production, not the litmus on which to test analysis.

The methodological consequences for Benjamin's thought that Tafuri sees in 1975 correspond to arguments elsewhere advanced by Tafuri in quite different terms. This suggests that while Tafuri may *claim* the 'influence' of Benjamin, that the latter theoretician offers the former little more than the timely confirmation of pre-existing critical assessments related to the 'tools' and 'tasks' of the architectural historian. While Benjamin's discourse on the 'object' remains that most often cited by Tafuri, the possibility that Tafuri read and reconfigured Benjamin's theoretical analogy demands another level at which Tafuri understood the implications of Benjamin to problems of history and architectural production. Central to this second layer of significance is Tafuri's unrelenting strategy of undermining the construction of historical 'myths' though the agency of an inherently ideological (in disciplinary terms) architectural

---

58 The 'object' debate continues with Tafuri's consideration of Eisenman, for instance.—Tafuri, 'Peter Eisenman: The Meditations of Icarus,' trans. Stephen Sartarelli, *Houses of Cards*, by Peter Eisenman, (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 185-186 and Tafuri, 'L'archaeologia del presente,' *Il disegno dell'architettura: Incontri di lavoro, Parma, il ottobre 23-24, 1980*, ed. Gloria Bianchino, (Parma: Università di Parma, Centro studi e archivio della comunicazione, 1983), pp. 23-29. Other texts in which Tafuri discusses, albeit in brief, the thinking of Benjamin include Tafuri, 'Adolf Loos, teórico,' *Punto de vista*, no. 49 (August 1994), http://www.bazaramericano.com/arquitectura/tafuri/tafuri_loos.asp (accessed August 22, 2002) (originally presented as course materials in Tafuri's 1977-1978 seminar on Vienna at the *Istituto universitario di architettura di Venezia*); Tafuri interviewed by Sue Dance, *Transition* 2, nos. 3-4 (September-December 1981), p. 12.

59 Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia: Una proposta di metodo,' *Arte veneta* XXIX (1975), p. 277. Original phrase: *"capace di mettere in ogni istante in causa la legittimità storica della divisione capitalistica del lavoro."*—our trans.

theory. When, therefore, Benjamin writes of the 'death of the aura' with respect to the 'object,' Tafuri responds—though not directly—that the aura only ever existed as an ideological invention within the mechanisms of historical representation bound up by the mythicising abstractions of architectural theory. That history endorsed this 'mirror game' through its complicity in myth-making is irrelevant, for Tafuri, in light of the almost moral obligation on the part of historians to systematically distance themselves from the ideology of architectural production; hence the 'dialectical' model of architect's relationship to historian's proposed in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*.

We might measure the degree to which Tafuri agrees with Benjamin's proclamation of the 'death of the aura' and by the Benjaminian language with which he addresses historical and historiographical research and writing up to this point. It appears that Tafuri does not draw from Benjamin a completely new model for considering the development of architectural culture to the contemporary moment. Indeed, Tafuri's 'crisis of the architectural object' begins much earlier than Benjamin's essay admits, constructing a more intricate scenario for the historical preconditions of Benjamin's theorisation of the art work after the factory. It is likely—though impossible to prove—that Tafuri did not know *Das Kunstwerk* before its Italian publication (1966), and that his broad revisionist study on the discipline of architecture may have followed a rather different trajectory had Benjamin's essay not appeared when it did. The basic questions posed by *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* persistently reference far more autobiographically revealing sources than Benjamin, persistently returning to the relationship of critico-historical practices to a wider architectural culture in post-War Italy, and to his contemporaries, with whom he had already begun to exercise the 'dialectical relationship' described previously. The immediacy of the problem for Tafuri prevents him finding in Benjamin a solution capable of overcoming his own immediate disciplinary context.[60]

❧

We would be remiss not to indicate three more of Benjamin's writings that have a bearing both on Tafuri's historical practice *and* on his theorisation of the historical case of Borromini. Carla Keyvanian, in an early and intelligent analysis of Tafuri's historiographical sources, identifies the harmony of Tafuri's theorisation of the historian's practice in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* with that of Benjamin's in 'Theses on the Philosophy of History' (completed 1940, published 1950).[61] Also, she astutely observes

---

60 It is useful to note, with respect of Tafuri's inability to sense in Benjamin a 'solution,' his criticism in 'Per una critical dell'ideologia architettonica' of a way 'beyond' the apparent impasse of the avant-garde. Tafuri points out that Benjamin describes at once to the 'urban condition' of the *flaneur* and an emergent consumer culture bound in the arcades, as well as indicating a form of art—between Dada and De Stijl, Tafuri suggests—that engages the question of city, without acknowledging that in the 'radical' plan lies the capacity to either overcome these conditions, or to internalise them.—Tafuri, 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' pp. 55-56.

61 Benjamin, 'Theses on the Philosophy of History'; Carla Keyvanian, 'Manfredo Tafuri's Notion of History and Its Methodological Sources: From Walter Benjamin to Roland Barthes,' unpublished MSc thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992.

that Benjamin's *Passagenwerk* offers a model for the democratic ordering of evidentiary and memorial fragments that Tafuri argues for, both in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and in his later reflections on architectural historiography.[62] Insofar as Tafuri translates neither of these texts into the terms of an historical or historiographical discourse, we will treat several parallels between Tafuri's and Benjamin's cases as a methodological comparison. Additionally, to the extent that Tafuri did not know the unpublished *Passagenwerk* until many years after he wrote *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, the unknown presence of a model that could account for the kinds of historiographical challenges that Tafuri sought to address in his own practice calls for a more projective reading against the premises of its introduction, the previously published 'Paris' essay. With both of these caveats in mind, though, Keyvanian's observations (while she does not regard *Das Kunstwerk* to have the same degree of importance to Tafuri as we have given it in the preceeding pages) allow us to draw from Benjamin a series of theories underpinning an historical materialist practice *and* an exemplary model for how this might translate into a means for documenting historico-analytical research. The third text to which we refer is Benjamin's *Der Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiels*, a theory of the Baroque that Tafuri sets in place as a lens through which to return to his accumulated body of work on Borromini for his 1978 *IUAV* seminar.[63] While this topic could sustain a serious and lengthy analysis, we will treat it briefly as an example of Tafuri's application of a theoretical device to historiographical problems.

Keyvanian begins the second chapter of 'Manfredo Tafuri's Notion of History and its Methodological Sources' by observing that Tafuri and Benjamin share the bind of being caught between neo-avant-garde and Marxist positions, between accepting the interplay of "'truth' versus 'appearance'" and the impossibility of attaining truth (as a Marxist goal, leading to class emancipation).[64] Benjamin's 'Theses' argue against historicism as an historiography of victory; yet historical materialism (Benjamin's riposte) does not lead directly to a new hegemony, based upon other victories that could supplant, for instance, one class perspective with another.[65] Rather, Benjamin's 'Theses' consider, in terms that strongly agree with Tafuri's argument in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, an approach to historical practice that (1) does not replace one history with a superior history or (2) deny the power and 'usefulness' of historical knowledge in the presence, but that (3) accepts that a new way of thinking is necessary in order to 'free' knowledge suppressed by external forces while avoiding the procurement of new modes of oppression. Several exemplary passages bear this observation out.

In the third thesis, for instance, Benjamin writes: "A chronicler who recites events without distinguishing between major and minor ones acts in accordance with the

---

62 Benjamin, *Das Passagenwerk*, ed. Rolf Tiedemann, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1982); Engl. trans. Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlan, *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999).

63 Tafuri, ed., 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA' (Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia, Istituto universitario do architettura di Venezia, 1979).

64 Keyvanian, ibid., pp. 36-37.

65 Ibid., p. 38.

following truth: nothing that has ever happened should be regarded as lost for history."[66] For Benjamin, "the fullness of the past" is manifest only to "redeemed mankind," who will know the past, day by day, as a *"citation à l'ordre du jour."*[67] While we must set aside, for brevity's sake, the nature of redemption or of the messianic arrival, we ought to recognise the terms of a necessarily delayed full knowledge relative to a compulsion to practice history in the present. Tafuri, in contrast to Benjamin, regards recovery of the full past as a hypothetical 'project,' but recognises the burdens of that full past in an abstract sense as one of historiography's own burdens. Nonetheless, Benjamin's recognition of the arbitrariness of the historian's knowledge of the past corresponds to Tafuri's idea of the provisionality of 'fact' or of knowledge, and of the historian's need to resist those images that reassure the present on false grounds. Benjamin points to this difficulty in his fifth thesis, identifying in the words of Gottfried Keller the point at which historicism and historical materialism meet: "The truth will not run away from us."[68] The only moment in which the past is mediated exists as a true image is in the present, which immediately becomes past. "The past can be seized only as an image which flashes up at the instance when it can be recognised and is never seen again."[69] When the 'truth' of the past is bound up in the morality of the present, the past can only be known by an image shaped in the present. While Benjamin regards this as the suppression of a truth that can be known though, Tafuri steps further back to suggest that it is enough to know that the entire accumulated past has existed. This recognition, in turn, holds the historian to be honest to the past's inherent complexity, which leads in turn to his privileging of the 'fragment' as a symbol of that knowledge that resists the image (and thus present-determined values).

When, in the following thesis, Benjamin positions the historian's responsibility to his history—"to seize hold of the a memory as it flashes up at a moment of danger"—as a response to the threat of history's "becoming a tool of the ruling classes," we recall Tafuri's parallel imperative to undermine historical images in order to prevent their 'becoming tools of architectural theory' (to paraphrase). Tafuri and Benjamin consider the historian's responsibilities in equivalent terms, then: the imperatives to 'recall' fragments of the past, to undermine historical images, to introduce a dislocation between those who would deploy historical lessons (or, conversely, determine those lessons) and the past itself, as far as it can be known through its evidence in the present day. For Benjamin, this translates into a clear responsibility on the historian's past: "to brush history against the grain."[70] Tafuri, similarly (though not identically) declares the historian's task to be the reminder to those in the present of the past's complexity. The two theoreticians differ, therefore, on one important point. Benjamin regards with proper suspicion the 'cultural treasures' of history's victors, seeking to brush their tales against the grain in order to expose

---

66   Benjamin, ibid., p. 246.

67   Ibid.

68   Ibid., p. 247.

69   Ibid.

70   Ibid., p. 248.

alternative truths that expose class mechanisms and facilitate the wresting of authority from the ruling to the working classes.[71] Tafuri suggests that regardless of its moral authority (the class struggle, for instance), *any* image does damage because it suppresses complexity. The complexity of history, in turn, authorises architects (though anyone, to extend the argument from architectural to general historiography) to think freely in the present and not to regard history as an authority that is predicated on selective, and thus ideologically or memorially driven, values that prize one 'fragment' over another.

Benjamin aptly turns, in his ninth thesis, to Klee's 'Angelus Novus,' which famously interpreting the figure as looking back (out) to a past that accumulates before him as "one single catastrophe which keeps piling wreckage upon wreckage and hurls it in front of his feet."[72] Again, while Benjamin sympathises with the angel, who "would like to stay, awaken the dead, and make whole what has been smashed," Tafuri does not endorse this inclination. The mechanism remains the same when translated into Tafuri's thinking on history: the force of progress—most simply put, the passage of time—"irresistibly propels [the historian] into the future to which his back is turned," while the historian perceives the vast pile of wreckage before him, in the past, as a single, continuous accumulation (and not as a "chain of events"). The present remains the node in which the historian "is fixedly contemplating" both past and present in a single gaze, in full knowledge that the past and present are different and irreconcilable. If this philosophical quandary underpins Tafuri's theorisation of the past's communicability in the present, then Klee's angel stands for the disciplinary perspective that Tafuri accords the historian in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*: always looking backwards, from the present, which is constantly rendered past as the future becomes present.[73]

Benjamin, like Tafuri, draws on the metaphor of 'image' in rejecting the premises of historicism in thesis sixteen. History, for these two thinkers, is not an "'eternal' image of the past," but a temporal experience. Tafuri, sharing many of the principles of Benjamin's historical materialist, "leaves it to others to be drained by the whore called 'Once upon a time' in historicism's bordello. He remains in control of his powers, man enough to blast open the continuum of history."[74] Both figures resist a view of history as 'additive' (turning to Benjamin's seventeenth thesis), homogeneous, compact. "Thinking involves not only the flow of thoughts, but their arrest as well. Where thinking suddenly stops in a configuration pregnant with tensions, it gives that configuration a shock, by which it crystallises into a monad."[75] By exploring these monads, argues Benjamin (and Tafuri after him), the homogenising character of history is irrevocably subverted. Like the Jewish traditions with which Benjamin concludes his 'Theses,' the fact that the historian does not know the future does not render that future lifeless and homogeneous, like the history of historicism. Benjamin writes that "every second of time was the strait

---

71   Ibid., pp. 248-249.
72   Ibid., p. 249.
73   Ibid.
74   Ibid., p. 254.
75   Ibid.

gate through which the Messiah might enter." For Tafuri's conception of history (at once not forgetting his own Jewish heritage, but not bringing it directly to bear upon this question), this messianic moment that might come is shattered into an infinite series of possibilities. Tafuri thus challenges Benjamin's conception of the future as too hopeful, or at least too heavily invested in a specific hope. For Tafuri, then, the future is as complex and 'unpredictable' as the past and present. As he notes in conversation with Luisa Passerini:

> Like a medieval scholar copying the writings of Isodore of Seville, making copious notes, we keep transcribing manuscripts to preserve them because human destiny is so dubious. This is perhaps fortunate, because the historian is always glad when no destiny is prefigured.[76]

The prefiguration of history corresponds, for Tafuri, to the operative practices he dismissed in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. The freedom for the future to be *anything* is a curious conclusion that Tafuri draws from his practice, in which he differs most markedly from Benjamin. However, the parallels of Benjamin's 'Theses' and Tafuri's *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (and especially its final chapter, 'I compiti della storia') reinforce the synchrony of these two thinkers

<div align="center">❧</div>

If a brief comparison reveals some shared territory between Benjamin and Tafuri, then Benjamin's most important research project offers us a crucial point of reference for the translation of the historian's tools and tasks (as Tafuri would put it) into a working historiographical model. Tafuri cannot have known *Das Passagenwerk* (compiled 1927-1940, first German publication, 1981) when he wrote *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. However, it is useful to not the resemblance between the kinds of historiographical strategies to which Tafuri aspires and those that find almost pure form, for their complexity and complicity with the conditions of research, in Benjamin's work on the Parisian arcades. The formalisation of a modern (anti-historicist) way of knowing the past in *Das Passagen-Werk* is an extension (1) of the operator's mode and (2) challenge of the loss of aura that concerned Benjamin in *Das Kunstwerk*. It is telling that, like Benjamin, Tafuri takes several years to develop a new way of presenting historical knowledge that resists, in its form, the homogenisation of the past into clear images. While, for Benjamin, the epitome of this practice is *Das Passagenwerk*, Tafuri's most reflective research structures appear in *La sfera e il labirinto* and *Ricerca del rinascimento*, both of which confront head-on the challenge of documenting research.

It is useful, for our present discussion, to briefly compare the structures of these two books of Tafuri's with Benjamin's *magnum opus*. We must acknowledge that Benjamin's

76   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 69.

work survives him as an assemblage in the most practical sense of the word: a project unfinished (though we must suspect Benjamin might never have finished it) when he left Paris in 1940, the year of his untimely death. For this reason, the structure is more or less arbitrary, though the importance of its elements less so. He may have considered siting his introductory 'exposé' (commencing the published versions of *Das Passagenwerk* that proliferate today) elsewhere in the book, yet its function as an image in dialectical relationship with fragments that follow would have remained as pertinent were it structured anywhere else. The book, as published, begins with the famous essay 'Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century.' Two versions appear in the English edition, one written in 1935, another from 1939. The latter exposé operates much more consciously as an introduction, implying some of his basic intentions and conceptual devices governing the collection and exposition of the material that makes up the hundreds of pages that follow. He starts with the observation: "The subject of this book is an illusion expressed by Schopenhauer in the following formula: to seize the essence of history, it suffices to compare Herodotus with the morning newspaper."[77] Benjamin relishes the possibility of seeing the most modern city through the interplay of fragments without assigning inherent value to one scrap over another. Any publication of Benjamin's project necessarily struggles to convey the 'filing' system used by the author-collector in gathering the evidence and reflections together. In this, Benjamin's publishers share a basic question that Tafuri systematically confronts himself from the mid-1970s: how to resolve historical research without publishing 'images'?

The relationship between 'Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century' and the rest of the volume corresponds to the relationship between Tafuri's 'Il "progetto" storico' and *La sfera e il labirinto*, or between the first chapter of *Ricerca del rinascimento*, 'Ricerca dei paradigmi: Progetto, verità, artificio' and the chapters that follow.[78] At the risk of making a 'Tafurian' reading of the arcades, *or* of holding Tafuri accountable to this model, we can identify several shared objectives. While Benjamin declares, as we saw above in discussing the 'Theses,' a historical materialist approach that advances counter-hegemonic histories, rendering the act of historical publication a blow against class oppression, Tafuri (even insofar as he shares, at least in the 1960s, this view in part) argues in favour of exposing *both* the broad strokes and the detail of the past. Historiographically, this supports the juxtaposition in his bibliography of such theoretical accounts as we find in the first chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* or in *Progetto e utopia* with the detailed readings of specific instances that both challenges and supports his abstracted readings. For Benjamin, this same mechanism operates between the overview of 'Paris,' which applies such devices as 'phantasmagoria,' 'illumination' and the 'market' to the Paris of the arcades, and thus to an image that is concerned with a specific moment of architectural formation ("most of the Paris arcades are built in the fifteen years following 1822") to which he anchors an

---

77   Benjamin, 'Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century,' *The Arcades Project*, p. 14.

78   As a writing device, we would also point out Benjamin's use of a 'theoretical' preface to his 1928 study *Der Ursprung des deutschen Trauerspiels*.

account of the city's modernity.[79] Contrasted with this image are the fragments, collected together over more than a decade with (doubtless) the same obsessive, but open-minded, rigour that Benjamin describes elsewhere as one of his characteristics as a collector. They range from sketched observations, to quotations, to poetic reflections, to false starts, to false conclusions. Their structure is thematic, but unresolved. They exceed their introduction, too, in holding themselves aloof. 'Paris' is a useful guide to the ideas at stake, but the fragments resist an easy relationship with the essay.

The same can be said for *La sfera e il labirinto* and *Ricerca del rinascimento*. Both books collect together advanced musings on a theme, the results of sustained research over (in both cases) a decade that have an ambivalent relationship to the introductions purporting to introduce the basic ideas that pervade the chapters that follow. In *La sfera e il labirinto*, for instance, Tafuri compiles several essays already published in a number of theoretically disparate settings. Claiming, in its subtitle, to offer a trajectorial history of the avant-garde, the introduction makes Tafuri's ambition of documenting historical research abundantly clear. Each of the referents (as we will see in Chapter Six) in 'Il "progetto" storico' warn against fixed readings, historical images, even (Nietzschean) words themselves. How, then, can we understand 'linearity' after such a message? Rather than undoing the provisionality of the introduction with a fixed reading, it invites the reader to consider, as does *Ricerca del rinascimento*, the book as both a fragmented construction and as a fragment itself. Nietzsche's warning applies equally to Tafuri, who is well aware of the 'dangers' of offering up any results of research, which can result in added burdens rather than the relief of those same burdens. Less as a model for research that Tafuri follows, then, *Das Passagenwerk* articulates the possibilities of a research that understands its own role in calcifying hegemonies. While Tafuri pursues this agenda over his life-work, Benjamin finds a balance between research and publication, between fragment and image in this one publication project. This open-endedness pervades, too, Tafuri's *œuvre*; finished, we struggle to regard it as concluded.

❧

Das Passagenwerk stands, therefore as a loaded possibility for the kind of research that Tafuri aspires towards. However, a third and final Benjamin text that Tafuri treats at length, though in his lecture programme and thus largely apart from his published writing, is *Der Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiels* (1928). This book, which Tafuri borrows as a *theoretical vehicle* for an historical study rather than as an historiographical *model*, is the backdrop to his return to his own publications on Borromini spanning from 1964 to 1978. The seminar reading list pertaining to his course in architectural history for the 1978-79 academic year, resurrects his Borromini bibliography (which we will consider at length in Chapter Seven) as a starting point for a broader study on the 'baroque.' A course introduction sets out the lecture topics and a basic theoretical

79   Benjamin, 'Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century,' p. 15.

framework under which Tafuri leads a reconsideration of this existing body of his work. The list of lectures indicates his thematisation of the material. Beginning with (1) "Walter Benjamin e *Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiels*", he steps back to consider (2) the 'rational' and the 'irrational' in Alberti. He continues with a wider consideration of "retorica e sperimentalismo nell'arte e nella letteratura teoretica del '500" (3) before focussing on the 'baroque' (which he consistently places in inverted commas throughout the introduction). This he commences with a lecture called (4) "Scienza e retorica nel '600. Il 'Cannocchiale aristotelico' di Emanuele Tesauro a la scienze galileiana." He balances science and rhetoric, as one theme, with allegory and metaphor in the fifth lecture ("La metafora barocca e i sentieri dell'allegoria: Bernini e Pietro da Cortona"). The next three sessions treat Borromini and his legacy at length:

> (6) Borromini nella cultura italiana: dall'apprendistato con Carlo Maderno, alle opera giovannili (palazzo Spada, l'interno del S. Carlino), alle opere mature (il complesso dei Filippini, S. Ivo alla Sapienza, i progetti per piazza Navona e i Pamphilj, la ristrutturazione di S. Giovanni in Laterano), alle ultimi opere (S. Andrea della Fratte, il complesso di Propaganda Fide, ville Falconieri e Frascati, i lavori in S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, la facciata di S. Carlino, ecc.).

Their final two classes then consider 'borrominianismo,' (7) "Balthasar von Neumann, Kilian Ignaz Dientzenhoffer, Giovanni Santini Aichel" and (8) "Borromini e Piranesi. Il 'doloroso dovere della libertà."[80]

While we cannot position with any precision Tafuri's reading of *Der Ursprung*, the introductory note indicates several of the themes at stake. He writes:

> To hold it up … against Borromini, means going down a spiralling path, placing it right where it opens a nerve-racking intellectual debate, where it is possible to catch the beginnings of a rational/irrational dialectic that goes crunching the transient universes of simulated 'certainty' of thought and of 'classical' art.[81]

Tafuri implicates Borromini in the 'node' of the 'baroque,' which (referencing Benjamin's *Ursprung*) implicates the melancholic *Zeitgeist* of the seventeenth century; citing Benjamin: "The allegory is here the *unicum*, a mighty serenade dedicated to melancholy"[82] In Benjamin's theorisation as a shift from 'myth' to 'history,' Borromini steps forward for Tafuri (as we will see later) as an architect who 'experiences' history as an intellectual.

---

80 Tafuri, 'Introduzione al corso. Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico' in 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIa' (1979), p. 5.

81 Ibid., p. 3.— Original passage: "misurarsi quest'anno con Borromini significa compiere un percorso a spirale, per collocarsi là dove si installa un faticoso dibattito dell'intellettuale con sé stesso, là dov'é possibile cogliere gli inizi della dialettica razionale/irrazionale che fa scricchiolare i provvisori universi delle 'certezze' simulate dal pensiero e dall'arte 'classici.'"— our trans.

82 Benjamin, cited in Tafuri, ibid.— Original passage: "l'allegoria è qui l'unico, poderoso divertimento che sia offerto al melancholia."— our trans.

Comprising a parallel, in architectural culture, to the artistic and literary cultures that Benjamin draws upon in positioning melancholy and the allegory as authentic 'baroque' intellectual devices, Borromini also reflects Tafuri's own historiographic proclivities for the melancholic. Nowhere is this clearer than in the allegory of the death mask. While writing his doomed *Habilitationsshrift*, Benjamin write to Christian Florens Rang (Winter 1923-1924) of settling on a notion of research and its documentation that is not unfamiliar either to Borromini or to Tafuri. Recounts George Steiner: "the requisite research and discipline of scholarly form makes of 'every completed work a death-mask of its intention.'"[83] Without exploring the implications of Benjamin's thoughts to the case of Borromini, we can readily point to the epistemological importance of a book that absorbs its own melancholy, while treating the theme objectively.

This parallels three elements of Tafuri's work that render his consideration of the *Der Ursprung* interesting as a passing (though important) reference. Firstly, the notion of published research as a death mask corresponds to the two epigraphs cited towards the end of Chapter Three, from *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and *Ricerca del rinascimento*. While for Benjamin it is the death-mask that fails to retain the life of the researcher's intentions, for Weiss, all that the researcher does (extrapolating and applying his words) fails to reach the full extent of that which he seeks; equally, for Williams, that 'research' only relates to intentions, as Venus to the sunrise, without ever reconciling index and its signified. It contains an important parallel (to which we will return in the last chapter) between documentation and completion of the historical 'project.' Secondly, the extension of a theoretical device that unlocks an historical case to become an historiographical tool is shared, in the *Der Ursprung*, by Benjamin and Tafuri. Notably, it is precisely in his consideration of Borromini and Piranesi that he tips the balance between objectivity and subjectivity, allowing the subject itself to inform historiographical method both specifically pertaining to the material at hand and further afield, to the broader implications of the case to historical practice. Finally, Tafuri is rarely explicit—in his published writing, of which this is not legitimately part—in his theoretical terms of reference for the analysis of an historical field. We do well to temper our interest in this specific invocation of Benjamin with some appreciation of the place of this reference within this teaching. However, his awareness of this important text and his understanding of its applicability to the study of Borromini does not escape our attention entirely.

Besides these last two examples of Benjamin's presence in Tafuri's later writing, *Das Passagenwerk* and *Der Ursprung*, his most complex invocation of Benjamin lies ultimately in what he called in *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992) 'the era of historical representation.' In regarding the entire history of architecture from *quattrocento* to *novecento* as a long 'modernity,' the relationship between the past *in fatto* and its transformation into theoretically bound 'material' available to architectural production is negotiated in the

---

[83]   George Steiner, 'Introduction,' *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, by Walter Benjamin, trans. John Osborne (London: NLB, 1977), p. 10.

field of representation. All architecture assuming the status of the architectural work with its aura 'intact' operates entirely within representational conditions. From Brunelleschi and Alberti onwards, the 'ownership' of history—as a representational device—by architectural theory complicates any attempt to defend the bases of architectural practice on historical terms. Tafuri consequently argues—in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, but later in 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Venezia e il rinascimento* and *Ricerca del rinascimento*—for a critical distinction between history (as historical representation of the past), and historical research (as an 'operative,' in the Benjaminian sense, historiography engaging that past). By confronting an 'age of historical representation' with its own 'past,' the ideological frameworks shaping historical memory, its sublimation by architectural ideology and application to architectural practice and by extension to the entire relationship of 'history' to 'architecture' remain consistently called into question.

Chapter VI
Weak History

In 1977, Tafuri published one of his most widely referenced essays on historiography under the title 'Il "progetto" storico.' It first appeared in a themed issue of *Casabella*, 'Architettura e linguaggio,' but was soon recognised as a disciplinary declaration operating in 'sequel' to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, by then almost ten years of age. More importantly, for his architectural audiences, it made explicit reference to the concept of 'the project,' a device that opened the door to a series of titles referencing Tafuri's 'later' work and posthumous reception.[1] By the time this essay appeared as the introduction to *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980), it was already published in English as 'The Historical "Project",' constituting Tafuri's final contribution to *Oppositions*.[2] The essay was rapidly assimilated as a clue for reading his work. While the setting of this text, more than any of Tafuri's publications in the 1970s, signals the theoretical vitality of the philological dimensions of architectural historical practice, the essay later came to be seen—along with its 'final' setting, *La sfera e il labirinto*—as the sunset of his engagement with the contemporary. While we might perceive the essay, in these terms, as prefiguring a 'retreat' from the 'present' (referring to the historical avant-garde *and* 'true' contemporaneity), a more accurate depiction of this text is as a bridge between the form of enquiry that brought together the disciplinary and methodological interrogation of a historical framework spanning from the fifteenth to twentieth centuries and, a reflection on the disciplinary and methodological challenges posed by the material of history itself, this pertaining principally to architects and architectural projects of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In this latter sense, 'Il "progetto" storico' predicates Tafuri's entry into a new phase of research work, but one that cannot be divorced from the intellectual acuity or rigour of his preceding decade. It comprises, importantly, Tafuri's overt implication of historiographical preoccupations with architecture in the field of contemporary thought. Where many see 'Il "progetto" storico' as a last theoretical gasp, taken just before the waters of Renaissance scholarship close, we propose its importance as a consolidation of the theoretical imperatives driving his historiography from the middle 1960s fused with an expanded awareness of contemporary epistemological debate concerned with 'the real.'

An expanding set of critical and academic contacts come to define, then, the terms of this consolidation and suggest—through reference to an licit debate on knowledge and reason—the implications of Tafuri's own research to present-day historiography of European (and especially Italian) thought in the years spanning the mid-1970s to the

---

[1]   Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Casabella*, no. 429 (1977): 11-18.

[2]   Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' trans. Diane Ghirardo and Stephen Sartarelli, *Oppositions*, no. 17 (1979): 54-75; *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980), Engl. trans. Barbara Luigi La Penta as *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987).

mid-1980s. The first footnote of 'Il "progetto" storico' offers a useful and important piece of evidence in reinforcing this claim. Therein, Tafuri draws a comparison between the fruits of the collaborative research of Carlo Ginzburg and Adriano Prosperi, documented in their study on the 'Beneficio sul Cristo,' *Giochi di pazienza* (1975) and those of a seminar co-taught by Tafuri and Franco Rella at *IUAV* during the 1976-1977 academic year.[3] We have noted, in Chapter Four, the critical timing of Rella and Tafuri's interaction with respect to the latter's refined reception of Freud and *la critica freudiana*. Their seminar resulted in two complementary essays, a public record of their collaboration: Tafuri's 'Il "progetto" storico' and Rella's essay 'Il paradosso della ragione,' published in *aut aut* the same year.[4] The timing of this seminar is noteworthy, not simply as a setting to which we can bind essays by two influential thinkers from this moment. 'Il "progetto" storico' has a special status in this collaboration, returning Tafuri to themes addressed in an essay published two years prior, which states concisely the methodological themes of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* while connecting these to a fashionable preoccupation with linguistics and structuralist theory. This piece, entitled 'Architettura e storiografia' (1975), *appears* to be updated by 'Il "progetto" storico.'[5] However, the strange 'restatement' of the earlier essay in the later—often through direct importation—exposes a series of surface theoretical conflicts that inform our view of a divide between two approaches to the intellectual problems posed by the practices of architectural history. This latter approach to the problem shifts Tafuri's focus from his disciplinary concerns to the materials of history, considering the historiography of architecture into the material itself while *at the same time* casting his eyes towards the abstractions pervading the debate of the *nouvelle historiore* in France, and its reception and development in Italy as *microstoria*. Both 'Il "progetto" storico' and 'Architettura e storiografia' directly address the disciplinary and methodological limits of architectural history, conflicting on few points of argument. However, a comparison of the endnotes of these two texts reveals a dramatic shift in the frames of reference that support Tafuri's later theorisation of history and historical research.

For its methodological and philosophical consciousness, 'Il "progetto" storico' offers a vital entry into a wider field of debate concerning the limits of rationality, a discussion later formalised in more extreme terms in the early 1980s by Gianni Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti as *il pensiero debole,* a response to the post-modern and post-structuralist discourse flooding out from the Parisian publishers of Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, (philosophical) Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard, and others. This distant body of referents was counterbalanced, within Tafuri's immediate range of contacts, by Cacciari

---

3   Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' p. 73n1. Cf. Carlo Ginzburg and Adriano Prosperi, *Giochi di pazienza. Un seminario sul 'Beneficio del Cristo'* (Turin: Einaudi, 1975).

4   Franco Rella, 'Il paradosso della ragione,' *aut aut*, no. 60 (1977): 107-111.

5   Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia. Un proposta di metodo,' *Arte veneta* XXIX (1975): 276-282. I have previously been guilty of identifying the continuities of Tafuri's argument between 'Architettura e storiografia' and 'Il "progetto" storico' at the level of argument without taking up Tafuri's own suggestion to look beyond his work for a fuller picture of the argument.—Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' p. 73n1.

and Rella, both of whom figure prominently in the post *pensiero debole* debate as well as in the critical discourse that precedes, or at least predicates it. In that Tafuri directly implicates this philosophical debate *within* his own disciplinary practice, concerned above all with research on architecture, his historical studies from the late 1970s do not readily fit into the 'neighbourhood' of Ginzburg's philosophy (his historiography is another matter), Rella, Cacciari, and, later, Vattimo and those others concerned with the new possibilities of philosophy in the Italian setting. However, the theoretical frameworks that implicitly guide the formation and elaboration of historical research for Tafuri and his colleagues from the end of the 1970s until his death constitutes an important contribution, even if played out tangentially, to this debate. That Tafuri's 'theoretical' audience largely regards his work of the 1980s and 1990s as too philological, and his 'historical' audience claims these same works as too theoretical, too speculative, has hitherto prevented the full exploration of the importance of the coordinates we identify in the following pages.

This is not to suggest that we dismiss, out of hand, 'Architettura e storiografia' as a disengaged first draft of 'Il "progetto" storico.' This would be misleading, of course, both for offering a simplified reading of the refinement of Tafuri's disciplinary thought over time, as well as for ignoring the intellectual consequences of his 'collaboration' with Rella. However, it remains for us to observe that 'Architettura e storiografia' is the first attempt since the theoretically self-conscious ('doubtful') *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* to explicitly articulate the conceptual and methodological bases of architectural historiography. Together with 'Il "progetto" storico,' these references are his only three essays to explicitly tackle the 'tools' and 'tasks' of historical practice independent of that same historical practice—i.e., discounting implied historiographical insights drawn from historical study. That 'Il "progetto" storico' later appears as the preface to *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980) fits more obviously within Tafuri's publication patterns, briefly reflecting upon historiographical problems pertaining directly to the historical research published within the collected evidence and analysis. The principle difference between the arguments of 'Architettura e storiografia' and 'Il "progetto" storico' is in the nature of his argument, building upon a programmatic reflection upon the vicissitudes of historical practice. While the former results in 'una proposta di metodo,' the latter reveals a more complex disengagement with 'the future' by stopping short of proposing an image of the discipline or its practice. Our assertion implicates a complex set of judgements, because both continue to have consequences for historical practices from an historical (though historiographically nuanced) account of architecture's relationship (through theory) to historical knowledge. In certain passages, especially in the second half of 'Il "progetto" storico,' the earlier essay remains intact almost to the letter. Yet even when Tafuri (slightly) later shies away from suggesting the 'proper' lines of historical practice, he nonetheless has strategies for that practice in mind, but pertaining to knowledge and its functions within architectural culture rather than within an autonomous disciplinary practice, as the earlier essay to which we refer implies in its title.

Our tasks here, then, are several. We propose to 'reinstate,' in discussions on Tafuri's work, the largely overlooked intellectual partnership between Tafuri and Rella insofar as it pertains to their explicit collaboration of 1976-1977. In doing so, we acknowledge the more commonly acknowledged relationship between Tafuri and Massimo Cacciari within the setting of *IUAV*'s internal 'politics of friendship,' though we indicate how Tafuri's deployment of Cacciari's ideas is here mediated by Rella. The terms of this reinstatement involve the pairing of the two reflections to emerge from their co-taught seminar course, placing 'Il "progetto" storico' alongside 'Il paradosso della ragione.' Secondly, accepting that Tafuri's long quotation from Ginzburg and Prosperi's *Giochi di pazienza* and his effective agreement with their depiction of historical research, not as "olympian and definitive," but rather "tortuous and complex," indicates an endorsement of their methodology, we must ask the extent to which their *microstorie* found corollaries in Tafuri's work from the late 1970s onwards. Further, if Ginzburg and Prosperi, as others argue, continue in the specific context of the post-War Italian university the historiographical strategies of the so-called '*Annales* School' of Marc Bloch, Lucien Febvre and, later, Ferdinand Braudel and his 'students,' then how far can we identify points of difference between Ginzburg and Prosperi (and Giovanni Levi, by extension, co-editor of Einaudi's *Microstoria* series) and Tafuri's own engagement with their work, evidenced in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and even earlier, well in advance of his 'proper' encounter with the work of Ginzburg following *Giochi di pazienza*?[6] In asking these questions and making these observations, we deliberately position Tafuri's theorisation of historical practice (and by implication of historical knowledge) within a wider intellectual setting. How far, we ask, does Tafuri go towards introducing to Italian historical culture a distinct 'reception' of the *Annales*? Is his theorisation of history evidence of participating in a *broader* debate in which Rella, Ginzburg, Prosperi, as well as Cacciari, were active participants? Such questions return us to Jean-Louis Cohen's claim, cited in Chapter One, upon Tafuri's place in the wider field of Italian, and consequently European intellectual history.[7]

❧

Insofar as we position 'Il "progetto" storico' as a departure from 'Architettura e storiografia,' we will commence with a review of this latter text. It expands several of the postulates of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, the fourth edition of which was published in Italian the following year (1976). (They are largely unchanged, though tempered slightly, as is the second edition of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1970), by the ideas

---

6   We refer to the historians loosely associated with the *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* and to the *microstorie* series edited by Ginzburg and Levi. On the *Annales*, we refer readers to the thoroughly readable study of Peter Burke, *The French Historical Revolution: The* Annales *School, 1929-89* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

7   We acknowledge, in laying out this map for the present chapter, that it is impossible to give due attention to all of the subjects indicated. However, in demonstrating our perception of how these broad range of topics interweave in anticipation of a better occasion in which to elaborate our argument fully, we trust that the schema will at least contribute to the debate in a productive way.

conveyed in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.'[8]) He begins by observing the necessity of challenging the 'proliferation' of studies on the 'significance' of architectural systems as a 'radical re-categorisation' of a much longer theme within the history of architectural language. "The theme that interests us here, therefore, relates to the *function* of language, to the way in which it 'acts,' provisionally bracketing the specific modes of its communication."[9] He observes an important disjunction, wherein the wealth of language as the basis for communication "does not coincide, in fact, with the historical expectancy of the work itself."[10] Beyond those systems of meaning and signification that can be reconstructed, or which translate directly into contemporary terms, are those meanings latent but locked away, no less loaded with meaning than those that continue to speak directly, but rendered silent for the loss of a signifying setting wherein the object once resided and relativised its autonomy and contextual meanings. With this observation in mind, he asks: "How often does a doomed work, an unrealised attempt, or a fragment have a bearing on the complete work, these hidden to the dignity of 'texts'?"[11] The choice to set an artefact within a known (and thus signifying) system is equally a choice to cover over the complicating forces of the unknown. Tafuri cites Alberti's 'perspectival errors' and "the exasperating ring geometries" of Baldassarre Peruzzi as examples of the inert knowledge the lies scattered over the historical field, treated as exceptions for not conforming to a contemporary 'language.'[12]

Tafuri suggests that the challenge of 'meaning' in architecture no longer rests with the reconciliation of the 'tragic' and the 'banal' of the twentieth century avant-garde with 'reality.' Rather, the historian, as an intermediary between past and present, is called upon also to measure and judge that temporal distance. "The manipulation of form, from the Enlightenment onwards, always has an objective transcending that same form: the constant *al di là* of architecture is a spring which releases those moments of fracture in the 'tradition of the new.'"[13] However, only that which can be known in present terms,

---

8   Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 2nd ed. (Bari: Laterza, 1970); 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79.

9   Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia,' p. 276. Original passage: "Il tema che qui ci interessa, dunque, è relativo alla *funzione* del linguaggio, al modo in cui linguaggio stesso 'agisce,' mettendo provvisoriamente fra parentesi i modi specifici del suo comunicare."—our trans.

10   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "non coincide affatto con la pregnanza storica delle opera prese in esame."—our trans.

11   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "Quanto volte un'opera fallita, un tentativo irrealizzato, un frammento non ci hanno posto problemi nascosti dalla compiutezza di opere assurte alla dignità di 'testi'?"—our trans.

12   Ibid. The orig. prase reads "gli esasperati 'ludi geometrici.'"—our trans. We should note, in this regard, that Tafuri was no stranger to the theme of 'architectural language' or to the theme of language in (particularly) thinking on modern architecture. His initiation into the polemical scene of Samonà's faculty at Venice was with the lecture 'Le strutture del linguaggio nella storia dell'architettura moderna,' *Teorie della progettazione architettonica* (Bari: Dedalo, 1968), pp. 11-30. Helpfully, the lecture itself is transcribed from a recording held at *IUAV* by Rixt Hoekstra, 'Building versus *Bildung*: Manfredo Tafuri and the Construction of a Historical Discipline,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Groningen University, 2005, http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/283596589 (accessed September 19, 2005), pp. 212-222.

13   Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia,' p. 276. Orig. phrase: "La manipulazione delle forme, dall'Illuminismo in poi ha sempre un obbiettivo che trascende le forme stesse: è questo costante 'al di là dell'architettura' che costituisce la molla che fa scattare i momenti di rottura della 'tradizione del nuovo.'"—our trans. We leave the phrase 'al di là' untranslated to keep intact Tafuri's double meaning of 'going

or in terms which may be historicised in the present, can be enacted as measures. The ephemeral nature of the historian's rule is as quick-sand, upon which (Tafuri suggests) lie the 'sublime mystifications' of the 'monumental' myth of the modern movement. By implication, this same terrain offers merely simulacra of stability to any historical analysis, especially one constructed upon difference or 'super-historical' comparison.[14] He continues:

> We will start, therefore, privileging architectural activity; it offers a more immediate 'material,' but at the same is more sympathetic to the multiplication of competing variables. We will put, that is to say, our attention on architecture as a *particular form of intellectual work*: an intellectual work that has the advantage of insisting upon a directly productive range of activity. That is, the accent goes on a dialectic … between concrete and abstract work in the Marxist meaning of their terms. In this way, architectural history can be read on the basis of relative historiographical parameters, and at the same time, as events wherein evolves the rapport of intellectual work with production.[15]

Even accounting for the Marxist dialectic Tafuri invokes in framing concrete and abstract work, his historiographical point transcends the particularity of this reference. Historians, he argues, must account for architectural activity in all of its intellectual and practical dimensions. The inclination to treat this observation as the beginning point of a 'class critique of architecture' (paraphrasing a famous passage in Tafuri's 1975 preface to *Architecture and Utopia*, the English translation of *Progetto e utopia* contemporaneous with 'Architettura e storiografia'), is quickly tempered by recalling Tafuri's earlier observation that any 'meaningful' basis for historiographical practice is ultimately unstable.[16] He leaves aside (therefore, we might say, but as a matter of course, more correctly) the explicit reference to a Marxist dialectic to posit two functions for architectural history that are directly bound to the points outlined above.

First, architectural history is rendered responsible for 'critically describing' the concrete time of the individual, autonomous architectural work and by implication the 'linguistic choices' bound up in each project as 'chapters' in a general history of intellectual work and its reception. In other words, this mode of architectural history

---

beyond' and 'going to "the beyond",' i.e., a motion towards the future with utopian or religious overtones.

14 Cf ibid., p. 281n1.

15 Ibid., p. 276. Orig. passage: "Partiremo, pertanto, privilegiando, dell'attività architettonica, il dato più immediatamente 'materiale,' ma nello stesso tempo più comprensivo delle molteplici variabili che in essa concorrono. Punteremo cioè l'attenzione sull'architettura come *particolare forma di lavoro intellettuale*: un lavoro intellectuale che ha il privilegio di insistere su una gamma di attività direttamente produttive. Ciò significa porre l'accento su una dialettica … fra *lavoro concreto* e *lavoro astratto*, nel significato marxiano dei termini. In tal modo, la storia dell'architettura può essere letta sulla base di parametri storiografici relativi, contemporaneamente, alla vicenda del lavoro intellettuale e agli sviluppi dei modi e dei rapporti di produzione."—our trans.

16 Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976).

tracks the choices that determine how and what a work *means*. The second function *returns* 'reports' of the specific conditions of architectural production to the general history of intellectual work, confronting '*lavoro astratto*' (abstract work) with concrete knowledge. Consequently, he writes, the effort of historical practice "appears *always* as the fruit of a dialectic."[17] Rather than remain 'contained,' Tafuri argues that the historian must unravel the web holding together 'intellectual anticipations,' 'real conditions' and 'modes of consumption,' recognising that they involve a vast field of forces, and implicate (as starting points) new fields themselves. Tafuri's timely invocation of Derrida and his notion of 'dissemination' reveal the analytical limitations that he seeks to break down through historical enquiry.

> For such broken down components it will be necessary to proceed to a separate analysis: reports of customs, symbolic horizons, avant-guarde hypotheses, linguistic structures, methods of restructuring production, and technological invention, stripped of innate ambiguities in the synthesis 'displayed' in the work.[18]

Importantly, Tafuri notes that for every 'specialist' history, be it 'traditional'—iconological history, for example—or emancipatory—as politico-economic or 'revisionist' history might be—the object of study itself will always have something else to say. An Albertian project might shed light on all manner of historical problems, but "none of these components will serve to provide me a reason for that work."[19] Rather than attending to the necessarily absent explanation of historical commentary, Tafuri suggests that the 'critical act' is rather one of 're-montage,' recognising that the historian is confronted less with trajectories, rounded accounts or full perspectives, than with fragments of historical evidence.

The 'complete historicisation' of the multiple 'non-linguistic' components pertaining to an historical example will have, he says, two serious effects. On one hand, it will break apart the 'magic circle' of language, forcing a declaration of the foundations upon which meaning lies; on the other, it will permit the recovery of the historical 'function' of that same language. He references this argument against another in linguistics, in which Jakobson, Tynjanov, following Karel Tiege and Jan Mukařovský, distinguish between linguistic and extra-linguistic series. Treating the architectural work as a node in a series of linguistic acts, though, opens the doors to treating the work simply as a starting point, to which all the 'extra-linguistic' spheres invoked in the work's dissemination return to be implicated in the work itself. "Or," he writes, "we will ourselves multiply out the metaphors of the architectural text, splitting and varying its 'free valences' to

---

17   Ibid. Italics mine. Orig. phrase: "apparira *sempre* come frutto di una dialettica."—our trans.

18   Ibid., pp. 276-277. Orig. quotation: "Di tali componenti disgregate sarà necessario procedere a un'analisi separata. Rapporti di committenza, orizzonti simbolici, ipotesi di avanguadia, strutture del linguaggio, metodi di ristrutturazione della produzione, invenzioni technologiche si presenteranno così denudate dell'ambiguità connaturata alla sintesi 'mostrata' nell'opera."—our trans.

19   Ibid., p. 277. Orig. passage: "[ma] nessuno di tali componenti mi servirà a dar ragione di quell'opera."—our trans.

infinity, its specific 'system of ambiguity,' or we will appeal to a synthetic principle beyond the work, outside its apparent construction."[20] The historian can 'explode' the 'profound structure of language,' but will be left simply with materials primed for reconstruction, both 'arbitrary and verifiable.' Depending on the historian's intentions, and his or her tasks, Tafuri withholds his judgement of the result. If the aim is to construct, following Blanchot, a 'literary space' encircling a magical circle, a bottomless well in which meaning and production are determined within clearly defined limits and tested within the autonomous bounds of that system, then Tafuri does not follow. This, after all, is the precondition of 'la critica operativa' and the 'pirotecnici sdoppiamenti' to which he takes obvious and controversial exception in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*.[21] The challenge faced by historians, as well as their readers, he suggests, is to avoid being 'charmingly deceived.'[22]

Conversely, an historian equally begins from 'real incidents' to perceive a 'language' from extra-linguistic events. For instance, one such 'measurable concept' is the theme of figurative space in architectural theory from the "bourgeois crisis of the Renaissance" to the "project of reorganising the construction sector."[23] However, rather than forcing a trajectory in the manner of the 'operative critics,' Tafuri advocates an historical process of reassemblage and montage.[24] "The web of intellectual work and productive conditions thus provide the only valid parameters for *reframing the pieces of mosaic that come from the analytical decomposition of something formerly complete.*"[25] The dialectical nature of this process of 'smontaggio' and 'montaggio,' destruction and recomposition, leads neatly (methodologically) to Tafuri's plea for the practice of architectural history as a practice building up chapters based on specific analyses for a general history of work and of

[20] Ibid. Orig. passage: "O ci adopereremo a moltiplicare le metafore del testo architettonico, sdoppiandone e variandone all'infinito le 'valenze libere,' il suo specifico 'sistema di ambiguità,' o ricorremo a un principio di sintesi esterno all'opera, estraneo alla sua costruzione apparente."—our trans. This argument, Tafuri acknowledges, follows Roland Barthe's *la nouvelle critique*. Cf. *Critique et verité* (Paris: Seuil, 1965); *Le plaisir du texte* (Paris: Seuil, 1973); also, Serge Doubrovsky, *Pourquoi la nouvelle critique. Critique et objectivité* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1967). Cf. Tafuri, ibid., p. 282n3.

[21] This passage, more than any other, reveals the 'dangers' of Tafuri's writing methodology as projected by Llorens. Attached, in the pages of 'Il "progetto" storico' to the second half of a new argument, this passage contradicts, by its presence, Tafuri's (only slightly) later acknowledgment that the militant criticism of Zevi, Portoghesi and Giedion ought to have been tempered by a more complex construction of the problem. He writes, therefore, in one part of the essay that "it would be useless to tear into the methods of 'operative criticism' … while leaving intact its basic principles"; on the other hands, he remains content to take shots at the methods themselves: "this is what so-called 'operative criticism' has been doing for some time, serving up, like so much fast food, its arbitrary and pyrotechnical hair-splittings of Michelangelo, Borromini or Wright."—Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' pp. 65, 69.

[22] Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia,' p. 277.

[23] Ibid. The two phrases in Italian: "crisi boghesia rinascimentale"; "progetto di riorganizzazione dell'industria edilizia."—our trans.

[24] Though in making this point, we recall our earlier observation (Chapter Four) that Tafuri has been prone to a psychoanalytical 'recovery' of the burdens of the present. We privilege the passage cited above, though, for its consistency with the overall historiographical intentions of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, which establishes a basic position that remains consistent in Tafuri's later historiographical writing.—Tafuri, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968).

[25] Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia,' p. 277. Italics ours. Orig. phrase: "L'intreccio di lavoro intellettuale e di condizioni produttive mi darà in tal caso, l'unico valido parametro per *ricomporre il mosaico dei pezzi risultanti dallo smontaggio analitico precedentemente compiuto*."—our trans.

social divisions. The dialectical interchange between the trajectory and the particular, therefore, informs knowledge both of architectural production (as a socio-economico-'linguistic' process) and consumption (as one of socio-economic signification). This is not to say that Tafuri's case is for a crude Marxist analysis of production and consumption in the building sector.

> Rather, these last things will be proclaimed by means of a reading capable of connecting—on the basis of verifiable parameters—the real significance of artistic choices to the dynamics of the productive transformations that are put into motion and which they try to impede.[26]

In this point, he admits sympathy for the perspective of Walter Benjamin his *Der Autor als Produzent*, which accords the work of art itself—for Benjamin, literature; for Tafuri, architecture—secondary importance compared with its indexical capacity with respect of the conditions of production.[27] He observes two results to this translation of Benjamin's analytical model into architectural historiography. Firstly, 'classical historiography' comes under scrutiny for its easy uses of periodisation in order to fully explore the dialectical relationship of abstract to concrete work. It is the task of historical analysis, he asserts, to recognise those moments wherein that dialectical exchange results in 'integrations,' "to the point of constructing true and proper *structural cycles*, in the fuller sense of the term."[28] Secondly, relative to debate on the analysis of artistic (and thus architectural) language, Tafuri suggests the need to bridge 'immediate' meaning and significance in the long view; that is to say, he proposes 'throwing a bridge' between words and structures. His constant purpose is to expose as historically illegitimate the capitalist division of work.[29]

❧

197

His aim, here, could readily distract us from the methods that support its pursuit. While it is evident that Tafuri's long-term goal for historians—a utopian goal, by all accounts, and thus subject to the same kinds of historiographical deformations as characterise those historians whom he castigates—is the exposure of the hold of capitalist ideology over knowledge *as well as* social structures; the true test of the methodological legitimacy of those strategies he outlines is the capacity for his methodological proposal to surpass

---

26   Ibid. Orig. wording: "Anzi, queste ultime andranno esaltate mediante una lettura capace di collegare—sulla base di parametri verificabili—il reale significato delle scelte progettuali alla dinamica delle trasformazioni produttive che esse mettono in moto, che esse tentano di impedire."—our trans.

27   Walter Benjamin, 'Der Autor als Produzent,' *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2, ed. Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser (Frankfurt am main: Suhrkamp, 1977). Engl. trans. 'The Author as Producer,' trans. Edmund Jephcott, *Selected Writings*, by Walter Benjamin, vol. 2, ed. Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland and Gary Smith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

28   Tafuri, Ibid. Orig. wording: "al fine di costruire dei veri e propri *cicli strutturali*, nel senso più pieno del termine."—our trans.

29   Ibid.

his historically specific goals. Recast in broader terms, we can read the scheme outlined above as integral to his more general goal of exposing the role and rule of ideology in shaping history.[30] The simplicity of this transition, in 1975, from a schema founded in a Marxist dialectic to an abstract concern with ideology undermines the complexity of his treatment of ideology as we understand it from our earlier discussion of this theme. A clear warning indicates that Tafuri, too, is well aware of the dangers of becoming locked into a formulaic historical analysis, well-versed to the degree of becoming a "mirror game."[31] Just as an analytical strategy circumscribed by a protective ideology simulates criticality, so too *any* form of critical activity based upon the most rigorous technique can become uncritically reflective. "[But] it is possible only if we succeed in entering the enchanted castle of ideological forms supplied with … an efficient antidote against hypnosis."[32] To this end, proposes Tafuri, the "proper parameters" for history are those that "permit architecture's existence" by unwinding the web of ideology that extends back from 'utopia.' This, in turn, is protected by a 'straight line' institutionalised in the 'poetic language' of historical images, like the everlasting surreality alluded to by Max Bense, which subsequently enters as a target of historical practice.[33]

Tafuri, importantly, here explicitly defines 'ideology' in terms extending well beyond the Marxist dialectic mentioned above and implicating the foundations of his broader practice of history. (We thus return his reflections on ideology to the place we assign them in Chapter Three.) He writes (against the simplistic characterisation of Engels noted in Chapter Four): "to define *tout court* ideology as an expression of false intellectual conscience is little more than useless."[34] However, all works, he continues, are thus bound ideologically. The historian's challenge is to identify where disjunctions occur between ideological systems underpinning production and those underpinning reception, permitting knowledge of the past to be set aside, negated. In other words, where the values of the present impose meaning and importance upon works of the past, replacing past values—determining production—with present—determining reception and the production of newer works that will subsequently be subject to ideological deformation—lies the 'real' of the past. The historian, in turn, is obliged to return evidence of that 'real,' though ultimately irrecoverable, to the present, in which he or she recognises contemporary values that render exposure of that evidence as a work of the present. This raises a thorny issue. The nature of the interaction of ideology with architectural production involves, more accurately, a *range* of ideologies indexed, in turn, by the work. This necessitates a 'complex operation of critical reconstruction.' Given the impossibility of reconstructing the productive environment, in its broadest intellectual

---

30 Ibid., pp. 277-278.

31 Ibid., p. 278.

32 Ibid. Orig. passage: ""[Ma] ciò è possibile solo se si riesce ad entrare nel castello fatato delle forme ideologiche muniti di un filto che funzione come efficace antidoto rispetto all'ipnosi."—our trans.

33 Ibid. Orig. wording of the cited passages: "parametri propri"; "permettono l'esistenza del-l'architettura."—our trans.

34 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "definire *tout court* l'ideologia come espressione di falsa coscienza intellettuale è quanto meno inutile."—our trans.

and practical sense, of any work, this critical operation is open, Tafuri asserts, to three further 'ideological' operations: a 'progressive' ideology, projected into the future on no firm footing, historical or otherwise (as propaganda); a 'regressive' ideology, nostalgically referencing myths of a 'better' past as historicism; or an ideology that insists upon reform, anticipating "new modes of production and a different organisation for the division of labour."[35]

Rather than proposing, as he writes, methodological eclecticism, Tafuri recognises that the conditions in which historians work, towards the ends outlined above (and in previous chapters) of exposing the ideological functions of architectural theory and its role in forming historical images, demand the same 'dismembered' and 'multiform' disciplinary underpinnings as determines architecture itself. As such, architectural history is a disciplinary mirror, held up to architecture, but responding to its own complexities, both in the present and in the present knowledge of the past. This implicates the evolving concept of architecture itself as a practice and a discipline, and thus the measurability of the architectural work as an index of intellectual labour framed by ideology over time. For this reason, the history of modern urbanism does not relate directly to the theories of the avant-garde; it is rather entrenched in a much longer evolution of ideas about the city and region. The fact that the historical avant-garde exacerbates the elaboration of modern urban theory is thus an historiographical red herring that Tafuri invites the historian to neutralise as a force determining reception while at the same time accounting for its importance in productive terms.

The methodological imperatives are thus clear: to recognise as fundamentally artificial any synthesis of historical material; to provoke the proliferation of divergent and independent historical trajectories; but to account for their interdependence where this is evident. "It requires, therefore, the interweaving of even more histories, even more integrated historical approaches."[36] While this points towards the methods employed by *Annales* scholars, Tafuri admits, his proposal is somewhat different, even grander. His observations on the nature of history, its material and its constructions deliberately implicate the disciplinary and institutional construction of history in the university, provoking the development of interdisciplinary (or, more specifically, inter-speciality) analytical methods, a proposal that runs contrary, he readily acknowledges, to the fixed forms that determine the didactic and research structures in the academe.

Tafuri identifies the historical cycle of Classicism as his broad target.[37] The historian confronts the relationship between referents, 'aura' (in the Benjaminian sense) and values; it does not, he says, so neatly translate into a dialectical contraposition between the 'language' of form and that of existence. The historical 'cycle' of classicism, Tafuri proposes, as a base architectural language, requires a more complex treatment: "The open

---

35 Ibid. Orig. wording: "nuovi modi di produzione e un diverso assetto della divisione del lavoro."—our trans.

36 Ibid., p. 279. Orig. phrase: "Esigenza, quindi, di più storie intrecciate fra loro, di più approcci storici integrati."—our trans.

37 Ibid.

cycle that begins from the visual rationalisation introduced by Tuscan Humanism can function as a reflexive mirror—a mirror in which one see reflected ghosts of today's bad conscience—for a history intent on seeking out the origins of capitalist *Zivilisation*."[38] This, in turn, requires the 'substantial revision' of historical and historiographical materials, of analytical criteria, of the epistemological structures that determine how we know the past.[39] The result is a demonstration of how 'nodes' appear within the cycle of Classicism, a more complicated scheme that that of trajectories and periods. Nodes reveal an 'indirect productivity' within the elaboration of broad themes. Most important (for Tafuri, in any case) is the translation of the humanist separation of 'rational intellect' from 'nature' into a mode for transforming 'reality,' which occurs (he suggests) in the 'space' between 'linguistic innovation' and 'technological innovation.' He continues:

> And for illuminating that same problem, exploring ideological themes will be of little use—iconology seems today to have become a battlefield privileged by a 'new historiographical idealism'—as much as the isolation of one in a series of themes that see structural transformations thoroughly enmeshed in complex ideological processes.[40]

Three examples illustrate his point. Firstly, he identifies an ideology of innovation pervading architectural advances of the *quattrocento* and *cinquecento*. It describes the 'difficulty' of humanist thought insofar as this 'ideology' operates in a resistant relationship with respect of 'Renaissance Humanism.' He points directly to the 'engineer' Leonardo da Vinci to demonstrate that this ideology of invention relies heavily upon specific economic and political conditions, which in turn depend upon abstract values. However, the 'language' of humanism and the technical advances of Renaissance engineering, urbanism and artistic practice are not multiform manifestations of the same *Kunstwollen*. Secondly, he identifies the range of inflections of a rationalist ideology, bound up in two quite different examples: the works on S. Pietro in Rome, and those upon the Escorial of Philip II of Spain. "We traces in these buildings two different symbols of the Catholic ecumene, emblems of the new universality of the Church, in which we find 'worship' played out according to two antithetical building sites."[41] S. Pietro, for instance, is undermined by important fiscal and administrative changes in the papal states, the works proceeding 'incredibly slowly' and marked with inefficient bureaucracy and organisation.

---

38   Ibid. Original passage: "[Il] ciclo aperto dalla razionalizzazione visiva introdotta dall'Umanesimo toscano può fungere da specchio retrovisivo—uno specchio in cui si reflettono i fantasmi della cattiva coscienza attuale—per una storia intenta a ricercare le origini della *Zivilisation* capitalista."—our trans.

39   Ibid.

40   Ibid., p. 280. Orig. passage: "E per illuminare quello stesso problema, non sarà tanto utile un'esplorazione dei temi iconologici—l'iconologia sembra oggi divenuta il campo di azione privilgiato di un 'nuovo idealismo' storiografico—quanto l'individuazione di una serie di temi che vedano intrecciate in modo complesso elaborazioni ideologiche a trasformazioni strutturali."—our trans.

41   Ibid. Orig. passage: "Si tratta in due fabbriche in diverso modo simboliche dell'ecuméne cattolica, emblemi della nuova universalità di Chiesa, e che vedono messe in opera due antitetiche organizzazioni di cantieri."—our trans.

The Ecsorial, on the other hand, indexes a new intellectual openness as a utopian value. The building fabric proceeds as "a rigorously scientific work," an ideological inflection matched by Herrera's intentions to establish a mathematical academy under royal protection.[42] Finally, he points to the architectural response "to the grand programme of transforming economical structures into 'territory.'"[43] In sixteenth century Veneto, for instance, the application of new structures systems to a resistant aristocratic order was regarded as 'heresy.' From the autonomous (and thus self-referential) systems of an architect like Palladio and the diverse forces at work in shaping Renaissance Venice all its complexity, including commerce, politics, diplomacy, trade, etc., emerge the forms and structures of a true intellectual 'avant-garde' with its own values, both internalised and expressed.

❧

With this point, he arrives at his proposition. The disjunctions between rational thought and its 'challenges' in the 'classical cycle,' he suggests, work as a prehistory to the crisis of intellectual work that (a) begins from the eighteenth century and (b) forms "the centre of our historiographical interests."[44] Rather than perceiving, in simple terms, intellectual work bound up in cycles of production, he argues that

> we must rather privilege the moments in which an artistic choice … contains
> therein either the premises of institutional reform in the management of cities and
> territories, or directly insists upon [these changes] and on transformation of the
> construction sector.[45]

Benjamin's prognosis of the 'death of the aura' translates into historiographical terms thus: in the history of contemporary architecture (and thus in the contemporary historiography of architecture) there are new correlations of linguistic values (as abstract labour, utopian projections) and "trasformazione produttive" ('productive transformations,' as concrete labour, counter-architectonic ideologies in architecture).[46] He considers Adorno's criticism of treating this relationship in terms outside of a dialectic as nostalgic. "The projection of such nostalgia remains the problems of 'handling dialectically the theory of the aura': to return it to the stream of a comparative historical analysis of formal modes of production, reception, production proper."[47] Other approaches, too, fall short of the

42 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "lavoro rigorosamente scientifici."—our trans.

43 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "ai grande programmi di trasformazione delle strutture economiche a raggio territoriale."—our trans.

44 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "il centro dei nostri interessi storiografici."—our trans.

45 Ibid. Orig. passage: "dobbiamo piuttosto privilegiare i momenti in cui una scelta di progettazione … contenga in sè le premesse di una riforma istituzionale nella gestione delle città e dei territori, o insista direttamente su quella gestione e sulla trasformazione dei modi di produzione edilizia."—our trans.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid., p. 281. Orig. passage: "Al di là di tale nostalgia, rimane il problema di 'maneggiare in modo

full treatment of the complexities of the architectural work that he seeks. Even the *mode du jour* of semiotic analysis is not enough. There must be, he suggests, "a better way of dissecting the work."[48]

Nonetheless, the complicated web of methodological proposals that grew from the intellectual freedom of the 1960s led directly to an historiographical impasse. In the history of the avant-garde, for instance, analysis of the external conditions upon which it sought to act, and thus of the relationship between the avant-garde and capitalist society and institutions, clashed with an analysis of the internal ideological constructions that lent form to its endeavours. "With an inevitable result: the complete division of the history of work from the history of institutions, by which it is conditioned."[49] For Tafuri, echoing a familiar formulation, this basic impasse calls for the historian to develop "a new history of intellectual work and of its slow transformations in pure technical labour (in 'abstract labour,' to be precise)."[50] He uncharacteristically charges historians with the task of constructing a 'new historiographical model' as an alternative to the canonised (nineteenth century) methods that fail, in his view, to properly account for the settings of intellectual work and for the processes that see intellectual and concrete dimensions of the work of art *meet* in the work of art, or indeed in any field of historical evidence. The kind of historiography for which he hopes (though does not himself advance) would unblock the 'obstacles' that capitalist society places before historical practice. Translated into broader terms, and recalling themes elaborated earlier in this dissertation, Tafuri predicates an historiographical practice that undermines those ideologies, memories, images that force historical evidence to conform to a process of homogenisation. His call is operative in that it demands change within his own discipline. While he does not go so far as to describe the methods that might lead historiography away from the intellectual challenges that he describes, he does guide his readers down a long path with few alternatives at the end. However, the unavailability of historical images to forms of productive practice (architecture, in other words) beyond historical practice

---

dialettico la teoria dell'aura': di ricondurla nei canali di una analisi comparata delle storie dei modi di produzione formale, di ricezione, di produzione."—our trans. Tafuri refers to Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetiche Theorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970); *Teoria estetica*, ed. Greta Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann, Ital. trans. Enrico De Angelis (Turin: Einaudi, 1975). In *Architecture and Modernity*, Hilde Heynen also writes of the 'disagreements' between Tafuri and Adorno: "In Adorno's opinion, one can speak of a *Verblendungszusam-menhang*—people are blinded by the idea that the world is at it is. As a result, the possibilities for real change that objectively exist do not get through to their consciousness and therefore have no chance of succeeding. The thesis of the 'totally administered world' postulates that people are imprisoned in a network of social relations of production and consumption so that they unconsciously allow themselves to be manipulated, with the result that the system can continue to exist fundamentally unchanged. In contrast to Tafuri, Adorno does in fact see possibilities of resistance in the face of these developments. He, too, is clear that radical political change is not something that is going to take place overnight, but he does allow for genuine criticism in terms of society."—Heynen, *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999), p. 191.

48 Tafuri, ibid., p. 281. Orig. phrase: "un ben altro metodo di dissezione dell'opera."—our trans.

49 Ibid. Orig. passage : "Con un risultato inevitabile: la completa scissione della storia del lavoro intellet-tuale da quella delle istituzioni che la condizionano."

50 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "una nuova storia del lavoro intellettuale e delle sua lenta trasformazione in puro lavoro tecnica (in '*lavoro astratto*,' appunto)."—our trans.

renders Tafuri's operativity internal to historiography, an important distinction from the operative criticism (affecting architectural practice) that he would otherwise eschew.

<div style="text-align:center">⚜</div>

This conclusion brings Tafuri directly into an exchange with a (initially, at least) French historiographical movement heralded by the book *Faire de l'histoire* (1974).[51] Therein, the community lent form by editors Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora, while flexing its intellectual independence, likewise acknowledges its substantial debt to the methodological breakthroughs of the first editors of the journal *Annales d'histoire economique et sociale* (published since 1929), Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre. We have already noted, in our first chapter, Tafuri's surprise that "no one, not a single colleague, *really no one* in Italy" knew of the advances that they had made in historical method.[52] Yet in opening the field of historical research beyond the maintenance of canons and periodisation, exploring the historical importance of popular culture, *les mentalités* and of *l'histoire du longue durée*, the forum maintained by Bloch and Febvre, and their own work, too, provided an important point of contact for Tafuri's own disciplinary and methodological reflections.[53] *Faire de l'histoire*, therefore, indeed charted a 'new historiography,' but one that indexed with due reverence the possibilities that the *Annales* opened up. Le Goff and Nora's introduction to the book, published in Italian as *Fare storia* (1981), set out the terms of this iteration of the *Annales* 'project.'[54] Like Tafuri's 'Architettura e storiografia' and *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* before it, *Fare storia* does not attempt to summarise the entire field of contemporary historiographical endeavours. Rather, it reflects on a few moments in which specific historiographical materialities and strategies open up

51   Jacques Le Goff and Pierre Nora, eds., *Faire de l'histoire*, 3 vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1974).

52   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000), p. 43.

53   We note, too, that Tafuri kept a full run of *Annales*, later called *Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, in the library of the *Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura* at IUAV. Bloch's (1886-1944) research focussed upon the history of feudalism and rural society, resulting in several important studies.— *Mélanges historiques*, 2 vols. (Paris: Sevpen, 1963); *La société féodale* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1968); *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*, 6th ed. (Paris: Colin, 1976); and the referential *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien* (Paris: Colin 1949). On Bloch, see Carole Fink, *Marc Bloch: A Life in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989). Febvre (1878-1956), Bloch's collaborator and co-founder of the *Annales*, made important inroads into a history of belief.—*Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle. La religion de Rabelais* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1949); *L'apparition du livre*, with Henri-Jean Matin (Paris: Albin Michel, 1958); *Un destin. Martin Luther*, 4th ed. (Paris: PUF, 1968); and *La terre et l'évolution humaine. Introduction géographique à l'histoire* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1970).

54   Le Goff and Nora, eds., *Fare storia. Temi e metodi della nuova storiografia*, trans. Isolina Mariana (Turin: Einaudi, 1981). In the coming paragraphs, we reference this version of the book. A substantially reduced version of the original collection, *Fare storia* includes essays by François Furet (on 'the quantative,' pp. 3-23); Paul Veyne (author of the extraordinary tome *Le pain et le cirque* [Paris: Seuil, 1976], on 'conceptualised' history, pp. 25-57); André Leroi-Gourhan (on pre-scriptural history, pp. 59-72); Henri Monitot (on non-literary peoples, pp. 73-91); Nathan Wachtel (on acculturation, pp. 93-116); Georges Duby (writing on social history and 'ideology,' pp. 117-138); Nora (on 'the event,' pp. 139-158), Alphonse Dupront (on religious anthropology, pp. 159-192); Jean Starobinski (on literarture interpretation, pp. 193-208); Emmanuel le Roy Ladurie (on climatic history, pp. 209-238); and Le Goff (on mentality, pp. 239-258).

debate on historical practice, generally, and on the practices of historical research, in particular.[55]

Like Tafuri, they draw a fine distinction between proposing a new 'type' of historiography and advancing a model for a reflection, through practice, on historiographical limitations: a theorisation of historical practice *through* the same practice that they theorise. Despite their 'origins' in the *Annales*, they recognise this debt as their greatest limitation; in contrast, they write (citing from the Italian edition), "there is not, here [in their 'new' practice], some orthodoxy, nor even an orthodoxy of freedom."[56] Both Tafuri and the *nuovi storici* recognise that the post-war field of historical research and reflections on historical knowledge demonstrate that no single historical method can any longer attend to the vast range of materials that enter into the historian's scope. How may one propose, they ask in unison, an historical practice that surpasses the need for articulation a 'proper method' that, however rigorous in its formation (like the *Annales* historians or such 'Second Vienna School' art historians, like Sedlmayr and Pächt) would become bound up in disciplinary and methodological form? Just as Tafuri makes a series of apparently 'false' starts into the architectural history of Venice, the broader methodological problems associated with a disciplinary practice that deliberately resists form are conditioned here by an open approach that draws together economics, geography, climo-geology, mentality and religious anthropology (to take a few keys from the titles that follow), in order to show the richness of historical material, and to describe the 'problem' of addressing these 'new' fields with appropriate (necessarily new or adapted) analytical tools. Tafuri would recognise, here, the same entropic approach as he introduces in 'Architettura e storiografia': confronting historical images with evidence that is both 'proper' to the image in an historical sense, but which undoes the image's tendency to 'flatten out' a complex and conflicting knowledge of the past. He binds this inextricably to the processes of research. Le Goff and Nora write that we find in the historical sciences a constant 'oscillation' between "lived history and constructed history, immediate and fabricated."[57]

The reflections of Tafuri and Le Goff and Nora correspond on a theoretical plane, too. The latter historians identify three 'processes' by which a new approach to historiography plays out within practice: they identify new *problems* in historiographic discourse; new *conclusions* to traditional historiography; and new historical *themes*. Consequently, these

---

55   Hoekstra rightly points to the connection that links the title of this book with the *IUAV* seminar series, *Fare storia*, which she synthesises in her dissertation. However, while she observes the connection between the title of this book and that of the conference, she does not appear to perceive the ongoing institutional endeavour to pursue those disciplinary quandaries that are paralleled between the pages of *Faire de l'histoire* and those of Tafuri's writings (principally in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*).—Cf. Hoekstra, ibid., pp. 10-15.

56   Le Goff and Nora, 'Presentazione' in *Fare storia*, ibid., p. vii. Orig. passage: "non c'è qui alcuna ortodossa, neppure quella più aperta."—our trans. However, in saying this, they are forced immediately into an apology for what appears to be a nationalist proposition for a new 'French' historiography (all the authors in the collection being French). The key line of their excuse, which enables us to treat them so readily (in fact) as an inheritance from the *Annales*, is their note that "gli autori mostrano una convergenza di formazioni, di preoccupazioni, di scopi vicini."—Ibid., pp. vii-viii.

57   Ibid., p. viii. Orig. wording: "la storia vissuta e la storia costuita, subita e fabbricata."—our trans.

parallel reflections draw parallel conclusions for the disciplinary mechanisms at stake in their analyses, if not in the substance of their 'results.' Both argue, that is to say, that in 'rethinking' historical practice, the themes brought to bear upon historical materials relate directly to the epistemological foundations of the 'discipline' within which they practice.[58] In other words, we show in this comparison of Tafuri's disciplinary declarations (in the two above-noted sources) that this brief index of the broader concerns posed in the field of historiography (in France, at least, though by its uptake in Italy, we feel comfortable noting its broader relevance), the clear relationship between, (a) the materials of history and their elucidation and, (b) the epistemological foundations of historical knowledge. That Tafuri and his (present) comparative examples both then point to the ideological dimension of their work is not surprising. Agreeing (indirectly) with Tafuri's terms, Le Goff and Nora recognise the problems of an historiographical tendency towards global, synthetic 'visions' of the past. They write:

> We extend social history into the history of social representation, of ideology, of mentality. It is a complex game of interactions and confusions rendering a simplistic recourse to notions of infrastructure and superstructure impossible.[59]

Their case is for a 'history of the present,' an 'immediate history,' a historiography that does not set up artificial boundaries between present and past in order to formulate more 'stable' models for treating the past scientifically, but in so doing 'neutralises' the *force* of the past in the present.[60] Their construction of themes (which, they allow earlier, have a place relative to the knowledge fields in which historians practice) traditionally implicates the construction of historical totalities.[61] Yet, with Le Goff and Nora, such themes as the history of cooking, or that of the book, which cut through social and economic barriers, open up material rather than close it down. The history of building,

---

58   Ibid.

59   Ibid., p. ix. Orig. passage: "La storia sociale si prolunga nella storia delle rappresentazione sociali, delle ideologie, delle mentalità. Esse vi scopre un gioco complesso di interazioni e di sfasature che rende impossibile il ricorso semplicistico alle nozioni d'infrastruttura e di sovrastruttura."—our trans.

60   Ibid., pp. ix-x. We can note, in passing, that this basic position is not, therefore exclusive to Tafuri, as Vidler seems to imply. Or, at least, if it is exclusive to Tafuri in architectural historical culture, then it has clear correlations *beyond* architecture.—Vidler, 'Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism, 1930-1975,' unpublished PhD dissertation, Technische Universiteit Delft, 2005, http://www.library.tudelft.nl/delftdiss/pdf/2005/arc_vidler-20051024.pdf (accessed November 15, 2005), p. 4 (3rd thesis).

61   Le Goff and Nora, ibid., p. x. To continue their point at length: "L'archaeologia moderna trasforma lo scavo in griglia di letture di sistema di oggetti; la storia economia di articola intorno a nozioni, come quella di crisi, che permettono di ritrovare, attraverso la congiuntura, il concatenarsi e il meccanismo di un insieme; oppure si supera integrando la storia economica seriale in una globilità in cui intervengono il fenomeno politico, quello psicologico, quello culturale. Del pari, la storia demografia complica i propri modelli, ricollocandoli negli insiemi di mentalità e di sistemi culturali. La storia religiosa, la storia letteratura, la storia delle scienze, la storia politica, la storia dell'arte oscillano egualmente verso una storia totale, mettendo a fuoco concetti globalizzanti come il sacro, il testo, il codice, il potere, il monumento."—Ibid., p. x.

in the same vein, would do likewise. In this sense, they point towards a "quantitative revolution in the historiographical ambit."[62]

However, they raise another important issue that relates directly to Tafuri's own institutional imperatives for addressing these questions and testing the limits of an architectural historical discipline in the University. If, Le Goff and Nora ask, the historiographical moves that break open the tendency to build up images draw the historian away from the traditional ambits of his or her practice, is it then legitimate to speak of the historian's disciplinary 'territory'? Does not the very notion of a *field* containing the materials, tools, techniques and methods of historiography preface the problems exposed both by Tafuri and by the 'new historiographers'? Le Goff and Nora observe: "Is there still an historical territory? Does history perhaps deceive us because, by definition, we attach it to time, the field of human experimentation? And does there reside the diversity of coexistent histories, also a single history, *History*?"[63] These terms return us precisely to a key point in Tafuri's thinking about the historian's practice. If we introduce, as Tafuri (we argue) has done, an instrumental (in a disciplinary sense) distinction between the past as an irrecoverable field—heterogeneous, unknowable in any authentic sense—and history as an artificial image responding to the ideological and institutional burdens of its maker (the historian) or to the forces that determine the practices of the historian's image-making, then we identify a clear correlation in disciplinary reflection between Tafuri and the French historians that originates, at least in part, in the same referent: Bloch and Febvre's identification of historiographical ideology. The intellectual innovation of both Tafuri and his French counterparts is thus the translation of this preoccupation with ideological formation into all kinds of historiographical formalising, counter-posing against image, fragment; against history's projection into the future, a present (though complex) exposure of the past.[64]

❦

Returning to our focus: while a substantial portion of 'Il "progetto" storico,' principally in the second half of the essay, reinforces (often, to the word) the argument of 'Architettura e storiografia,' the first half of the essay either introduces or restates Tafuri's critical relationships with a number of important philosophers and theoreticians. These include Foucault, who already receives Tafuri's attention in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*; Derrida, and by extension Nietzsche; Freud, as we have seen already; and Cacciari, whose

---

62 Ibid., p. xi. Orig. phrase: "rivoluzione quantitativa nell'ambito storiografico."—our trans.

63 Ibid. Our italics. Orig. passage: "Esiste ancora un territorio dello storico? Forse la storia illude perché, per definizione, si annette il campo della sperimentazione dell'umano, il tempo? E di là dalla diversità delle storie coesistente, esiste ancora una Storia, *la Storia*?"—our trans.

64 If we are to point to a moment when Tafuri predicates this argument in his own practice, it is in his scientific study of drawings of the Palazzo Carpegna. Therein, Tafuri takes upon the notion of an architectural (or perhaps, architectonic) 'mentality' to which one might hold evidence to account. We will return to this example in Chapter 7, but in different terms.—Tafuri, 'Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna. Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche,' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* XIV, nos. 79-84 (1967): 85-107.

importance for Tafuri we reiterate here, despite their well-known, long-term critical and personal relationship. The basic theoretical framework of this essay centres upon language as a metaphor for knowledge structures. In this, Tafuri's citation of a passage from Nietzsche's *Morgenrothe* (1881) offers a vital entry:

> Whenever the primitives established a word, they believed they had made a discovery (*Entdeckung*); they had met a problem and in the illusion that they had *solved* it, they created an obstacle to its solution. Today, for every bit of knowledge, one has to stumble across words which have become as petrified and solid and solid as stones. And one will break a leg on them instead of a word.[65]

He introduces a "series of problems" ("architecture, language, techniques, institutions, historical space") that normalise as linear constructions only when "the critic's goodwill makes his bad conscience explode."[66] Otherwise, he argues, Derrida's notion of language as a "system of differences" better informs the behaviour of these relationships: "History is both determined and determining: determined by its own traditions, by the objects it analyses, but the methods it adopts: also determining its own transformations as well as those of the reality it deconstructs."[67] Rather than translate the 'problems' of either architecture or architectural history into linguistic terms, he takes the complexities of language as an analogous starting point for understanding the contemporary complexities of historical practice.

At the outset of this essay, he asks if we can disrupt the conventional implications of such terms as architecture, language or technique. His declared goal is the antithesis of that tendency to which he alludes above (though avoiding specific references) in asking: "Can we challenge and split up the 'terms' used in order to trace them back to some subordinate or hidden structure that will allow them to find a basis for common meaning?" He here implicates the interrelated notions of 'genealogy' and 'technique' as posited by Foucault and addressed by Rella.[68] Genealogy, in this sense, turns away from a 'search for origins' ("against such an infantile wish to 'find the assassin'"); it does not identify causes but, like science, 'dissects.'[69] While Tafuri endorses the importance of this action, he indicates that the danger of Foucault's approach (and of Derrida's, by implication) to 'fragmented' or 'disarticulated' objects of knowledge lies in their ability to return these fragments to new narratives that develop their own internal logic. Thus Foucault's histories of "madness, clinics, punishment, sexuality" pose the additional problem of how to retain, in "a history written in the plural" the plurality of

---

65 Friedrich Nietzsche, *Morgenrothe* (*Aurora*), cited by Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' ibid., p. 61. Tafuri cites from the Italian edition of Nietzsche's *Opere*, edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari, vol. V, Italian trans. Sossio Giametta (Milan: 1965), pp. 215-216.

66 Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' ibid., p. 56.

67 Ibid.

68 Tafuri alludes to Rella's responses to Foucault.—Ibid., p. 57.

69 Ibid., pp. 57-58.

its theorisation. "History's task is not," he writes, "to draw back the 'Maja's veil' of truth, but rather to cut away that barriers that history itself erects, in order to proceed and surpass itself."[70] Tafuri 'agrees' with Foucault that 'power' insinuates itself everywhere. But to draw identifications, as Foucault does, between power and institutions is to ignore (he suggests) the very elusiveness of power. Turning this observation to his own 'critique of architectural ideology,' he observes:

> It is therefore correct to suspect that the criticism of architectural ideology, as it has been undertaken up to now, has only taken account of the most apparent and immediate features of this ideology: the refusals, removals, and introspections which run through the body of architectural writing.[71]

He defends, then, the legitimacy of identifying power structures and institutions, making them the targets of historical practice. However, the relationship between these two entities is substantially more involved than a linear historical narrative can ever possibly convey; the mechanics of their interaction is no longer sufficiently served by a simplified 'critique of ideology.'

Returning us to the programmatic uses of memory, Tafuri recalls Freud's importance to this relationship. Citing 'Der Mann Moses und Die Monotheistische Religion,' Tafuri likens the problem of historical memory to the historiographical 'murder' of Moses. As we noted in Chapter Four, underneath the trace evidence lies the 'real' event. The challenge of historical analysis (following a Freudian analytical model, as we have seen) is the recovery of those decisions that displace 'reality' in response to present day values.[72] Tafuri locates this displacement as bound up in 'language,' both metaphorically and discursively.

> Are not the language of history or the languages codified by critical analysis also 'spoken' through a series of censures, repressions, negations? Textual criticism, semantic criticism, iconological readings, the sociology of art, Foucaultian genealogy, our own criticism—are not all these so many techniques which only decipher by concealing the traces of 'murders' more or less conspicuously perpetrated?[73]

Tafuri positions, therefore, the language of criticism as a device for breaking open the Nietzschean 'words' of architectural ideology ("that which ought to 'move and break stones'"), but which in turn tends to become a stone itself. He asks: "How, then, can we use it so as to prevent it from becoming the instrument of a holy rite?"[74] Freud's

---

70   Ibid., p. 59.
71   Ibid., p. 59.
72   Ibid., p. 62.
73   Ibid., p. 63.
74   Ibid. This is the polemic of his earlier essay, '*L'architecture dans le boudoir*,' in which he observes the

demand that analysis be at once interminable and open to termination resonates with the quandary Tafuri identifies at stake in historical practice. In "the theme of origin," then, as one shared by both memory in a psychoanalytical sense and representation of past as intrinsic to historical practice, Tafuri draws together the notion of recovery and its reverse: the discovery of language, as by Nietzsche's 'primitives,' and the introduction of a new problem. In Freud's terms these are obstacles to mental health; applied by Tafuri to his own disciplinary concerns, they are artificial limits undermining the historian's capacity to pursue an ultimately unattainable access to 'reality,' which for him in an historiographical sense refers to 'the past.'

At stake, then, is a basic obstacle introduced by French post-structuralist discourse: the simultaneous resistance to and necessity for limits to discursive plurality, a condition endeavouring to extricate knowledge from the power mechanisms of institutions while avoiding the dissolution of critical practice into mere linguistic games. Tafuri is quick to dismiss Deleuze and Guattari: he declares the validation of their "metaphysics of desire" as an "perverse but always possible act"; their interpretation of "ideological bundles in their complex interactions" as 'rhizomes' intoning "hymns to the irrational."[75] Tafuri senses the danger identified by Nietzsche ("he who reaches perfect knowledge faces annihilation") in Derrida's establishment of 'differences' and 'disseminations': "the reconsecration of microscopically analyzed fragments into new autonomous unities which are meaningful in themselves."[76]

He aligns his own 'historical project' with the "divorce between the signifier and signified" characterising the 'linguistic turn' of Freudian psychoanalytic theory from modern medical practice to the analysis of modernity: "How much longer must we lament to those who are nostalgic for 'centrality' that at present there is really no other possibility ...?"[77] However, he is not yet ready to turn '*historical space*' over to discursive formulations. He accepts that science must "dissect and not ... assemble," but remains suspicious of those who can, with their 'easy readings' "violate words and texts, construct fascinating geneaologies, hypnotically illuminate historical knots."[78] Tafuri defends, in other words, the 'reality' of 'historical space' without protecting it from the 'crisis' towards which it is forced by historical analysis. To rephrase, the theoretical and

---

critical difficulties of architecture's entry (with specific reference to the 'New York Five') into critico-theoretical debates outside of architecture, returning these to architecture itself. This theme, like many others introduced here, could sustain a great deal more attention, but we will address it on another occasion. As the first of Tafuri's publications in *Oppositions* (though not his first English-language publication, which was in Ambasz's *The New Domestic Landscape*) and a text drawn from an important lecture at Princeton University (1974), it becomes a key moment in any discussion (to which we will return later) of Tafuri's reception by the East Coast academe.—Tafuri, '*L'architecture dans le boudoir*: The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language," trans. Victor Caliandro, *Oppositions*, no. 3 (1974): 37-67. We refer also to 'Design and Technological Utopia,' *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape, Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*, ed. Emilio Ambasz (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972), pp. 388-404.

75   Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' pp. 60, 65.

76   Ibid., pp. 58-59.

77   Ibid., p. 61.

78   Ibid., p. 63.

disciplinary challenge posed of the historian's craft as articulated in 'Il "progetto" storico' remains that of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*: how to conduct an historical practice able to destabilise knowledge of the past without institutionalising that same practice as a stabilising force. "The real problem," he writes, "is how to design a critique able constantly to call itself into a crisis while forcing reality into a state of crisis."[79]

<center>❧</center>

By identifying this as a fundamental question posed of 'Il "progetto" storico,' we can understand the moment in which Tafuri's theoretical and disciplinary interests meet those of Rella. As we noted at the outset of this chapter, Tafuri's essay is too often read solely in terms of his own theoretical agenda; returning it to stand alongside the much shorter essay 'Il paradosso della ragione,' we invoke the 'collaboration' that sparked both pieces. In an echo of the original context of Tafuri's essay, Rella raises the problem of language in parallel terms to Tafuri, extending a discussion on language and *superlangage* to bring it to bear upon rational thought. Like Tafuri, Rella understands that a 'crisis' of classical thought calls for new analytical tools, although Tafuri takes this observation as a starting point from which to develop (as an historian) tools for analysing (reiterating our point above, with respect to 'Architettura e storiografia') the 'historical cycle of Classicism.'[80] As a rational architectural language, the Classical tradition forced an intellectual divorce based 'language' and 'nature.' We have encountered this same dichotomy elsewhere, under different guises: as Order and Nature, for instance, or Order and Chaos, or (even) Architecture and city. In his wider view, Rella argues that the 'crisis' of the Classical (the same as that identified by Tafuri) is fundamentally linguistic in its nature, though here 'language,' too, is invoked as analogy. He begins his essay: "The crisis of the classical system has signified, historically, the end, the liquidation of every illusion recomposing the multiplicity of languages in *one* complex language, which could turn the contradictory plurality of the real into *reason*."[81] This 'crisis,' Rella claims, forces all the adherent 'techniques' of Classical knowledge—its tools, languages and critical criteria—into a crisis state, within which the fragmentation of a single complex language into truly distinct fragments (no longer of a whole) predicates a fundamental incapacity to translate from one 'language' or 'technique' in another. When composed as a unitary (if intricate) system of 'languages,' there always remained a path *between* languages; in their divorce, Rella argues, we can still approximate, but can not translate between them with any 'decency.' He cites Cacciari in identifying the 'present' impossibility of translating, for (his) example, politics into a metaphysical realm whereby we can speak of the 'language of the political' in order to move it into other 'linguistic'

79   Ibid.

80   Tafuri, 'Architettura e storiografia,' p. 279.

81   Rella, 'Il paradosso della ragione,' p. 107. Orig. passage: "La crisi del sistema classico ha significato, storicamente, la fine, la liquidazione, di ogni illusione di ricomporre la moltiplicità dei linguaggi in *un* linguaggio complesso, che potesse *avere ragione* della pluralità contraditoria del reale."—our trans.

spheres: literature, architecture, art, or history. When put into play with, and thus held accountable to, these (now) 'untranslatable' languages, the resultant 'clash' forces the perpetual renegotiation of their internal constitution and of their external relationship with 'the real.'[82]

Where Mario Tronti positions the consequences of this 'clash' (for political practice, at least) as an "*autonomia senza residui*," Rella argues

> that *none* of the elements that we produce in a crisis can be resolved without leaving residues, without producing margins that continually displace, which continually corrode or explode the limits of every discourse, also of the political.[83]

He regards the 'task' of analysing the crisis, as it stands, as inescapable in the face of a tendency towards 'regressive irrationalism.' He, as Tafuri, takes explicit exception to the "desire without object" of Deleuze, with Foucault's translation of power into "terms of fantastical dispersion" and with "the 'idle chatter' of 'appearances' in our lacanianism."[84] These *dispositivi* do not express the tension of an 'irrational' and 'regressive' recovery of (lost) totality. This is the paradox of reason of Rella's title, that pro and con belong to the same 'polyvalent reality,' which can be thrown into revolt without loss.

> The task is properly this: to revolt against the statutes of Reason, which has expelled behaviours and needs from its own practices without loosing itself, without loss of Reason, in order to reconstruct a conflicting reality, *to reconstruct the reality of its conflicts*.[85]

Rella thus properly directs his criticism at a discursive logic that does not expose itself outside of self-referential and clever displays of the twists and turns open to discourse itself. Rather than seeking any engagement with the 'real,' it simulates its own reality. Thus the 'crisis' of disciplines is averted by a strategy that shifts the experience of disciplinary structures being exposed and undermined into a virtual realm, where disciplines internally simulate that critical experience that would otherwise be meted

---

82   Ibid. On this point, see the insightful essay by John Macarthur, 'Technique and the Clash of Languages: Some Thoughts on Tafuri's *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*,' *Transition: Discourse on Architecture*, no. 32 (1991): 6-21.

83   Rella, ibid., pp. 107-108. Orig. passage: "che *nessuno* degli elimenti, che si producono nella crisi, possa risolversi senza lasciare residui, senza produrre quei margini che spostano continuamente, che continuamente corrodono o fanno esplodere, i limiti disciplinari di ogni discorso, e anche del politico."—our trans.

84   Ibid., p. 108. The original wording: "desiderio senza oggetto"; "termini di dispersione fantasmatica"; "il chiacchereccio dei 'sembianti' del lacanismo nostrano."—our trans.

85   Ibid. Orig. passage: "Il compito è proprio questo: rivoltarsi contro gli statuti della ragione, che ha espulso da sé pratiche e comportamenti e bisogni determinati, senza pedersi, senza pedere la ragione, per ricostruire la realtà conflittuale, *per ricostruire la realtà dei suoi conflitti*."—our trans.

out to them through a continued engagement with unmediated knowledge, artefacts, documents, etc. He observes: "This *will to loss*, in fact, results from its power."[86]

The challenge that Tafuri advances as proper to historical practice, 'calling itself into crisis' while 'calling reality into crisis,' involves two basic presuppositions to which Rella, in turn, attends. The first premise is that in order for a discipline to call itself into crisis, it must recognise those places where 'crisis' ferments and perform a critical action thereupon. Secondly, to recognise these sites of crisis, and to enact an operation that can simultaneously throw open an internal *and* external crisis, to destabilise, that is, 'reality,' a discipline must in fact have an ongoing 'experience' of reality. In the discursive practices to which Rella points, their retreat into the 'ghetto of the irrational' ensures that their critical concerns—the 'dominant reason' that prevails—enter precisely that zone that Tafuri regards as anathema to a critical practice: new values of 'mythology,' "of the non-place of utopia, not even intended any more as the 'project,' but assumed as the joining of practice and disparate behaviours, ferociously incapable of 'working' the crisis, of crossing it, of acting it."[87] The programmatic antagonism of post-structuralism, while framed as an epistemological response to '1968' (a different '1968' than that to which we elsewhere refer), fails (in Rella's eyes) to enact an operation upon the 'real.' Despite the public intellectual status of Foucault, Derrida and Lyotard, for instance, Rella implicates them in this judgement, barely implicit, which within a year he repeats in *Il dispositivo Foucault*.[88] The latter conference itself attests to the value of reflecting upon the innovations in philosophy or in history made possible by a thinker such as Foucault, but the moves to open 'knowledge' that they enable are not fair-trade for their tendency towards disengagement.[89]

---

86 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "Questa volontà di perdita è, di fatto, il risultato della *sua* volontà di potenza."—our trans.

87 Ibid., pp. 108-109. Orig. passage: "del non-luogo dell'utopia, nemmeno più intesa come 'progetto,' ma assunta come insieme di practiche e comportamento disperatamente e ferocemente incapaci di 'lavore' la crisi, di attraversarla, di agirla."—our trans.

88 While we are not citing Rella directly on this point, he indicates the importance of Cacciari's contribution to *Il dispositivo Foucault* on 'the politica' in Deleuze and Foucault, wherein the 'national' cases of France and Italy experience conflict over the intellectual status of 'power' and 'action.'—Cacciari, 'Il problema del politico in Deleuze e Foucault (sul pensiero di "Autonomia" e di '… "Gioco"' in *Il dispositivo Foucault*, ed. Rella, pp. 57-66. In addition to Cacciari's essay and Rella's lengthy introduction (double the length of other contributions), the book (documenting a seminar of the same name) contains papers by Teyssot (on heterotopia, pp. 23-36), Tafuri (on discursive practice, pp. 37-46) and Rella (on the 'political economy' of the body, pp. 47-56).

89 In fact, we can refer to Tafuri's paper in making this case with some balance: "Ponevo all'inizio il problema di come mai il Foucault abbia bisogno di smettere sè stesso, vale a dire di usare—senza accorgersene direi—practiche discorsive egli dichiara non compenetrabili, differente, tecniche linguistiche diverse, per confirmare enunciati già da lui precostituiti altraverso altri tipi di indagine. Azzardo questo ipotesi: che analisi del testo, per Foucault, non sia nient'altro che un pretesto, nel senso letterale del termine. Ogni testo per Foucault, è un pretesto, nel senso che è un *pre-testo* vero e proprio: è un testo *che viene prima o dopo*, troppo presto e troppo tardi. Cosa egli può non assolutamente indagare una volta isolate practiche di discorso da practiche di dominio, quindi da practiche che hanno un contenuto politico preciso? In 'ceci n'est pas une pipe,' cosa tiene insieme la pipa rappresentata, quindi il dominio sull'immagine, e 'ceci n'est pas une pipe,' la scrittura? Uno spazio impossibile per Foucault. Non lo chiameremmo lo 'spazio del scontro,' ignorata da Foucault. Cioè, che cosa è avvenuto? Che la 'dispersione,' quella che Derrida chiamerà la 'disseminazione'—ma direi che la 'disseminazione' di vari discorsi e delle varie practiche avviene in Foucault non sulla metafisica, come in Derrida, ma sulle practiche significanti—che questa 'dispersione,' questa 'disseminazione' delle trace non può più dar luogo

Returning his argument to the realm of the political, he suggests that such 'slogans' as "il personale è politico," insofar as they neither expose nor problematise either discursive formulations (in a Foucaultian sense), or political practice (insofar as this constitutes a 'real' condition), have limited value unless they constitute 'nodes' "in the process of which a series of needs, historically determined, become political and, if they allow, *demonstrate* and *transform* these needs."[90] That is to say, the importance of a political discourse, for Rella, lies in the nature of its engagement with conditions beyond discourse. A slogan need not project the future, in the sense of Tafuri's *critica operativa*. Rather, in the encounter of ideas with the 'real,' both the theoretical questions *and* the materials to which they are addressed are called upon to test themselves as to the limits of their validity.[91] Rella's general analogy echoes Tafuri's call for historical practice, whereby the 'real' is (for Tafuri) the 'past.'

Rella's terms become quickly comparable to those used by Tafuri when Rella considers the implications of adapting the thinking of Freud to problems of knowledge, analysis and discipline. He writes that it has become impossible to speak of any interaction between the rational and irrational without also talking about the relationship between reality and its 'names,' between that which is and the 'mythology' that controls it. Despite the additional layers that Freud has endured at the hands of Lacan and his disciplines,

> what I mean to say is that we have cultured nobody like Freud in the 'rationalisation' of the separate and non-universal languages, already [and here is where the relationship between Rella's and Tafuri's parallel analyses becomes important] a formation of compromise, which tends, as such, to render unassailable … those grand ideological formations that historically sought to heal 'the discomfort of civility.'[92]

---

a nessuna 'ricostruzione,' ma principalmente non dà nessuno 'spazio dello scontro,' non dà più luogo a nessuno 'spazio del conflitto.'"—Tafuri, 'Letture del testo e practiche discorsive,' ed. Rella, pp. 43-44. For a more considered approach to the 'meeting' of Foucault and Tafuri, consider Macarthur, ibid., pp. 13-16.

90   Rella, 'Il paradosso della ragione,' p. 109. Orig. passage: "nel processo in cui una serie di bisogni, storicamente determinati divengono politici, e se ci permette di *mostrare* e *trasformare* questi bisogni."—our trans.

91   Rella extends his argument in the following paragraph by considering what happens in a practical sense (though, we might say, still dealing with abstractions) in an historical treatment of the working class. Treating, historiographically, the notion of a 'natural' totality to which there exists an 'other' as ghost, in contraposition to that which is "nella società e nella storia," results in a distinction between dominant class and other that rests on distinctions bound up in "il fantasma del capitale." Any treatment of these power structures in these strict, traditional, terms, reinforces, in fact, the subjugation of that same working class that such a critique would purport to undermine. The kind of critical actions necessary in the face of this 'closing down' of discourse needs, rather, to cut through theoretical and practical structures, to expose "[i] margini 'incomprensibili' alla ragione dominante si affirmino."—Ibid.

92   Ibid., p. 110. Orig. passage: "[mi] para cioè che nessuno come Freud abbiamo colto come anche la 'razionalizzazione' dei linguaggi separati e non universali, sia una *formazione di compromesso*, che tende, in quanto tale, a farsi inattaccabile alla critica, allo stesso modo in cui si sono rese … inattaccabile alla critica le grandi formazioni ideologiche, attraverso cui si è cercato storicamente di sanare 'il disagio della civiltà.'"—our trans.

For Rella, therefore, as for Tafuri, "the critical, analytical task … is *interminable*."[93] Yet the interminability of the critico-analytical practices implicated by this judgement—among which is surely Tafuri's architectural history—is a 'device.' It keeps knowledge of the 'real' open in order to resist the tendency towards homogeneity; it tends, itself, and at any disciplinary costs, towards heterogeneity. However, when the interminable action is known, when the discipline is conscious of the incursions that cut right to its interior to expose its homogeneity, to treat its languages, its 'diverse disciplinary fields,' to undertake an operation towards 'heterogeneity,' the analysis risks simply removing 'reason' from the equation, reconstituting it as a mere *simulation* of heterogeneity.[94] This risk, put otherwise, is one of adopting and maintaining a 'normative language' to guard disciplinary thresholds.

> However, we will see, then, that … a realised model of reason that serves for its non-universality can recreate itself as a 'strong reason,' which by virtue of its being firmly built as a defence against the invasion of heterogeneity, once again results in a given reading behaving as a *non-analytical* practice.[95]

He indicates Tronti's 'political autonomy' as a case of an analysis that dictates the terms of its own heterogeneity, recognising at once its use in breaking open the epistemological field, but the dangers inherent to its maintenance of a critical form. Paraphrasing Cacciari (and we after him), he notes that a rational cannot be established either upon a 'crisis' *or upon a 'general' critique.* The 'language' of criticism, as such, will assume "the force of a metalanguage," replacing one hegemony with another.[96]

Rella's 'paradox' of reason therefore implicates the capacity within reason to oppose itself 'without perdition.' That is, the paradox lies in the *necessity* (today, Rella would 214 write) to force all reason into an act of self-opposition, whatever its original aims; he thus includes even the most reactionary, avant-garde constructions. Ironically, it is in this very act of transgressing reason's wholeness that (for Rella, and for Tafuri), lies the 'becoming of reason.' In other words, 'reason' is the capacity to oppose the 'self,' and this without loss. For Tafuri, and history, therefore, these terms translate into analysis of the past and treatment of those images that arise from historical practices. Following on from Rella, Tafuri agrees with his conclusion (if 'Il "progetto" storico' allows us to judge), claiming that historical practice necessitates throwing everything into doubt. 'History' (in a disciplinary sense) remains a viable entity, though, because the perpetual casting of knowledge into doubt is not the same thing as dismissing it out of hand, casting it aside. In such terms, Rella's distinction then between 'reason' as a general target of critical

---

93   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "il compito critico, analitico … è *interminabile*."—our trans.

94   Ibid.

95   Ibid. Orig. passage: "Vedremo, allora, realizzarsi … il modello di una ragione, che avendo scontata, la sua non-universalità, si ricompone comunque come 'ragione forte,' e che proprio in virtú del suo costuirsi saldamente come difesa dall'irruzione dell'eterogeneo, finisce ancora una volta per dettare legge, comportamento, practiche *inanalizzate*."—our trans.

96   Ibid., pp. 110-111. Orig. phrase: ""la forze di *un* metalinguaggio."—our trans.

actions and 'the model' as a specific target becomes important in understanding the abstract claims that Tafuri makes in reflecting upon historical practice.[97] The importance (for Tafuri) of synchronously calling into question the materials and methods of research corresponds readily to the availability of models (for Rella) as critical objectives, implicating (again) both materials, as defined fields of study, and methods (as fixed approaches).

<p style="text-align:center">❧</p>

While Rella appears to perceive the 'proper' field of application of these ideas as being that of political practice or, indeed, an intellectual political engagement with the 'real,' Tafuri returns the results of his enquiry squarely to an *historical* practice. Nonetheless, the parallel terms that we identify in both of their 1977 essays, 'Il "progetto" storico' and 'Il paradosso della ragione,' lends substance to a broader intellectual claim they make in unison. That is to say, in both texts, in both *frutti di collaborazione*, we find a strong claim for 'belief' in the 'real,' a groundedness that prompts an intellectual accountability for the historian's (for example) practice. Insofar as Rella and Tafuri both argue that the dissolution of critico-analytical practices into the discursive realm constitutes a retreat from engagement, even if it continues (in their observations) to simulate engagement *within* discourse, they both identify the need to return intellectual activity to a real, present moment. As we have seen elsewhere, Tafuri's critique of historians labelled operative in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, the basic premise for the kind of historical practice he formalises, to an extent, in Venice and in the constitution of the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* in relation to *IUAV* as a wider faculty, demands the return of historical studies to the present moment in an action of accountability. This is not, we assert, in order to rationalise the past in present terms; nor is it to reconstitute history as 'lessons' for contemporary practice. Rather, in the complex interplays between historical practice and publication, education and exhibition and, on the other hand, the delivery of a message of the fundamental heterogeneity of the historical field to the present, Tafuri finds a mode of *historical* practice that eludes, in theory, the traps of 'language.' Yet, following Rella's passing critique of Tronti's *critica dell'ideologia*, all forms of practice that busy themselves with elucidating the heterogeneous and complex nature of knowledge—of the 'real,' or of the 'past'—are likewise subject to the tendency towards homogeneity, reason, 'language.'

We find resonance between this plea, enacted by Tafuri and Rella in terms of epistemology and practice, and that of the *nouvelle histoire* considered earlier. Where the two Italians, themselves indexing a broader debate, sense dangers inherent to all forms of the relationship between knowledge and it representation, the French community conscious of the 'legacy' of the *Annales* frames this concern in terms specific to historical practice. Tafuri's critical and methodological encounter, then, with Carlo Ginzburg

---

97   Ibid., p. 111.

is interesting, positioned between a closely paid attention to new developments in historiography *and* an acute appreciation of the epistemological debates opened up (joined, more accurately) here, by Tafuri and (more particularly) Rella. As a reference in 'Il "progetto" storico,' Ginzburg is the one most obviously absent from our preceding synthesis, for Tafuri begins with an extraordinary epigraph drawn from *Giochi di pazienza*. The paragraph regularly reappears in analyses of Tafuri's historiography. However, in that it has some bearing on the connectivity of these two debates—knowledge and history—and illustrates remarkably well the 'dangers' of historical practical to which Tafuri alerts us, we risk reciting this passage from the eighth session of Ginzburg and Prosperi's seminar 'sul Beneficio del Cristo.'

> Sometimes (but not always) there is a moment during research when, as in a game of solitaire, all the pieces begin to fall into place. But unlike the game of solitaire, where the pieces are within reach and there is only one figure to compose (so that the exactitude of the moves is precise and immediately controllable), in research the pieces are only partially available, and more than one figure is theoretically possible. In playing solitaire, one always takes risks more or less consciously, using the pieces like blocks in a toy construction kit. For this reason, the fact that everything falls into place is an ambiguous clue: it is either completely right or completely wrong. In the latter case, external verification is replaced by the selection or solicitation (more or less deliberate) of evidence, forcing it to confirm the more or less explicit presuppositions of the research. The dog thinks he bites a bone and instead bites his tail.[98]

This passage is often regarded as a declaration of Tafuri's alliance with the research methodology 'formalised' by Ginzburg and Levi in Einaudi's *Microstorie* series. Certainly, after this explicit acknowledgement of Ginzburg's work, Tafuri's contributes two titles to the *Microstorie* series: *L'armonia e i conflitti*, co-authored with Antonio Foscari (1983), and *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985), themselves models of a response, in architectural historiography, to *Giochi di pazienza*.[99] In *Venezia e il rinascimento*, too, we find the closest application (even if limited) in Tafuri's bibliography to the historiographical theorisation of Le Goff and Nora in *Faire de l'histoire*. However, this example alone gives us pause to stop short of readily handing over Tafuri's methodology entire to either the *nouvelle histoire* or *microstoria*.[100] *Venezia e il rinascimento*, as we will observe in Chapter Eight,

---

98   Ginsburg and Prosperi, ibid., p. 85; Tafuri, 'The Historical "Project",' p. 55.

99   Tafuri and Antonio Foscari, *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983); Tafuri, *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985).

100   Peter Burke makes an interesting comment in the acknowledgements for *The French Historical Revolution*. He thanks a number of historians, including Ginzburg, "who have, like myself, tried to combine their involvement with *Annales* with a measure of detachment from it."—Ibid., p. vii. We claim, following this logic, a measure of involvement on Tafuri's part with *microstoria* (and, further, *Annales*) that also comes conditioned by a measure of detachment.

draws together a net cast widely over philosophical and historiographical constructions, bridging, to echo the 1977 'exchange' recounted above, the intellectual and material fields in which knowledge lies.

Microstoria, then, is one of several historiographical devices set to work by Tafuri in order to elucidate the dual subjects at stake in his study (literally, 'Venice' and 'the Renaissance'), and which ought to prevent us from easily treating this book, and *L'armonia e i conflitti*, and (by extension) *Ricerca del rinascimento*, as prostheses to Ginzburg's own historiographical preoccupations and experiments, interesting and important though they have proven to be.[101] Just as Tafuri does not emulate the ideological conflict that Rella instigates with contemporary French thought (with the important exception, on Tafuri's part, of Foucault), neither does he draw directly from the historiographical strategies of Ginzburg. His work rather enters Tafuri's consciousness within a general and ongoing reflection on the nature of historical practice and on the relationship *between* that practice and the materials open to it. Tafuri certainly endorses the privilege that Ginzburg accords the research process, the unpredictable consequences of treating material, following unexpected trails and clues, juxtaposing narrative with fragments of knowledge extracted from libraries, diaries and published literature. But neither this, nor the exceptional example of historical practice that Ginzburg leaves from this moment (neither can we hold him to an enduring 'image' of his practice) justifies seeing Tafuri's work from the late 1970s solely through this methodological lens. Consequently, we argue here for a continuous line of enquiry extending from *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (perhaps even further back, from *Ludovico Quaroni*), through these years and on to *Ricerca del rinascimento*. That this enquiry shifts in its referents and language from one year to the next, on occasion, is evidence of the self-critique that it claims, therein, to conduct. Yet it is precisely the tenets of this enquiry that renders it impossible to trace a red thread of referents from one 'period' to the next.

Ginzburg, for instance, is completely absent from Tafuri's 1975 essay. He has no place, if this text is a barometer, in Tafuri's theorisation of the practice of architectural history roughly up to the point at which the dominance of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* as a model of his historical practice starts to wane. He acquires, though (as we have seen), a key position in the essay published two years later. While Tafuri himself does not link these two essays as a development, he does not return to the themes or subject of 'Architettura e storiografia' *except* in 'Il "progetto" storico,' and does not return at all, after that, to the pool of structuralist and linguistic referents therein, except insofar as he restates them through self-quotation. During this time, Ginzburg's work itself becomes increasingly visible after the publication of *Giochi di pazienza*. The book would have easily caught Tafuri's attention; his citation is ample evidence that in the intervening months he read and assimilated this book and its 'example.' While we might conjecture that Tafuri also looked for other works by Ginzburg, which included several publications from the late 1960s, this would ultimately prove unimportant with respect of our present

---

[101] Tafuri, *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1992).

case. At precisely the moment when Tafuri declares the limits of historical practice open, albeit to politicised ends, corresponding to the call made simultaneously in France by the *nouvelle histoire*, and both (in turn) taking cues from the *Annales*, Ginzburg steps forwards. In so doing, *Giochi di pazienza* demonstrates one form of practice under the terms of this (evidently widespread) historiographical imperative, proposing a way of *fare storia* privileging materials and the research *process*, documenting both evidence of the past *and* how history, in fact, is made.

<p style="text-align:center">❧</p>

In this, and alongside Rella, Ginzburg makes an important contribution to a 'national' debate on the relationship between 'knowledge' and the 'real.' We will not undertake the daunting task of synthesising the basic points of this discourse, except to indicate that it did not raise concerns that were fundamentally different to those that Tafuri writes of. In fact, we can readily trace 'Il "progetto" storico' into this debate via Rella's agency, through our principal index to this *argomento*: the collection *Crisi della ragione* (1979).[102] Admittedly, this book gives us with a very narrow window onto this general discussion. However, there are several points it introduces that we do well to bring into play in considering the resonances between Tafuri's 'Il "progetto" storico,,' Rella's writing of the same moment (both 'Il paradosso della ragione' and his introduction to *La critica freudiana*), as well as a more general interest in the theme of 'reason' and the 'real.' *Crisi della ragione* collects together ten essays (including Aldo Gargani's lengthy introduction) that, title after title, implicate broad philosophical themes: Giulio Lepschy on 'Linguistica, scienza e razionalità'; Francesco Orlando on 'Retorica dell'illuminismo e negazione freudiana'; Vittorio Strada on 'Interpretare e trasformare'; Nicola Badaloni on 'Ragione e mutamento'; Remo Bodei on 'Modelli e prospettive di razionalità,' his main title 'Comprendere, modificarsi'; Salvatore Veca on 'Modi della ragione'; and Carlo Augusto Viano on 'La ragione, l'abbodanza e la credenza.' In this book, Ginzburg first publishes his seminal essay on historical evidence, 'Spie.' Rella returns to the themes of 'Il paradosso della ragione' in his new essay 'Il discredito della ragione,' on the subject of practice for Freud and Lacan.[103]

We need not recount the argument of Ginzburg's 'Spie' to position this essay as a methodological polemic that finds corollaries in his famous *microstorie*: *Il formaggio e i vermi*, *Indagini su Piero*, *Storia notturna*, etc.[104] However, we note with interest that the

---

[102] Aldo Gargani, ed., *Crisi della ragione. Nuovi modelli nel rapporto tra sapere e attivita umane* (Turin: Einaudi, 1979).

[103] Carlo Ginzburg, 'Spie. Radici di un paradigma indiziario,' *Crisi della ragione*, ed. Gargani, pp. 57-106; Franco Rella, 'Il discredito della ragione,' ed. Gargani, ibid., pp. 147-178. Ginzburg's essay would later form the basis of one of his key books, *Miti, emblemi, spie. Morfolgia e storia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1986). Even earlier than Ginzburg, Rella would elaborate these themes in his referential book *Il silenzio e le parole. Il pensiero nel tempo della crisi* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1981). In *Crisi della ragione*, the abovementioned essays occupy, respectively, the following pages: Lepschy, pp. 107-125; Orlando, pp. 127-146; Strada, pp. 179-196; Bodei, pp. 197-240; Badaloni, pp. 241-278; Veca, pp. 279-302; Viano, pp. 303-366.

[104] Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermi. Un cosmo di un mugnaio del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1976); *Indagini su Piero*.

relationship between 'Spie' and Ginzburg's practice parallels the relationship between 'Il "progetto" storico' and Tafuri's historiography. For both historians, the past is not a matter of discourse, but of real evidence that lies (nevertheless) in a discursive field. Ginzburg's approach to evidence lies precisely in recovering sufficient evidence to 'name the murderer,' bringing the weight of historiographical experience to bear upon the 'mystery.' One clue holds no intrinsic value that renders it more vital than another, each piece of evidence builds up a more substantial historical image. However, because evidence is itself heterogeneous—entries in a diary, an object, 'mentality,' economic trajectories, a signature, meeting minutes—the image does not approximate a recoverable truth. The historian, Ginzburg recognises, by mediating between evidentiary traces and drawing them together (following leads that they themselves 'suggest'), acknowledges the capacity to impose resolution upon an heterogeneous field. The privilege he accords the evidence above 'language' or 'image' is clear in *Giochi di pazienza*. The 'clues' of research suggest the ensuing directions it can take. The outcome is neither divorced from its 'clues,' nor is the evidence filtered through a thesis. Pervading Ginzburg's practice is the recognition that clues index reality, which for both he and Tafuri is the unrecoverable past. However, recognising the past as a real and complex field renders the evidence that extends forwards to exist in the present moment more powerful as materials of practice than discourse, ideology, or theory. Equally, though, they are not *fact*, because the clue which remains relative as an index cannot embody in itself the entirety of the world (or past) that it 'survives.' To repeat: more clues, for both Ginzburg and Tafuri, do not mean more truth; a greater amount of knowledge of any specific past corresponds to the recognition of that same past's complexity.

Rella's argument concerns *knowledge* rather than history, but his ideas concur nonetheless with Ginzburg's. While Freud appears in Ginzburg's 'Spie' as 'evidence' (a curious turn), for Rella, Freud lends weight to an analytical practice that contends both with the techniques of analysis and with the material itself. We have already seen that Rella appropriates, for an independent critico-analytical practice, Freud's capacity to subject the target of analysis to a simultaneous operation of criticism and self-criticism. The self-critical dimension of this analytical practice necessitates holding 'discourse' accountable to the real. Importantly, he begins his essay with the same invocation of Nietzsche's *Morgenrothe* that we encountered in 'Il "progetto" storico.'[105] The capacity for language, and for 'theory' as an analogous linguistic construction—at a remove from that which it 'names'—to prise 'the real,' the past, from its representation constitutes an intellectually divisive move. We have already noted that Rella directs (alongside Tafuri) this criticism at Foucault's historiography; he is too ready, they claim, to declare that all knowledge belongs to a discursive terrain. Rella reiterates, here, the importance of a 'present day' reading of Freud's case for the balance between interminability as a

---

Il battesimo, il Ciclo di Arezzo, il Flagellazione di Urbino (Turin: Einaudi, 1981); *Storia notturna. Una decifrazzione del sabba* (Turin: Einaudi, 1989).

[105] Rella, 'Il discredito della ragione,' p. 149.

condition of analysis—of knowledge, or of the past, which can forever sustain deeper and deeper study—and terminability as a condition that the analyst—the historian, in the case of Tafuri and Ginzburg—imposes upon it. The 'crisis of reason,' felt by historical practice, for instance, and specifically by Tafuri (and by Ginzburg, we would propose), lies in the resistance, simultaneously, of historical images and theoretical actions to negate those same images. Tafuri responds, as does Ginzburg—each in their own way, though often in parallel—to this 'crisis' by devising (different) structures for formalising research, so that the images one *could* draw from a 'concluded' (if potentially interminable) historical analysis signal their own methodological provisionality. That is to say, Tafuri installs through the structures of his research, as (more famously) does Ginzburg, clear indications that the research could go on indefinitely. A finished book, therefore, comprises a *documentation* that is bound into the *processes* of research and is not a derivation *of* that research.

Tafuri's contribution to this debate, we propose, lies in his sustained theorisation of the 'project' as a 'weak' vehicle, privileging research over history *per se*. Proper to his concept of architectural disciplinarity, it is ultimately a literal projection, a utopian gesture that belongs in the 'not yet.' Yet in positioning historical research as a 'project,' and doing so with evident irony by placing project in inverted commas, Tafuri signals the interchange between evidence (as the material of research) and image (a 'natural' consequence of publication) as being, in itself, a provisional and interminable interaction. He writes, in 'Il "progetto" storico,' of the historian's imperative to attend to his or her analytical tools lest they transmorph into theoretical devices, merely *simulating* the desired interminability of historical practice while moving further and further (stumbling over words) away from the material of study. We note the synchrony, therefore, between the positions occupied by Tafuri, Rella and Ginzburg relative to the interplay between discourse and the real, on one hand, those sketched out a few years later by Vattimo and Rovatti in their articulation of *il pensiero debole*.[106] Framed as both an approach to knowledge and a metaphor for other analytical practices, their notion of weakness is an extension upon Tafuri's historical practice, especially accounting for the terms of 'Il "progetto" storico.' In recognising that Vattimo and Rovatti here build upon the *Crisi della ragione*, and in positioning Tafuri as an adjunct participant in that debate (he at least appears in the footnotes), we wish to suggest, in conclusion, Tafuri's real contribution to the theorisation of 'weakness.' We do not argue for the recovery of Tafuri's 'proper' place in the 'real' debate—this, after all, is something readily traced through the publications and meetings that came to define this image (which, after all, it became)—or the equivalency of the 'reason' debate with that on 'weakness.'[107]

---

[106] Gianni Vattimo and Pier Aldo Rovatti, *Il pensiero debole* (Milan: Feltrinelli, 1984).

[107] We find an early response to Vattimo and Rovatti in *aut aut*, no. 201 (May-June 1984). Entitled 'Il pensiero debole. Temi e variazioni,' the editors note: "Riprendiamo in questa sezione la proposta avanzata nel volume collettivo *Il pensiero debole*. I testi che seguono ipotizzano linee di ricerca, variazione e critiche nell'ambito dello spazio teoretico individuato da tale problematica."—p. 1. With reference to the relation of *aut aut* to the other writers mentioned in this chapter, it is useful to note that the journal, founded by philosopher Enzo Paci, counted Vattimo and Rovatti amongst its editorial board, and sev-

While the *pensiero debole* discourse extends that discourse of *Crisi della ragione* by claiming *all* reality as provisional—constructed with bases in the real, but irrecoverable in an unmediated sense—Tafuri and Ginzburg both remain confronted by 'evidence.' For this reason, the form that this debate takes immediately prior to its dissolution into a form of weakness permitting equivocation remains that with the most enduring implications for disciplinary historical debate. The introduction of weakness as a *force*, in the sense proper to the physical sciences, retains its importance (theoretically speaking). The rejection of historical causality, therefore, is not an opening for the complete dissolution of knowledge. Confronted by buildings, drawings, letters, tangible absences, and other forms of 'clues,' Tafuri's reflections on historical practice under these new knowledge conditions makes a crucial contribution to this debate overall. That he begins within disciplinary knowledge and does not depart from it renders his reflections all the more pertinent to this seminal discussion on knowledge, 'the real,' and hence, 'the past.'

eral important contributors to this debate on its advisory board: Giorgio Agamben, Jean Baudrillard, Cacciari, Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault and Paul Veyne, to name those directly implicated in the debates at stake here. The names clearly describe a Franco-Italian philosophical exchange. Particularly engaging in this issue are the essays: Mario Perniola, 'Lettere a Gianni Vattimo sul "pensiero debole"' (p. 51-64); Giorgio Agamben, 'L'idea del linguaggio' (pp. 67-74); Massimo De Carolis, 'Sofia, sofistica, filosofia nella "Metafisica" di Aristotele' (pp. 75-110). A second takeup, this time in France, occurs in *Critique. Revue générale des publications francaises et étrangers* 452-453 (January-February 1985). The issue, entitled 'Les philosophes italiens par eux-mêmes,' expands the field of referents under the banner of *il pensiero debole* to a range of thinkers that take the field somewhere rather different than its starting point just two years earlier, framed by Jean Piel as "une prédeliction particulière" ('Avant-propos,' p. 4). Our impression of Tafuri's hypothetical contribution to this debate lies properly with the sphere of discourse surrounding *Crisi della ragione*.

Part Four
History and the Project

Chapter VII
Historical Memory and Programmatic Indecision

In Tafuri's reconstruction of the 'eclipse of history' in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), the emancipation of the architect as an artist relies upon the device of architectural theory as a disciplinary tool defining the nature of architectural production in terms circumscribed by historical representation. When seen in light of Walter Benjamin's activation of the modern figures of magician and operator, Tafuri's historical arc acquires meaning in different terms.[1] As Benjamin writes of the 'equipment' of modernity towards which the artist assumes either a mimetic or an operative stance, Tafuri's concern is the equipment of history. Yet Tafuri's 'history' refers not to the past *per se*, but to its present manifestation, mediated by historical representation, offered to architecture and turned towards that practice's concern with the future.[2] Although we have given this argument some consideration earlier in the dissertation, it remains useful to recall that Tafuri's account of history's eclipse begins with a burdensome reconstructed classical tradition, and proceeds with examples of its emulation, elaboration or subversion in the subsequent centuries. Such architects as Giulio Romano, Jacopo Sansovino and Andrea Palladio remind architecture of its past beyond this tradition, thus consciously interacting, to varying degrees, with the mechanisms of historical representation.[3]

---

[1]   While Chapter Five contains a more detailed consideration of this trajectory, the following paragraphs reference Walter Benjamin, 'Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit,' *Zeitschrift für Sozialfurschung* V, 1, 1936; published in English as 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt, trans. Harry Zorn (1968, New York: Pimlico, 1970); and Tafuri's discussion thereof, in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968), pp. 46-49.

[2]   This disciplinary distinction, as we have considered earlier, pervades the first chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, entitled 'L'architettura moderna e l'eclissi della storia.' Cf. Chapters Two and Five.

[3]   *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* contains the most theorised references to these three architects from this date, the basic idea indicated above is present in his more sustained studies on their works. See, for example, Tafuri, *L'architettura del Manierismo nel cinquecento europeo* (Rome: Officina, 1966); 'Teatro e città nell'architettura palladiana,' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio,'* no. X (1968): 65-78; *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* (Venice: Marsilio, 1969); 'Sansovino "versus" Palladio.' *Bollettino del CISA 'Andrea Palladio'* XV (1973): 149-165; 'Andrea Palladio, utopista della sintesi,' *Rinascita*, no. 39 (1980): 23-24; 'Alvise Cornaro, Palladio and the Grand Canal,' *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 130 (July 1981): 3-30; 'Un progetto irreaslizzato di Jacopo Sansovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani sul Canal Grande' (with Antonio Foscari), *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* XXVI (1981): 71-87 and *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, no. 15 (1981): 69-82; 'Evangelismo e architettura. Jacopo Sansovino e la chiesa di S. Maria a Venezia' (with Foscari), *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* 1982: 1-4: 34-54; 'Alvise Cornaro, Palladio e Leonardo Donà. Un dibattito sul bacino Marciano,' *Palladio e Venezia*, ed. Lionello Puppi (Florence: Sansoni, 1982), pp. 9-27; 'Sebastiano da Lugano, i Grimani e Jacopo Sansovino. Artisti e committenti nella chiesa di S Antonio di Castello' (with Foscari), *Arte veneta* XXXVI (1982): 100-123; *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500*, with Foscari (Turin: Einaudi, 1983); 'Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e Jacopo Sansovino. Un conflitto professionale nella Roma medicea,' *Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane. La vita e l'opera. Atti del XXII congresso di storia dell'architettura, Roma 19-21 febbraio 1986*, ed. G. Spagnesi (Rome: Centro studi per la storia dell'architettura, 1986), pp. 76-99; 'Giulio Romano. Architect and Painter in Mantua' / 'Architetto e pittore a Mantova,' *Domus*, no. 710 (November 1989): 21-32; *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ed. with Ernst Gombrich (Milan: Electa, 1989); 'Giulio Romano e Jacopo Sansovino,' *Giulio Romano. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su 'Giulio Romano e l'espansione europea del rinascimento,' Mantova, Palazzo Ducale, Teatro scientifico del*

However, while these examples show, for Tafuri, the capacity of architects to step outside the prescribed bounds of tradition in order to test the validity of those same bounds, they do not inform the practice of history itself. We propose that two *progettisti* do assume this function for Tafuri. Francesco Borromini (1599-1667) and Giovan Battista Piranesi (1720-1778) not only permeate Tafuri's writing as historical examples, evidencing an historiographical awareness unmediated by classical tradition or a Counter-Reformation ideology; as architects who evidence how historical knowledge might surpass its theoretical constraints, they offer Tafuri a counterpoint from which to reflect upon his own practice.

Borromini and Piranesi present, as a 'problem,' the way in which disciplinary figures whose sights are fixed upon the future, a view encapsulated in the production of *projects*, might understand the past when they transgress the historical representations intrinsic to the production of architectural theory. In turn, Tafuri asks these individuals a question he asks himself: how does one understand the past as an architect, while rejecting the future? Tafuri's reading of Walter Benjamin's *Das Kunstwerk* (1936) sheds some light upon this problem. Between Benjamin's 'magician,' concerned with mimesis, and his 'operator,' concerned with penetration of 'the equipment,' Tafuri identifies a third category: *gli indecisi*, the undecided, who feel the difficulty of such courageous and radical realism as demonstrated by Tafuri's modern 'operatives,' but who lack either the feigned or real ignorance of his 'mimetics.' Both of his 'certain' figures assume specific stances in an architectural response to modernity. The painterly architect imitates evidence of modernity with traditional techniques and the artistic language of modernity; the operator tests those same techniques to an extreme by *embracing* the modern condition, examining it from within and thus shaping it, rejecting the possibility of a passive role in the world. The undecided, in turn, lack both the ignorance safeguarding the 'painters' and the revolutionary conviction of the operators. They possess a heightened consciousness of their historicity, but nonetheless resort to a principle of mimesis through their incapacity to 'force the future.' Tafuri initially applied the epithet of *gli indecisi* to characterise the ambiguous modernity of Heinrich Tessenow (1876-1950), Emil Fahrenkamp (1885-1966) and Paul Bonatz (1877-1956) as a response to the 'equipment' of modernity in the face of the Third Reich.

However, in making this application, he exposed a mechanism that could as readily be observed in the history spanning from the fifteenth to twentieth centuries in which he invokes this analogy. Restating the development of architectural theory recalled in Chapter Five, Tafuri implies clear distinctions between the various factors constituting the relationship between history, architecture and theoretical or ideological agendas. Knowledge of the past, under this model, is mediated by architectural theory and presented as an historically legitimised disciplinary heritage, upon or against which contemporary architecture builds within the broad framework of 'tradition.' The 'equipment,' in this setting, comprises the theoretical 'bubble' that defines at any given moment the

scope of architecture's definition as a discipline. Considering this model in the setting of Tafuri's long eclipse of history by the architectural experience of modernity, when Brunelleschi and Alberti determined architectural production by means of historically authorised theoretical agendas, they also laid the foundations for this model's elaboration as a disciplinary structure both defining and defending the figure of the emancipated architect. Consequently, to practice 'Architecture' involved building in the classical tradition, and drawing a dichotomy between 'architecture' and 'context.'

And so, the very identity of the Architect as an emancipated figure emerges from the Renaissance through this very mechanism, namely the distinction of one sort of building from all others, and the maintenance of this distinction through a codified body of architectural theory, governing the production of architecture. A second history, in addition, follows the development of 'super-historical' knowledge, awareness of the past 'unmediated' by architectural theory but activated in architectural practice. In this, Tafuri locates many figures of 'mannerist,' baroque and rococo architecture, who equally, he writes, describe an evolving classical tradition. However, we here ask: what is the broader role of those 'undecided' architects to whom Tafuri's alludes for historical practice? If the 'project' is a site for pursuing the future, and evident historical knowledge demonstrates an awareness of the past beyond the traditions ratified in theoretical discourse, then Tafuri's studies on Borromini and Piranesi spanning from the years preceding the 1967 *anno borrominiano* until the 1978 *anno piranesiano* offer essential insights into his thinking on history's tools and tasks in precisely such terms. These two architects assume a vital place in Tafuri's observations of an awareness of the past beyond the constraints of a theorised historical corpus; they are undecided for understanding the fragile nature of historical representation while insisting upon their tendencies towards the future and the utopian condition of representation.

These two figures by no means describe Tafuri's entire theoretical engagement with specific architects. We need only consider his long-standing fascination with the abovementioned architects, with Alberti (as an exceptional case) and Francesco di Giorgio, and his sustained preoccupation with Eisenman, Le Corbusier, Gregotti, Rossi and Scarpa. However, these individuals offer Tafuri something quite different to Borromini and Piranesi, whose brief appearance in his bibliography coincide with an explicit reflection, in such works as *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and 'Il "progetto" storico,' on the nature of history as a theoretically determined boundary condition defining the practice of architects. Tafuri considers Piranesi's example at greater length and with a sharper eye, it seems, on his applicability to the problems of history preoccupying Tafuri. However, Borromini too remains critical as a sounding board, even if the resonances *between* the two figures remain largely unexplored to date. Tafuri asks both of them how the architect can demonstrate super-historical knowledge of the past; that is, knowledge of the past unconditioned by 'history' as an abstract and homogenising representation. He consequently subjects both Borromini and Piranesi to sustained studies, both scientific and theoretical, which anchor them to historiographic questions. Borromini

and Piranesi, both in drawn and built work, confront 'flat' knowledge with the means of its own disturbance.

❦

While Borromini's example is a useful comparison with Piranesi's in the setting of this dissertation (notwithstanding the traditional pairing of these two figures), his importance is bound not simply to Tafuri's historical practice, as a subject, but to his thinking about the nature of that practice, tested against a form of historical practice integral to Borromini's production of architectural works. While Piranesi plays this issue out, as we shall see, by means of an engagement with architectural representation, and with, in turn, the representation of architecture and its past, Borromini offers Tafuri an example of such questions being addressed through buildings and not simply through architectural representation, though Tafuri also treats Borromini's unrealised 'paper projects.' On the premise that these two figures are important to Tafuri for their considering the 'question of history' from the privileged and disciplinarily specific position of architects, the capacity for building itself to maintain an historiographic position becomes a useful counterpoint in developing a rounded approach to this element of Tafuri's investigation into historical practice. Tafuri's writing on Piranesi may evidence a more refined approach to historiographical problems, but Borromini is both a theoretical referent *and* material for historical practice, predating his advanced engagement with the *œuvre* of Piranesi by several years.

While his first writing on the latter, and later, figure occurs in the pages of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, as we have seen, Borromini features prominently among Tafuri's early historical subjects, during a time corresponding to his 'repositioning' from architect to historian over the middle 1960s. His first scientific article appeared in the pages of the *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, published by the *Facoltà di architettura* at Rome, entitled 'Borromini in palazzo Carpegna. Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche' (1967).[4] These documents demanded ongoing research in the Roman State Archives and a new application of Tafuri's youthful and vigorous investigation of the terms and conditions of historical practice to the tasks of history itself. Borromini, too, pervades his theoretical reflections on those same tasks and conditions. He writes a modest yet significant series of articles exposing Borromini's capacity to pose those questions that appeared important to Tafuri at that moment, questions that slightly later reappear (implicitly and explicitly) in both the tone and substance of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. These articles include two essays in the Roman journal *Palatino*: 'La poetica borrominiana. Mito, simbolo e ragione' (1966) and, during the *anno borrominiano*, 'Inediti borrominiani' (1967). Additionally, he makes two essay-length contributions to the symposium *Studi sul Borromini*. An early polemical article targeting the writing of Portoghesi further

---

4   Tafuri, 'Borromini in palazzo Carpegna. Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche,' *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* XIV, nos. 79-84 (1967): 85-107.

demonstrates Borromini's utility to Tafuri. The *Comunità* article 'Borromini e l'esperienza della storia' (1965) is a significant piece of differentiated historiography, forcing distance between Tafuri and his peers.[5]

The essay appears, retitled as 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' some years later in Tafuri's 1978-1979 seminar on Borromini at *IUAV*, which collects and revisits his writing on the subject. He introduces the seminar with a new essay (as we noted in Chapter Five), 'Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico,' wherein he drew explicit links to his seminar course taught two years earlier, with Franco Rella, on the subject of language and architecture. This course was documented, as we observed in the previous chapter, in 'Il "progetto" storico,' the introductory essay of *La sfera e il labirinto* (a book overtly concerned principally with Piranesi and his 'legacy'). In making this connection, Tafuri further exposes his explicit interest in Borromini in terms of his problematisation of historical representation, a theme he recalls as central to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, and thus to the consideration accorded Borromini therein. That Borromini and Piranesi remain subject to the same terms of critique in this dissertation is no accident, but follows on from Tafuri's own critical construction of their relationship during the 1978 conference *Piranesi tra Venezia e l'Europa* in an essay that concludes his seminar bibliography and frames a later seminar on Piranesi, conducted in the 1980-1981 academic year (this, in turn, coinciding with the publication of *La sfera e il labirinto*, 1980).

We will return to this later reflection further into the present chapter. However, Tafuri's early interest in Borromini ably responds in an increasingly well-informed manner to the proliferation of catalogues, monographs, scholarly and theoretical articles, exhibitions and conferences that first prefaced and then commemorated the tercentenary of his 1667 death. The earliest of these pieces belongs as much to Tafuri's body of work considering Borromini as it does to Tafuri's response to the operative criticism of Zevi and Portoghesi's show, *Michelangelo architetto* (1964). Tafuri, in fact, draws a direct link between Portoghesi's treatment of Michelangelo and of Borromini by noting that during a year in which Michelangelo had drawn substantial critical attention (marking four hundred years since his death) and the curators' historiography widespread disdain (if newspapers reviews are an indication), it was 'proper' that Portoghesi should conclude his *annus horribilis* with a two volume study on Borromini, constituting a re-edition of the *Opus Architectonicum* (first published 1725) and a critical volume ("raccoglie gli appassionati studi di Paolo Portoghesi") entitled *Borromini nella cultura europea* (both 1964). If these books constitute, as Tafuri asserts, a specific claim upon Borromini on

---

5   We should note, here, that our intention is not to position Tafuri's scholarship on either Borromini or Piranesi in terms of the field of studies pertaining to either architect. Rather, in elaborating Tafuri's essays on these two figures, each in turn, we seek to demonstrate that he conducted a sustained reflection *through* his subjects on issues pertaining to historiography. An analysis of Tafuri's relationship *within* Borromini or Piranesi scholarship would be a rather different undertaking. Our principal undertaking, with reference to the dissertation in its entirety, is to probe the internal logic of Tafuri's theorisation of history. Testing against an 'exterior' will expose different problems for historiography, but we set them aside for the moment.

Portoghesi's part, then Tafuri's critique is a self-authorised act of liberation.[6] Tafuri begins by observing "that no one else, before or after [Borromini], has so thoroughly harvested the lessons of Buonarotti, with as much penetration and as much awareness of his deeper significance."[7] Portoghesi's text offers, he says, no new conclusions to the "problema borrominiano," simply conveying the testimony to Portoghesi's ongoing interests in this figure.[8] Tafuri regards the book with the utmost suspicion. Despite its obvious attention to the serious task of preparing the ground for Borromini's tercentenary, Tafuri positions it as a 'rectification,' balancing Portoghesi's misdeeds though his collaboration with Zevi on Michelangelo.[9] However, even if Portoghesi sought to 'correct' these sins, Tafuri remains critical of his historiographical activation of 'exemplars' in the present:

> In this fascinating account of a cultural construction-in-process, in its determination to make contact with the exigencies of an invested awareness, of a poetical world, understanding the entire reality of the work in the order of a critical and tormented state of mind, the modern architect can recognize many of the problems facing him daily.[10]

Put elsewise, "Portoghesi selects with precision the potential terms for a relationship between the Borrominian poetic … and current problems."[11] The *Opus architectonicum*, observes Tafuri, offered Portoghesi a vehicle for considering, in literary terms, the mode of Borromini's "love … for the transposition of economic and functional matters, psychological programme and form."[12] This theme, Tafuri conjectures, continues Portoghesi's research as published in the previous year (1964), caught between the philological 'recovery' of the *Opus* and the critico-historical volume that particularly problematises, he says, 'Borromini minore.'[13] He argues that despite the significant attention already paid to Borromini's work, there had been no study seriously addressing

---

6   Tafuri, 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' *Comunita* 129 (1965), reprinted in Tafuri, 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIa' (Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, 1979), p. 10; Paolo Portoghesi, *Borromini nella cultura europea* (Rome: Officina, 1964); Francesco Borromini, *Opus architectonicum*, edited by Paolo Portoghesi (1725, Rome: Elefante, 1964).

7   Tafuri, ibid., p. 9. Original passage: "che nessun altro, prima o dopo di [Borromini], ha raccolto la svonvolgente lezione del Buonarroti con tanta penetrazione e tanta coscienza dei suoi più intimi significati."—our trans.

8   Ibid., p. 10. Orig. phrase: "la testimonio della ricerca di un critico e studioso."—our trans.

9   Ibid., pp. 10-11.

10   Ibid., p. 11. Orig. wording: "In questo affascinate racconto della vicenda di una costruzione colta nel suo farsi, nel suo determinarsi a contatto delle esigenzie di una vigile committenza, di un mondo poetico teso a comprendere l'intera realtà su cui opera pur in un atteggiamento critico e tormentato, l'architetto moderno può spesso riconoscere molti dei problemi che lo agitano quotidianamente."—our trans.

11   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "Portoghesi coglie con esattezza i termini di un possibile rapporto della poetica borrominiana … con i problemi odierni."—our trans.

12   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "l'amore … per la trasposizione del dato economico e funzionale in programma psicologico e in forma."—our trans.

13   Ibid.

the difficulty of documenting and studying the semantic structures of Borromini's production. Whatever other judgements Tafuri makes, he admits that Portoghesi's contribution was nonetheless timely.[14] However, listing a number of basic structural criticisms, Tafuri admits that the one question left unanswered is why, after Michelangelo, Portoghesi turns directly to Borromini. He identifies a 'critical key':

> Portoghesi's readings appeal to the theme of the *parentheticity* of Borromini's compositional method, of his complex process of organic decomposition partly detected and recomposed following a free yet controlled synthesis.[15]

The notion of a tactical engagement with the elementary level of architectural composition, Tafuri observes, pervades not only Portoghesi's analyses, but also those of Frey, Garroni and Argan.[16] However, Tafuri notes (observing that Portoghesi extends Argan's critical line) that while Argan establishes a 'moral' tension between freedom and order in Borromini's buildings ("expressed in symbols and in *passionate ghosts*"), Portoghesi (reads Tafuri) canonises Borromini's poetics according to four points: (1) his reevaluation of *work* as a construction that exceeds architectural form (implicating psychology); (2) the value he places on memory, but autobiographical memory above all, 'figuratively' reliving the more troubling episodes of the classical tradition; (3) his willingness to explore more and more levels of the work wherein meet 'reason' and 'emotion'; and (4) his interest in the "psychological *functionality* of images."[17] Under these terms, Portoghesi explores new critical dimensions in Borromini studies.[18] Tafuri also applauds Portoghesi's historicisation of Borromini's work within a broader research programme concerned with the Roman baroque, a culture (to cite Portoghesi) "Dominated by reason and its given norms, but able to demonstrate freedom in each of its acts, to continually recreate, with a critical spirit, the conventions on which it leans."[19]

Tafuri takes direct issue with the easy distinctions that Portoghesi draws between Borromini and Gian Lorenzo Bernini. Portoghesi asserts that Bernini is preoccupied with *persuasion*; Borromini's concerns lie with *demonstration*, from mathematical hypotheses to more general and subtle manifestations of discourse on the imagination and the senses. Any such differentiation, argues Tafuri, is artificial and indefensible

---

[14] Ibid. Tafuri mentions recent works by a number of well-known scholars of the Roman baroque.—Frey, Hempel, Sedlmayr, Argan.

[15] Ibid., p. 13. Orig. passage: "Nelle letture portoghesiane riccore il motivo della *paratatticità* del metodo compositivo borrominiano, di quel processo complesso di scomposizione dell'organismo in parti individuate e successivamente riconnesse secondo libere ma controllate modulazione sintattiche."—our trans.

[16] Ibid. We might observe, also, that the capacity to understand an historical language independent of its superstructure, to critically decompose and recompose its elements, remains central to Tafuri's reading of Borromini.

[17] Ibid., p. 14. Orig. phrase: "una *funzionalità psiciologica* delle immagini."—our trans.

[18] Ibid., p. 14.

[19] Portoghesi in Tafuri, ibid., p. 14. Orig. passage: "dominata dalla ragione e dale sue norme, ma capace di dimostrarsi libera in ogni suoi atti, di ricreare continuamente, con spirito critico, le convenzion su cui poggia."—our trans.

against the archive. It may be true, he writes, that Borromini confronts "an illusive and spectacular technical problem," but his polemic (Tafuri suggests) is in much closer proximity to Bernini than Portoghesi allows.[20] This is not to say that Tafuri argues for the confluence of these two 'grandi rivali' (a stereotype that he still maintains in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, three years later) but rather that Borromini 'demonstrates' not only the practice of an architectural mathematics, for instance, but also the play of 'fables' and 'the fantastic,' the problem of citation versus 'memory' and, by extension, "the free and utopian interpretation of the ancient, reviewed nostalgically, then philologically, in the columns of the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphyli*."[21] Portoghesi places Borromini in a historical trajectory that is 'fulfilled' in the Enlightenment, wherein new relationships between man and nature are predicated (in Portoghesi's terms) by Borromini's complex treatment of the natural world. Insofar as Portoghesi identifies this also in Bernini, arguing for a naturalistic theoretical imperative to his artistic motivations, both architects constitute modal points in his historiographical justification of modern expressionism, a discourse underpinning his analysis, at the same moment, of Michelangelo.

<div align="center">❧</div>

Tafuri responds by suggesting that Borromini's engagement with the natural can be historicised within a scientific discourse in which astrological references 'reveal' "the new Galilean conception of the natural and cosmic work by reviving and affirming *rational experience*."[22] Borromini thus denies, Tafuri argues, the human measure, both in the humanistic sense of man as reflection of God, and thus as a divinely appointed scale, *and* in the Enlightenment sense of man as the arbiter and instigator of all knowledge, and thus with all knowledge serving man in an unmediated, positivistic way. Consequently, he endorses Galileo's observation that the universe exists outside of man and is thus

---

20 Tafuri's evidence is a set of letters accompanying drawings for the villa Pamphily, in which Tafuri identifies "i referimenti astrologii, le memorie storiche e le evocazione delle interpretazione e descrizione delle *mirabilia* della *Domus* neroniana." While nonetheless distinct from Bernini's tactics, Tafuri identifies that 'la raffinata teatralità' demonstrated in his work at the Pamphily, brings Borromini into closer proximity to Bernini.—ibid., p. 15. The original wording of the above quotation: "un problema di tecnica illusive e spettacolare."—our trans.

21 Ibid. Orig. passage: "la libera ed utopistica interpretazione dell'antico, nostalgicamente prima che filologicamente rivissuto, della colonniana *Hypnerotomachia Poliphyli*."—our trans. Tafuri refers, in making the connection with *Hypnerotomachia Poliphyli*, to Argan's argument that the utopian character and fantastic reconstructions of this text are revisited in Borromini's work: "Anzi questo lato fantasiosi e il complemento, o la controparte, della tecnica abilissima, addrittura acrobatica."—Argan, *Francesco Borromini*, p. 28; cited in Tafuri, ibid., p. 30n7. Tafuri's assessment continued thus: "Infatti in questo edificio in cui si rispecchia l'intero mondo astrologico dove, anzi, esso viene captato nei suoi valori simbolici e tradotto in immagini reali e verificabili, come a voler porre la stessa architettura in una posizione intermedia fra il mondo della prassi e quello nel quale il destino dell'uomo appare purificato in accezioni vicine al senso ultimo dell'universi (con la conseguenza di attribuire appunto all'architettura una funzione *rivelatrice*), sembra aver conclusione una delle più tormentate e complesse ricerche del manierismo, che appunto nel tema della villa aveva dispiegato una tematica di contestazione all'interpretazione umanistica del rapporto edificio-natura."—ibid., p. 15.

22 Ibid., p. 16. Orig. phrase: "[la] nuova concezione galileiana di un mondo naturale e cosmico da rivivere e affermare tramite una *razionale esperienza*."—our trans.

'uninformed' by human measure, mythology and ideology. This observation is central to Tafuri's view of the 'problema borrominiano':

> The *spectacle* is also part of the experience and comes to assume as much … only, that spectacle is not, as for Bernini, the point of arrival of an architectonic process and thus a sensitive (if not sensual) solicitation, but is rather refined by architectural practice, entering a fixed network of narrative elements that psychologically determine the path of observation in a natural shift towards spatial apprehension.[23]

Borromini stands, in Tafuri's analysis, in opposition to a closed naturalistic repertory and thus to use as an 'instrument of isolation and analysis,' as well as to 'symbolic or emblematic themes,' each working within a closed tradition. Argan's 'acute' analysis of Borromini's 'innaturalità' ('unnaturality'), he writes, indicates that the 'intransigent application' of a contradictory principles originates from the "cultural substrates and images contrary to those that will appear as from the semantic ends of the work in all its complexity."[24] Both S. Ivo alla Sapienza and S. Carlo alle quattro fontane demonstrate a rigorous spatiality informed by this same 'innaturalità' that constitutes, precisely through a rigorous approach to the historical and geometrical justification of spatial form, an anti-naturalistic stance.[25] This has immediate historiographical implications:

> And the continuation of that substansive symbolism lies in *demonstrating awareness of a conscience that calls other consciences to their own sense*, concentrating every narrative element by an exceptionally rigorous effort into a synthesis that is, taken together, the record of an inner artistic process … and an ideal guide on a hypothetical route for achieving [artistic] self-consciousness.[26]

Mirroring Portoghesi's continuities from sixteenth to seventeenth centuries, Tafuri regards Borromini's and Michelangelo's examples contiguous *insofar* as they demonstrate the critical capacity of 'experience' independent of 'synthetic' or 'stylistic' questions. The two architects contest every discovery, "to the ends of reaching a concrete universe."[27]

---

[23] Ibid. Orig. passage: "Anche lo *spettacolo* è parte dell'esperienza e come tale va assunto … solo che quello spettacolo non è, come per Bernini, punto di arrivo di un processo architettonico e sollecitazione sensitiva (se non sensuale), bensì è purificato nel farsi architettura ed entra in circolo con una fitta rete di elementi narrativi che puntualizzano psicologicamente il percorso dell'osservazione nel suo moto naturale di apprendimento spaziale."—our trans.

[24] Ibid., pp. 20-22. Orig. passage: "substrati culturali e figurativi contrari a quello che risulterà come fine semantico dell'opera nel suo complesso."—our trans.

[25] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[26] Ibid., p. 23. Orig. passage: "E il continuato di quel simbolismo sostanziale è tutto nella *dimostrazione della consapevolezza di una coscienza che chiama le altre coscienze alla loro propria consapevolezza*, concentrando con uno sforzo rigoristico eccezionale ogni elemento narrativo in una sintesi che è, insieme, la registrazione del processo interiore compiuto dall'artista e la guida ideale di un ipotetico percorso per il raggiungimento dell'autocoscienza."—our trans.

[27] Ibid. Orig. phrase: "al fine di raggiungere un'università concreta."—our trans.

This universe, by extension, implicates Borromini in the contemporary preoccupation with his work: the acceptance, as 'nature' of the classical tradition, contrasting an 'anti-naturalism' penetrating historical and historiographical bases of the very idea of a classical tradition. Borromini's interrogation of the bases of historical syntheses carries an historiographical judgement of "the true and authentic historicity of classicism."[28] Tafuri diverges from the judgements of Portoghesi and Argan (among others noted in passing) when they identify in Borromini a formal 'revolution.' Where they observe 'revolution,' he sees a *divorce* from the 'representation' of the past as tradition played out not through an inspired act of futuristic creativity, but through an intelligent and rigorous exploration of the bases of the past upon which the traditions from which he breaks free are *traditionally* based.[29] That this strategy appears as a bold step into the future for many of Borromini's commentators demonstrates the degree to which the theoretical or ideological frameworks determining the nature of the representation of the past deforms, and thus diverges from the past itself, as it might be known in an unmediated (though necessarily hypothetical) sense.[30]

The notion of 'experience' for Tafuri, in the sense of an unmediated engagement with knowledge, the past, mathematics, and so on, has one major consequence for the historical constructions within which Borromini's forebears operate in the period named (by Tafuri among others) as *il Manierismo*: the "annulment of the superhistorical categorizations to which classicism had submitted a consideration of nature on the part of the artist."[31] He stops short of declaring a divorce between the 'mannerists' (ensconced in tradition, even if they 'haunt' it with superhistorical medieval memories, archaic images, and so on) and Borromini, who in his view

> has the meaning of a fascinating voyage of memory, receiving appearances and solicitations that, also, introduce the *experience* of a restless culture while attempting to pick up the values of a history that one begins to sense in its totality, no more as an intellectual paradigm.[32]

28 Ibid., p. 24. Orig. phrase: "la storicità, vera e autentica, del classicismo."—our trans.

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid., pp. 24-25.—"Può anche darsi, quindi, che Borromini sognasse un'irrealizzabile *rivoluzione nell'ordine*: in realtà il suo *ordine* e una *dimensione*, un metodo di acquisizione di una autocoscienza e la sua rivoluzione è tutta compresa in tale concezione. Ciò che di veramente rivoluzione egli ci trasmette, di vivo e attuale, dall distanca di tre secoli fra i più dicisivi nella storia dell'umanita, è proprio quella *dimenzione* nuova della considerazione dell'arte in relazione alla società, quella tormentata dimostrazione dell'inesistenza di un centro e di un periferia, nell'arte come nella vita, che apparenta la sua architettura alle *verità nuove* di un Galileo."

31 Ibid., p. 25. Orig. passage: "[il] annulamento delle soprastoriche categorazzazione cui il classicismo aveva sottoposto la considerazione della natura da parte dell'artista."—our trans. Tafuri returns to this line of argument in the first chapter of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* when he suggests that 'nature' as an artificial, scientifically determined (after the eighteenth century) construct operates as a metaphor for tradition in an equivalent relationship to that held between life and past.

32 Ibid. Orig. passage: "ha il significato di un affascinante viaggio della memoria ad accogliere spunti e sollecitazione che, anch'esse, si presenteranno come *esperienza* di una cultura inquieta ma attenta a captare tutti i valori di una storia che si comincia a sentire nella sua totalità e non piu come paradig-matica guida intelletuale."—our trans.

But how does Borromini's practice constitute, for Tafuri, an 'experience'? And how, in particular, is it an 'experience of history'? Tafuri lists several examples of repositories of past knowledge evidenced by Borromini in Rome: 'fragments' inserted into the villa Doria Pamphili, medieval and humanist sepulchral monuments from S. Giovanni Laterano. Likewise, 'Albertian' memories filter through in the upper cornice on the interior of S. Carlino; the fabric of the Filipini belies Borromini's appropriation of gothic motifs; S. Carlino and S. Andrea delle Fratte both, he point out, contain 'obviously repressed' references to the spatial modulations of Imperial Rome, in the superficial interplay of concavity and convexity. All this, writes Tafuri, points to Borromini's employment of "an unpublished architectural expressivity, [of] *architecture as continual and poliphonic narration*, concrete in the complex composition of autonomous and correlating parts"[33] In other words, he enables a '*religion of man*' over a '*religion of transcendence*,' closely attending to the "history of man, of nature, of things" in which facts (read in the broadest possible sense) stand beyond abstract systems to which they could either conform or constitute exceptions, acquiring autonomy "in the profound sense of their mundanity."[34] This position, ideological in itself, assumed with respect of knowledge *per se*, acquires concrete form "in the complex constructed of such spatial organisms as S. Carlino, S. Ivo or S. Agnese."[35]

All of this is to position Borromini's *opere* not within the internal structures of the Baroque and its historiography, but simultaneously within and beyond a broader engagement with antiquity, expressed both as a classical tradition claiming the antecedence of antiquity and as a capacity, in Rome above all, to access that ancient world through its archaeological detritus, fragments from the past, in the present. Borromini's '*experience of history*' is one that denies the future; that 'utopia' hinted at in his works results from an 'alchemical operation' that conducts "an unsettling exploration of the past."[36] Piranesi, he notes in conclusion, is alone in internalising the intensity of Borromini's 'experience,' the "*nuova classicità*" ('new classicism') of the 'present' moment—an historicist development properly the concern of Portoghesi, Tafuri implies—not only falls short of a 'Borrominian vitality' but fails to grasp the ethics that underpin Borromini's 'polyphonic language.'[37]

❧

Tafuri's next two articles on Borromini appear in the Roman cultural review *Palatino*. In 'La poetica borrominiana. Mito, simbolo e ragione' (1966) Tafuri takes a more explicitly antagonistic stance against the senior figures of Italian architectural historiography:

---

33   Ibid., pp. 25-26. Orig. passage: "un'espressività inedita dell'architettura, *ad un'architettura come narrazione continua e polifonica* concreta nel comporsi complessi di parti autonome e correlate."—our trans.

34   Ibid., p. 27. Orig. phrases: "storia dell'uomo, della natura, delle cose"; "nel profondo senso della loro mondanità."—our trans.

35   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "nel complesso costruirsi degli organismi spaziali di opera come il S. Carlino, il S. Ivo o il S. Agnese."

36   Ibid., p. 29. Orig. passage: "un'inquieta esplorazione nel passato."—our trans.

37   Ibid., p. 30.

Portoghesi, Argan and (more tangentially) Zevi. Considered cynically (though perhaps accurately), the article works as a claim upon the territory of architectural history in the specific setting of Borromini's tercentenary, a celebration set to be dominated by Portoghesi and Argan, and offering Tafuri a great deal of 'material' upon which to pursue his attack on the perpetrators of *Michelangelo architetto*. This is, to repeat, rather cynical, yet the accusation holds when we compare this article with his later missive, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, which, insofar as it considers Borromini's work, does not offer a significantly revised reading of it than we find in the pages of *Palatino*. By extension, the function of this text as a declaration of the discipline's poverty, or at least of its systemic failure, might well be present already in very specific terms in the setting of the tercentenary and its 'claimants.' The timing of this attack is therefore interesting, appearing on the eve of a year-long Borrominian focus. Tafuri does not substantially revise his argument in 'La poetica borrominiana' from the earlier 'Borromini e il problema della storia,' but does shift from a specific consideration of Portoghesi's *Borromini nella cultura europa* to a general reflection on Borrominian themes introduced through the agency of the *anno borrominiano*.[38]

Paramount among these is the 'myth' of *naturalità*, this reinforcing Portoghesi's own discourse in defence (following Zevi) of the modern expressionists as a contemporary inheritance of mannerism and the baroque. The confrontation of this trajectory with contrary evidence remains a major strategy of Tafuri's first decade or so of historical writing. It does not, in itself, constitute a polemic against the expressionists and their followers in favour of other forms of inheritance of the modern movement; or at least, he works hard to repress his own preferences after an early series of articles arguing in favour of specific continuities from a heroic modernist era. It might better be understood as a form of temple-clearing, acting upon a judgement that contemporary historiography, posing as rigorous and impartial, simply reinforced architectural polemics, specific architectural practices through 'critical affirmation.' His targets are thus the historians, whose 'corrupt' presence dominates a field he now regards as his own. Borromini's example, in this light, achieves two things. Firstly, the lavish critical attention paid to Borromini's work from 1965 to 1967 furnishes an abundance of writing from the main figures with whom Tafuri takes obvious issue. Secondly, Borromini's work itself contains 'lessons' not simply for contemporary architects, as Portoghesi would identify (as would Tafuri, we must admit) but for Tafuri himself, in his demonstration of an awareness of a past beyond historical representation that would occupy his field of vision for some time to come. His interest in the historiography of Borromini may constitute a phenomenon distinct from his interest in Borromini himself, evidenced later in scientific research based on holdings in the State Archives, but they are nonetheless interrelated by a single thread:

---

[38] It may appear strange, in light of Tafuri's sustained criticism of the operative criticality of Bruno Zevi in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and afterwards, that Portoghesi appears to miss out on being the target of the same level of critique as Zevi. These articles demonstrate that Portoghesi, for whom Tafuri elsewhere indicates his respect for producing a great deal of important research on the Roman Baroque, has been sufficiently 'problematised' from an historiographical perspective.

the confrontation of programmatic images with historical knowledge. That Borromini is at once the subject of such a confrontation and the instigator of another within his own lifetime offers Tafuri a productive counterpoint through which simultaneously to reflect upon the historian's practice and the terms of an 'operative' architectural engagement with the equipment of history.

The account Tafuri offers in 'La poetica borrominiana' appears within a slightly different frame in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, a book he had certainly commenced writing by the time this essay was published, even if we cannot see them as parallel works. Tafuri argues that the humanist revolution of *quattrocento* Florence knitted together three lines of 'reason': history (the recovery of 'classical' knowledge), nature (the discovery of mathematical interrelationships) and man (as the 'measure of all things'). The development of a "cult of *form*" centred on these truths formed a counterpoint to the "cult of the *image*" in the 'Baroque world.'[39] To what extent, Tafuri asks, can historians regard the intervening centuries, between high humanism after Alberti and the high Baroque of Bernini, as a mediation between these two positions? Or does the historical evidence justify a periodised development? These questions are implicit, rather than explicit to Tafuri's argument, which focuses (again) on Borromini's reception of a Michelangelesque practice. Assuming (if we can refer to his thinking on this issue elsewhere) that Tafuri's historiography is vehemently anti-periodic, then his question is this: to what extent does Michelangelo act as a precursor for Borromini's manipulation within tradition by exposing the artificiality of its limits, along the lines explored in 'Borromini e la problema della storia' and elaborated above. Or, should we rather understand Borromini's practice as a reaction to all that precedes him, including the work of Michelangelo?

Tafuri answers that if it is possible to speak of a Brunelleschian system of architectural language, imposed as we have seen elsewhere upon the medieval city, and if it is possible to understand the origins of its syntax and vocabulary, then the architects of 'mannerism' (with Michelangelo as their exemplar, but by no means their totality) demonstrate a new engagement with the *structure* of that language, and thus with the structure of classical form, to the extent that their work constitutes a structural deformation of *quattrocento* and early *cinquecento* classical architectural form.[40] The effect, he proposes, is the rejection of nostalgia as an operational principal for architectural production: cultural nostalgia anchored to the claim by Renaissance Florence upon the legacy of Ancient Rome; and formal nostalgia for an ancient, pure, architectural syntax. And Borromini? "For [him], the continuity of the Mannerist problematic means an initial protest against the alienated forms that Roman architectural culture had put aside as disturbing mannerist lessons."[41] This criticism addresses the perceived capacity to restore and maintain a

---

39   Tafuri, 'La poetica borrominiana. Mito, simbolo e ragione,' *Palatino* X, nos. 3-4 (1966), p. 184. Orig. phrases: "culto della *forma*"; "culto dell'*immagine.*"—our trans.

40   Ibid., pp. 184-185.

41   Ibid., p. 186. Orig. passage: "Per Borromini la continuità con le problematiche del Manierismo ha il significato di una iniziale protesta contro gli aspetti alienate con i quali la cultura architettonica romana aveva riposto alla sconvolgente lezione manierista."—our trans.

rhetorical image of history that appears, through its internal argumentation, as a sound basis for the historical practice of architecture, but is revealed as 'scandalous' by the tendency towards 'dilapidation' exposed in the Baroque sympathy for excess.[42] The very definition of surplus, in this setting, relies upon the conscious negation of rhetorical limits, an understanding of theoretical artificiality and an advanced curiosity as to the consequences of confronting such rhetorical constructions with the unmediated material of their historical foundations.

Tafuri returns this issue to a Baroque engagement with the encounter between humanism and the world of the new Galilean sciences. Therein, the mythological structures upholding the entirety of humanist artistic production, spanning the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries are called into question; principally, and through translations into form, this is done through the exposure of a distance between 'knowledge' and 'myth' as metaphoric positions assigned equally to historical knowledge and historical representation.

> The poetical exaltation of nature and of science, circulating in seventeenth century literature as the cover of art's substantial separation from the naturalist myth of Humanism, as from its identification with scientific experience, does not, in reality, correspond to the Borrominian poetic[43]

Even in their engagement with scientific concepts, Tafuri identifies a number of formal references to developments in scientific discourse: the infinite (Bruno), fluidity (Cavalieri), the monad (Liebniz), and so on. He attributes to Borromini the creation of a 'new figurative world' that would only later acquire meaning as a theoretical device governing architectural production. Borromini's access to and employment of superhistorical knowledge demonstrates his use of new tools in architectural practice.

> Borromini realistically assumes an already given cultural situation: the humanist simplication of history with all its myths was no longer active, no longer corresponding… to a constructive *weltanschaung*, no longer corresponded . . . to a constructive *weltanschaung*, no longer presented a model, a coiled spring.[44]

Borromini turns away from the future and thus from his own architectural disciplinarity, posing a "*vaexata quaestio*". Rather than search for the means by which to restore to their glory the utopian conditions of art, he intellectualises the abstract notions and *raisons*

---

42   Ibid.

43   Ibid., p. 187. Orig. passage: "L'esaltazione poetica della natura e della scienza, che circola nella letteratura seicentesca come copertura di un sostanziale distacco dell'arte dal mito naturalistico dell'Umanesimo, come da quello della sua identificazione con l'esperienza scientifica, non ha in realtà corrispettivi nella poetica borrominiana."—our trans.

44   Ibid. Orig. passage: "Borromini assume realisticamente una situazione culturale già data: la semplificazione umanistica della storia con tutti i suoi miti era ormai inattiva, non corrispondeva più, da tempo, ad una costruttiva *weltanschaung*, non si presentava più come modello e molla per l'azione."

d'être of history and tradition by looking into the bases of that same utopian vision. In this sense, the superhistorical relationship with classical antiquity surrendered itself to 'anticlassical *curiosity*': forcing a disruption to the classical canon (itself a 'memory') and a "neomedievalistic declaration."[45] Tafuri writes, "we speak of a *Borrominian gothicism*," implicating the medieval 'ghost' about which he elsewhere speaks in referring to the formal deformations of Michelangelo's, Romano's and Palladio's mannerism. Just as it is possible to speak of a classical language, so too, Tafuri proposes, is it possible to identify a counter-language in the works of Borromini, following his *principio di contraddizione*. In this sense, Tafuri ascribes to Borromini a constant provocation of the limits between tradition and revolution, naturalism and subjectivity.[46] Further, in Borromini's manipulation of emblems and emblematic content, Tafuri unmasks a superstructure that prefigures a newer, more truthful, reality without realising that reality himself. Disengaged from the responsibility of making new formal worlds, Tafuri positions Borromini as a catalyst who demonstrates 'profound crisis' in the classical tradition by confronting its relationship with *l'antichità classica*.[47]

Tafuri's characterisation of Borromini's 'experience of history' corresponds to an experience of the past for which he argues at length in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. In his architectural practice, Tafuri observes, Borromini makes extensive use of an important semantic distinction between 'symbol' and 'emblem' that disengages him from linguistic envelopment in the classical tradition and enables the direct indexicality of the emblem, which *stands for* rather than *means*. Symbols, conversely, implicate the semantic context in their construction, which (in turn) implicate the signified element. 'Emblem' and 'symbol' thus correspond to a now familiar dialectic that Tafuri observes in the historical examples through which he elaborates the historian's tools and tasks. Put another way, between knowledge of the past and historical representation lies a distinction of utmost importance for Tafuri. In that space resides the programmatic 'value,' as ideology or theory, of historical representation. In the terms of Tafuri's reading, the 'emblem' (as an abstraction) stands for that which is resistant to semantic deformation, thus approximating 'the unmediated' while being (in themselves) mediating elements. The 'symbol,' it follows (and still in abstraction), requires the embrace of the linguistic structures of its formation, confirming its availability to architectural theory through composition and mediated historical knowledge. Despite the mediating forces to which emblems remain subject, they nonetheless (under Tafuri's analysis) constitute a reaction against open ended 'meaning' within the broader frameworks of the classical tradition. In its preoccupation with such devices, 'La poetica borrominiana' remains Tafuri's most

239

---

45   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "dichiaratamente neomedievalistiche."—our trans.

46   Ibid., p. 188. Orig. phrases: "si parla di *goticismo borrominiano*."—our trans.

47   Ibid. He goes on to say: "Borromini accetta completamente tale crisi; non si scandalizza né assume atteggiamente moralistici. Se la storia si presenta come *insieme*, in fond privo di valori etici, al mondo culturale barocco—ché, alle fine, al crollo del mito umanistico corrisponde l'incapacità o il disinteresse a pronunciare giudizi sulla storia stessa—ciò significa che forse si sta preparando un nuovo terreno di valori che non passa più attraverso la rigorosa fedeltà ai principi selezionatori del Rinascimento."—ibid., p. 189.

abstract analysis of Borromini. Liberally illustrating the text with drawings published in J. J. De Rubeis's edition *Insignium Romae templorum prospectus* (1664), Tafuri retains sufficient grasp on Borromini's specificity while exploring his agreement with the ideas that would soon appear in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*.

<center>❧</center>

Entering the *anno borrominiano*, the three texts that Tafuri publishes on Borromini in 1967 comprise his last dedicated word on the subject for nearly a decade (excepting his commentaries on Borromini's work in the via Giulia), after which he revisits Borromini through the specific lens of the critical marking of Piranesi's bi-centenary. We will return to this essay later in the chapter. In the meantime, it is useful to consider the three, quite different, dimensions of Tafuri's contribution to the *anno borrominiano*. The second of his *Palatino* essays appear in 1967, 'Inediti borrominiano.' So, too, an essay on the specific collection of unpublished drawings for the palazzo Carpegna, published in the *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, this making less a polemic stand than a scientific claim. Finally, his two-part contribution to the conference 'Studi sul Borromini,' held at the *Accademia nazionale di San Luca*. Again, this concerns his relationship with other historians and with modes of commemoration, but unlike previous instances, he makes his declarations to a live audience. Central to this argument, to which we will shortly return, is the idea that the exhibitions of unpublished Borromini drawings demonstrate a loss of 'balance' between critical perspective and material objects of study. He writes that among the 'sinking linguistics' of Portoghesi, the 'vehement contemporaneity' of Zevi, the 'iconological literature' of Battisti, the 'structuralism' of Brandi and the "research on Borromini's echoes in Bohemia" of Norberg-Shulz, "the novelties of this *anno borrominiano* are prevalently of the philological variety."[48] The privileged status of archival holdings, a theme elaborated upon in earlier chapters, thus takes on specific meaning.

The drawings from 1620-1632, he writes, "throw new light on the many problems which were, until now, allowed only a simple solution."[49] This does not simply, he suggests, recover those processes that 'result' in building, as steps leading to a solution. Rather, documentation of architectural drawings offers an insight into the architect's 'internal poetics' and thus to the heart of the 'project,' in the sense of its place within the architect's uncorrupted imagination or, in other words, to his 'internal utopia.' Tafuri identifies in the drawings of Borromini the conceptual absence (corresponding to his

---

48 Tafuri, 'Inediti borrominiani,' *Palatino* XI, no. 3 (1967), p. 256. Orig. phrases: "ricerche sugli echi borrominiani in Boemia"; "le novità di questo anno borrominiano sono prevalentemente di tipo filologico."—our trans.

49 Ibid. Orig. phrase: "gettano una luce nuova su molti problemi su cui finora erano lecite solamente semplici supposizione."—our trans. Tafuri elaborates upon this claim, in parentheses: "Si penso solo al problema delle relazioni Maderno-Borromini, assai piu complesse e ancor piu difficilmente definibili di quanto non fosse prima della conoscenza dei disegni dell'Albertina, che contengono vere sorprese per opere come palazzo Barberini, la fasciata di S. Anna dei Palafranieri, il Monte di Pieta, o la fase maderniana di progettazione di S. Andrea della Valle."—Ibid.

critical judgements elsewhere, as we have seen) of 'naturalità' and 'storicità,' "which should not justify itself before the demanding tribunal of direct verification in the material, in the meeting between real and virtual, in the commission to spawn historical codes."[50] To the extent, then, that Borromini's graphical *opere* constitute a more direct index of his 'travaglio critico' than we can read from his built works; they are closed to 'contamination.'[51] Tafuri considers Portoghesi's exhibition of Borromini drawings from the Albertina; the themes that concern him are, he says, 'quite evident.'[52] They include the continuities and contestations of the classical tradition, the 'magical' and 'esoteric' value of Borromini's symbolic repertoire and 'profound narratives,' the immediacy of his *metodo di progettazione* and the value accorded to the rigour of geometrically founded structures.[53] Tafuri admits that these themes are already exposed through other avenues in dealing with Borromini's work, but that in the sheer number of drawings displayed in Portoghesi's exhibition at the palazzo Carpegna, a new dimension emerges: "thowing … new light on the internal psychological world and culture of Borromini."[54]

For instance, Tafuri observes that in Borromini's copy of a relief at S. Vitale di Ravenna (Alb. 1434), "we recall Borromini's interest in explosive spaces of late antiquity, articulated in its own *time*, already conveyed in its organisational structures."[55] Tafuri further posits this interest as an exploration of the 'valid margins' of *cinquecento* architectural debate, pointing towards a number of examples to show how this draws from a direct engagement, in his younger years, with the final phase of Mannerism, where in the decorative programme for the façade of S. Andrea della Valle, draws on the lessons of Pellegrini, on the oscillations between naturalism and anti-naturalism.[56] He follows (Tafuri notes) a 'Palladian thematic' in the archive of the Filippini; equally, his designs for the casa dei Filippini 'reference' Michelangelo.[57] Tafuri identifies the confluence of Borromini's use of emblem and his structural invention in a drawing for the interior of S. Carlino (211, Alb): a convergence of Trinitarian emblem, as an equilateral triangle, with the Pythagorean symbol of science. "The complexity of the Borrominian symbol," Tafuri suggests, "appears here in all its extensions."[58] So, too, in S. Ivo, where Tafuri observes

---

50   Ibid. Orig. passage: "che non debba giustificarsi dinanzi al severo tribunale di una verifica diretta nella materiale, nello scontro fra reale ed irreale, nella commissione dei *generi* e dei codici storici."—our trans.

51   Ibid., p. 257.

52   Ibid.

53   Ibid.

54   Ibid. Orig. phrase: "gettano … una luce nuova sull'intero mondo psicologo e culturale borrominiano."—our trans.

55   Ibid. Orig. passage: "ci richiama all'interesse del Borromini per lo spazio esplosivo del tardo antico, articolato in un proprio *tempo*, narrativo già nella sua organizzazione struttiva."—our trans. Borromini here demonstrates, as in his documentation of Roman funerary monuments, "l'esistenza di un interesse continuo nel tempo per un codice di valore spaziali liberamente eletto a proprio antecedente storico."—ibid.

56   Ibid.

57   Ibid.

58   Ibid., p. 259. Orig. citation: "La complessità della simbologia borrominiana appare qui in tutta la sua estensione."—our trans.

of Borromini's multifarious and irreconcilable themes: "the victory of wisdom over the land of Babel" (following an etching of Kircher's).[59]

> The impossibility of a singular interpretation thus has a precise significance: the symbol becomes structural, becomes the same as its synthesis, presents as allusions of an historical signification for emblems whose historicity comes from explaining, from exasperating within a polyphony of images, from confronting the allegorical world of the Roman baroque.[60]

The allegorical roots of the Roman Baroque, on the other hand elaborate the notion of heresy integral to the architecture of the *tardocinquentesco*, thus reintroducing a 'speculative naturalism' to humanistic knowledge and thus undermining the myth of man as centre of the universe and consequently man as the image of God.[61]

Exhibitions of *inediti borrominiani* in three institutions allow Tafuri to elaborate on these general observations by referring to specific materials: from the *Accademia nazionale di San Luca*, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* and the Archivio di Stato romano.[62] The first of these suffices to identify the kind of 'heresies' that Tafuri suggests pervades the larger body of work exhibited throughout Rome in that year. In a façade drawing for the Trinitari convent (201, Alb), he locates a form of 'neomedievalism' comprising a heresy against the "individual *objects*, closed in their singular formal qualities."[63] He identifies in the design a 'coronomento *goticista*' anticipating Borromini's solution for the 'casa dei Filippini.' As Tafuri is first to point out, such examples do not in themselves constitute a persistent engagement with the equipment of history, however we might choose to frame it. Yet, these three major exhibitions of unpublished drawings in conjuncton with Portoghesi's recently published edition of the *Opus Architectonicum* inform Tafuri's reading of an architectural 'mentality,' wherein the encounter between representation and fact, between the ideological limits of his present moment (determined by science,

---

59 Ibid., pp. 259-260. Orig. phrases: ""la vittoria della Sapienza sulla Babele terrene"

60 Ibid. Orig. passage: "L'impossibilità di un'interpretazione univoca ha quindi un significato preciso: il simbolo diviene strutturale, è esse stesso una *sintesi*, si presenta come allusione ad un patrimonio di significazioni per emblemi che ha una sua storicità da esplicitare, da esasperare in una polifonìa di immagini, da confrontare con il mondo allegorico della Roma barocca."—our trans.

61 Ibid., p. 260. He continues: "Le opposizione dell'ambiente romano al Borromini hanno dunque come una della loro ragioni la reazione contro l'immissione violenta, in una tradizione dogmatica, di un mondo figurative che si compromette con le gnostocismo, con l'ermetismo simbolico, con la mnemotecnica, fino a dimostrare, *malgré soi*, la necessità di una distruzione dell'intero simbolismo tradizionale. Uno storicismo ermetico perché al limite dell'antistoricismo, dunque, così come è, il suo, un simbolismo che nasconde più di quanto non riveli. La commistione, la sintesi all'interno della disorganicità, la moltiplicazione dei riferimenti in un *assemblage* in qualche modo *sporco*, contaminato, troppo ricco: la lucida razionalità di Borromini ha come seconda faccia il presentimento della fine catastrofica della stesse tradizionale cui egli non può fare a meno di riferisi."—ibid.

62 Considered, respectively, on ibid., pp. 260; 260-262 and 262.

63 Ibid., p. 260. Orig. phrase: "*oggetti* individuati è chiusi nelle loro singole qualità formali."—our trans. He specifically describes them thus: "Alle tre altane aperte come aree divagazioni contro il cielo, si alternano dei finiti comignoli, in una sorta di parata di *cose* architettoniche lasciata polemicamente slegata, priva di nessi logici."—Ibid.

arts, philosophy, the Church) and the often contradictory consequences possibilities is prompted by an engagement with the limitations of historical representation.

❧

If this comprises a first mode of the philological reading of Borromini's drawings, the observation, through close attention to the material, of certain historical continuities on a par with the availability to history of *des mentalités* (in the sense invoked by the later *Annales*), present as underlying patterns, then a second is evidenced in 'Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna.' Therein, Tafuri continues his assault on Borromini's historians by considering two important (if well-aged) readings by Eberhard Hempel and Gustavo Giovannoni of the architectonic evolution of palazzo Carpegna from its 'original' form as the Palazzo Viani, prior to Borromini's initial involvement in the project in 1638, testing them against unpublished documentation made public throughout 1967 within Portoghesi's exhibition of Albertiniana. By accessing archival holdings pertaining to the Palazzo Carpegna and holding them up to the internal trajectory of Borromini's graphical works explored in Portoghesi's Albertina show, Tafuri suggests that there is a new basis for the re-examination of Borromini's chronology and of the place of Palazzo Carpegna in particular that is held simultaneously accountable to both sets of material, a contribution that is both philological and critical.[64] With reference to the architectonic development of the stairway at the end of the long axis, Tafuri claims a revised chronology accounting for both the development of the project documentation and Borromini's artistic *œuvre*.[65]

For Tafuri, evidence of Borromini's presence at various stages of the renovation of the Palazzo Viani follows judgements that rely upon the broad view of Borromini's graphical development allowed for by the exhibitions noted above. He enacts their translation from distant observations to evidence by bringing those to bear upon a specific archive, in this case the papers of the Palazzo Carpegna. The documents become complicit in Tafuri's attributions, evidencing Borrominian strategies, which in themselves become solid evidence through their presence in the Carpegna collection, tempered by their place in Borromini's development. Two drawings from 1643, for instance (Alb. 1038 and 1039), demonstrate (for Tafuri) Borromini's capacity for self-critique, an observation with no serious bearing upon the attribution and dating of the project immediately at stake, but evidence nonetheless of a mode of working he perceived 'proper' to Borromini.[66] He refers to collections of drawings that evidence the commencement of part three of the project over the years 1641-1643, under the authority of Cardinal Ulderico.[67] The

---

[64] Tafuri, 'Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna,' pp. 86, 89. Tafuri's claim of Borormini's involvement from 1638 revises the chronologies of both Argan and Portoghesi. He wites: "Fin qui risulti degli studi sinora compiuti: la bibliografia borrominiana posteriore non arreca ancun contributo sia dal punto di vista filologico che da quello critico."—ibid.

[65] Ibid., p. 85. The importance of his attributions, while interesting, are less relevant here than the ideas regarding the practice of history that are at stake.

[66] Ibid., p. 91.

[67] Ibid., p. 94. To be clear, this is not a matter of a simplistic philology: "Di fronte ad un programma di

Albertina collection, for instance, demonstrates an evolving relationship between the branches of the Palazzo Carpegna and the vertical circulation (both visual and corporal) as a relation 'proper' to Borromini. [68] From an apparent discordance within a general organic scheme, Tafuri suggests, we are forced to reconsider both the *œuvre* and the specific architectonic and artistic development of Borromini himself.[69]

This development pertains to a new relationship of *spatial objects* (the semi-circle, the ellipse, the octagon) as an advancement of Mannerism's formal themes.[70] His presentation along a longitudinal axis of an apparently 'casual' series of ostensibly autonomous spaces "is testimony of one of the most stimulating phases of Borromini research."[71] The evolution traced in the drawings, not evident in published works related to the Palazzo Carpegna, give Tafuri the material for an historical analysis that traces microscopic changes with vast historiographical consequences. In the same article, he applies the equivalent principles to drawings that concern other parts of the project, such as the stucco above the entrance to the stairwell discussed above. He demonstrates that his 'discoveries' are not isolated to specific instances of inspired analysis but show a systemic historiographical fault in the treatment of Borromini's evidence up to and into the middle 1960s. The degree to which Tafuri's declaration of the '*antinaturalistic triumph of the fragment*' is a pure consequence of philological analysis tempered with the availability of the *œuvre* is highly debatable, of course. However, the threads that he draws together in concluding this article lend weight to our present consideration of Borromini as both material and exemplar of an historiographical practice, operative in relation to the 'equipment' of the past. He re-examines, for instance, Borromini's relationship with Michelangelo in formal terms, as well as in the availability and utility of the Michelangelesque fragment to the middle seventeenth century.[72] While he returns, armed largely with speculative evidence, to consider the mannerist legacy in the seventeenth century, he concludes with the observation that even such minor works as the Palazzo Carpegna are capable of provoking historiographical revisions. This case study implies that Tafuri perceives in Borromini's approach to the material of the past an

---

così radicale rinnovamento, Borromini sembra svincolarsi dale cautele e dall'atteggiamento *moderato* che caratterizza i suoi progetti di destinazione civile o di residenza nobiliare quasi sempre risultati di attenti restauri. Il suo rifiuto al *genere* ed al *tipo*, che ha al suo fondamento una concezione di quella che per analogia portemmo definire una *retorica figurativa*, opposta a quella berniniana (a quindi a tutta la poetica del *verosimile e del probabile* a favour dell'*inverosimile e dell'irreale*), lo conduce ad elaborare progetti difficilmente riconducibili nello ambito di una casistica, anche se ricchi di *tipi figurali* ricorrenti nell'ambito dei diversi episodi che li caratterizzano."

68 Ibid., p. 95. "Il. Diss. 1019-b dell'Albertina, pur nel suo stato di semplice abbozzo, segna il trapasso dell'idea borrominiano ad uno stadio ulteriore, dove i motive già espresso negli studi precedenti vengono depurate a favour di una superiore organicità." Further, he asserts that between two phases of minor drawings (1019 and 1019-b) we can observe the fruition of new architectonic ideas pertaining to the dialectical interplay of the 'elliptical stair hall' and the 'lavatore,' "mentre un'altra sala ad ottagono allungato scavto da nicchie, separa artificiosamente scala e cortile."—p. 96.

69 Ibid., p. 96. Orig. passage: "è la testimonianza di una delle più stimolanti fasi della Ricerca borrominiana."—our trans.

70 Ibid., pp. 96-97.

71 Ibid., p. 97.

72 Ibid., p. 102.

extraordinary complexity akin, in many respects, to the complex accumulations of the past inherent to society itself.

❧

If Tafuri's polemico-scientific study of the Palazzo Carpegna in *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* comprises a direct engagement with scholarly debate on Borromini, his contributions to the *convegno* roundtables of *Studi sul Borromini* (still in 1967) claim a place in the field of Baroque scholarship.[73] While he does not contribute to the speaking programme, which includes lectures by Wittkower, Argan, Pevsner, Norberg-Shulz, and several manifestations of the Zevi-Portoghesi collaboration, he offers 'papers' to two roundtable discussions: 'Il metodo di progettazione del Borromini' and 'Il rapporto tra Borromini e la tradizione.' These two themes, as we have seen in the preceding pages, are intrinsic to Tafuri's appreciation of Borromini as an historical example as well as a 'lesson' in historiography. He suggests that the tendency not to treat typological themes within a broader reconstruction of "il metodo di progettazione borrominiano" or more generally within analyses of Baroque architectonic development means that historians overlook a fundamentally important factors in architectural composition.[74]

Approaching Borromini's *progettazione* from a typological theme allows historians, he argues, to better understand the architectural manifestations of a two-century long demise of humanist values, the results of "debate between the diverse currents prepared to break up the foundations of that same classical language."[75] Treating as equivalent the notions of typology in architecture and genre in painting, Tafuri writes that architecture of the seventeenth century, precisely for coming immediately "after the crisis of universal values," throws into relief the status of role of architect (in Borromini above all, we assume) as historian of classical typologies. No longer able to maintain as case studies an empirical analysis of typologies within the classical tradition, Baroque architecture confronted the need to recuperate "*new* components ... that restitute, in this way, values and universal consensus."[76] By implication, the 'recovery' of Borromini's methods of *progettazione* does not shed light only upon his internal development or upon his personal response to historical themes of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Rather, he informs historiographically the capacity for treating historical knowledge (both 'mediated' and 'unmediated') in seventeenth century operative practices. Tafuri points to the early manifestations of this 'problem' in Peruzzi, Serlio and Palladio, exponents of "the

245

---

73   Tafuri in 'Il metodo del progettazione del Borromini,' roundtable moderated by Salvatore C Roberti, *Studi sul Borromini. Atti del convegno promosso dall'Accademia nazionale di San Luca*, vol. 2 (Rome: De Luca, 1967), pp. 10-19; Tafuri in 'La rapporto tra Borromini e la tradizione,' roundtable conducted by Gugliemo De Angelis d'Ossat, *Studi sul Borromini. Atti del convegno promosso dall'Accademia nazionale di San Luca*, vol. 2 (Rome: De Luca, 1967), pp. 39-48; 60-63.

74   Tafuri, in 'Il metodo del progettazione del Borromini,' p. 10.

75   Ibid. Orig. passage: "il dibattito fra le diverse correnti che si apprestano a disgregare i fondamenti stessi del linguaggio classicista."—our trans.

76   Ibid. Orig. wording: "dopo la crisi dei valori universalistici"; "*nuovi* a priori compositivi che le restitui-cano, in qualche modo, valori e consensi universali."—our trans.

profound mannerist crisis"; they expose, he argues, the mechanisms of Alberti's operating principles of *storicità*, *naturalità* and *universalità*.[77] However, he observes that the first decades of the *seicento* accepted the 'conclusions' of the mannerist debate (by implication, accepting the mannerist debate as concluded); Borromini and Bernini, he proposes, step forwards as two exemplars of a new approach to the problems of architectural type, tradition and thematic synthesis.[78] The latter, he observes, conducts an internal criticism of architectonic 'type,' resulting in his proposal of new 'types' (for example, he suggests, the palazzo Chigi-Odescalchi).

He advances the idea that Borromini, in contrast, does not propose new types, rather identifying in the 'experimentation' and 'research' of the mannerist debate themes that Borromini plays through to their finality: spatial interpenetration, a dialectic between "organisms of different geometrical matrices," perspectival deformation and the freedom of form from its conventional function, to name a few. Yet in freely accessing these historical themes, *available images*, a rich repository of 'sources,' he advances an historiographical issue: "The new problem will be that of inventing new meanings for new organizational structures in architectural organisms."[79] In the church and the chapel, for instance (types with many examples in Borromini's *œuvre*), Borromini experiments with geometrical matrices, spatial solutions, configurations and historical referents. The edifice, too, evidences his rigorous empiricism in the arrangement of isolated and integrated elements, such as in the fabric of the Filipini.[80] Borromini's constant "functional reasoning" ("ragionamento funzionale") underpins his 'absolute originality,' as Tafuri has it, and thus his mastery over the new critical capacities bound up in type.[81] He writes:

> The new parameters introduced by Borromini are these: (a) the deferred valuation of the building's function in urban reality; (b) the introduction of a new rigour and complex geometrical construction of space and its objectification; (c) the exaltation of symbolic figuration upon those organisms founded particularly on social messages, or in which they bind, time to time, their hermetic and polyvalent allusions.[82]

Without restating Tafuri's case in support of these three proposed contributions, we note in passing that he claims the *progettista* to rethink historical and semantic 'types' and their

---

77   Ibid., p. 11. We refer to "la profonda crisi manierista."—our trans.

78   Ibid.

79   Ibid., p. 12. Orig. wording: "organismi di diversa matrice geometrici"; "Il nuovo problema sarà caso mai quello di inventare per essi nuovi significati in nuovi strutture organizzative degli organismi architettonici."—our trans.

80   Ibid.

81   Ibid., p. 13.

82   Ibid. Orig. passage: "I parametri nuovi introdotti dal Borromini sembrano essere: (a) la valutazione spregiudicata della funzione dell'edificio nella realtà urbana; (b) l'introduzione di una rigorosa e complessa costruzione geometrica dello spazio e delle sue oggettivazione; (c) l'esaltazione delle figurazione simboliche su cui organismi particolari fondano i propri comunicati sociali o in cui racchiudono, volta per volta, le loro ermetiche e polivalenti allusioni."—our trans.

interrelationship in each work. Where Bernini and Pietro da Cortona "disguise their failures in naturalistic recovery and scenographic episodes," Borromini "accepts it for what it is, accentuating it, rendering it a semantic pretext."[83] He demonstrates for Tafuri the negation of typological singularity; in each project implicating an historical 'type,' the tools, meanings and manifestations of said type are broken open and reconstituted under a tightly structured geometry.[84] His spatio-geometric invention lends weight, Tafuri suggests, to the notion of new "*tipi geometrici.*"[85]

Tafuri returns, in conclusion, to the Borrominian synthesis of complex problems within a singular architectonic episode, "leaving the unity of the complex organism as an open problem."[86] His compositions and manipulation of type are at once an expression of historically legitimate 'crisis' *and* an expression of a new 'ideology of the city' in which architecture is not simply an actor but an interventional agent.[87] The crisis, therefore, predicates the capacity for critical action; criticality (in this case) is played out through manipulation and confrontation of existing knowledge and techniques, testing limits and relationships. The relationship between his architectural works as critical devices and of the city as ideology resonates with a theme that pervades Tafuri's own *œuvre*: "the dialectic of the unity and the fragment."[88] The crisis of typology that Tafuri observes in historiographical terms in Borromini extrapolates into a critical position shared by both figures, that is, the broad problem of recovery in a setting that is necessarily underpinned by values, by ideology (as we have seen Tafuri read it). The valence, then, of types and symbols as historically predetermined structures constitutes, for both Tafuri and Borromini, a target for their critical practice.

Tafuri observes this being played out in reference to the theme of 'tradition,' the subject of the second roundtable at the *Studi sul Borromini convegno*. The conventional model of tradition, he begins, involves an accumulation over time, of values and experiences, resulting in an 'homogeneous' development. Borromini, on the other hand, throws 'tradition' open to such problems as the indefinite and contradiction, tending towards *heterogeneity*. History, Tafuri asserts, does not present Borromini either tranquillisers or certainty.[89] An engagement with tradition is rather a 'risky' venture not cloaked simply in distrust and an observation of super-traditional phenomena, but also in a very early engagement with museology, the *Archivio di stato di Roma* and the 'encyclopaedic' spirit of the Counter-Reformation that Tafuri posits as anything but casual.[90] It demonstrates, he suggests, a specific manifestation of a wider ambiguity and uncertainty in seventeenth

---

83 Ibid., p. 15. Orig. wording: "dissimulano tale fallimento nel recupero naturalistico e nell'episodicità scenografica"; "lo accetta per ciò che esso, è, lo accenta, lo rende pretesto semantico."—our trans.

84 Ibid., pp. 15-16.

85 Ibid., p. 16,

86 Ibid., p. 18. Orig. phrase: "lasciando come problema aperto l'unità degli organismi complessivi."—our trans.

87 Ibid.

88 Ibid., p. 19. Orig. phrase: "la diallettica dell'unità a del frammento."—our trans.

89 Ibid., pp. 39-40.

90 Ibid., p. 40.

century Roman culture pertaining to history and its uses. This context is grounded in a spirit of cultural and religious enquiry at once nostalgic for the fifteenth century while remaining fully aware that Rome cannot be 'unsacked,' that the past constitutes a burden with which tradition must actively grapple. The recollection of medieval memories in the work of both Borromini and Bernini (and in the contemporary cultural discourse on both their work) is both nostalgic and confrontational, testing the validity of 'tradition' to the current needs and limitations of the Church and the Papal States. Tafuri brings this condition to bear upon an operational choice, writing that such Gothic memories as pervade the works of these architects is a methodological consequence of philological research into documents and precedents; these triggers, in turn, introduce fractures into the traditional bases of architectural practice.[91]

Three specific inheritances are consequently thrown into jeopardy: the linguistic experimentation of the 'mannerists'; the notion of theatrical architectonic experience proper to Raffaello and Peruzzi; and the 'complete de-historicisation' in recuperation of new abstract norms, tendencies he identifies with Andrea da Sangallo il giovane and Vignola. By returning to Vitruvius as 'source,' asserts Tafuri, new extra-traditional availabilities become clear, which when combined with emergent knowledge of antiquity and a revalued medieval age predicate a new instrumentalisation of history.[92]

Borromini does not seek to introduce new complexities into the traditions governing architectural traditions, but rather recognises that the accumulated past of architectural theory and practice already manifests a high degree of complexity that undoes, in turn, the very notion of tradition. Whereas the 'mannerists' haunt an intellectualised classical tradition with counter-traditions and super-historical knowledge, Borromini sets aside the traditional precondition of architectural practice, turning instead to an argument for the architect's tools and tasks that dismisses the necessity to negotiate disciplinary knowledge or tradition. That which is considered by others are '*eresie*,' then, is foreign to the way that Borromini sets about testing the architect's technique and knowledge bases. In this sense, suggests Tafuri, he prefaces the twentieth century intellectual freedoms experienced by the artistic avant-guard. This is not to align Tafuri's reading of Borromini with that of Zevi and Portoghesi (with whom Tafuri continues to take issue) in suggesting a rejection of history. Rather, it is in the problematisation of historical knowledge as represented by tradition that Borromini predicates an intellectual strain, "in another form" ("in altra forma") of the avant-garde.[93] It is within this same line of reasoning that we observe a resonance with Tafuri's notion of historical practice. Tafuri

---

91   Ibid., p. 42.

92   Ibid., pp. 42-43. "Tale sospensione del giudizio storico e tale strummentalizzazione degli studi sull'antico significano infatti suspensione del giudizio sul presente, evasione resa istituzionale, concentrazione dell'attenzione sui prui problemi professionali, rinuncia tacita, in una parola, al ruolo di avanguardia che la rivoluzione culturale dell'Umanesimo aveva avocato a sè nel momento stesso in cui rivendicava per l'architetto la dignità dell'*intellettuale* in sense moderno. Il dibattito culturale del tardo '500 romano si svolge invece fra professionalismo ed esibizionismo intellettualistici."

93   Tafuri, in 'Il metodo del progettazione del Borromini,' pp. 47-48. Insofar as Tafuri's final contribution to this symposium restates, more or less, the trajectory of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* from Borromini to the avant-garde, we well not reconsider it in any detail.—Ibid., pp. 60-65.

neither rejects the past nor activates it in service of the future; nonetheless, the 'problem' of history is raised by any form of historical practice.

❧

Turning now to our second example, Tafuri's principal essay on Piranesi appears in three settings, each time slightly revised, over the course of the 1970s. The evolution of his titles alone describe the subtlety of the shifts involved: 'G B Piranesi: L'architettura come «utopia negative»' in *Angelus Novus* (1971); 'Giovan Battista Piranesi: L'utopie négative dans l'architecture' in *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui* (1974); and finally, '"L'architetto scellerato": G B Piranesi, l'eterotopia e il viaggio,' the opening chapter of *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980).[94] In addition, *La sfera e il labirinto*, notably subtitled *Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70*, 'recovers' Sergei Eisenstein's claim upon Piranesi's legacy for avant-garde visuality, at once problematising that claim both as an historiographic abstraction and adapting it in order to further historicise the avant-garde through the agency of Eisenstein and his admiration for Piranesi's perspectival deformations. Among the three essays directly pertaining to Piranesi in *La sfera e il labirinto*, the transposed Eisenstein essay entitled 'Piranesi, ili teku es form' (1946-1947) and Tafuri's critical response, 'Storicità dell'avanguardia: Piranesi e Ejzenštein' (published earlier in *Oppositions* as 'The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Tafuri and Piranesi') take us well beyond Tafuri's thinking on the architect's response to knowledge of the past.[95] Nonetheless, they raise important issues regarding Piranesi's 'availability' for the future. This essay is thus contemporaneous with Tafuri's treatment of the critical relationship between Piranesi and Borromini, as we have already discussed it with reference to 'Borromini e Piranesi: La città come "ordine infratto"' (Venice, 1978) and the contiguity of his Borromini and Piranesi seminars at IUAV at the end of the decade.[96]

94   Tafuri, 'Giovan Battista Piranesi. L'architettura come "utopia negativa",' paper presented to the conference 'Bernardo Vittone e la disputa fra classicismo e barocco nel settecento,' Accademia delle scienze, 1970; 'G. B. Piranesi. L'architettura come "utopia negativa",' *Angelus Novus. Trimestrale di estetica e critica*, no. 20 (1971): 89-127; and *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e archtettura da Piranesi agli '70* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980).

95   Tafuri, 'The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Piranesi and Eisenstein,' *Oppositions*, no. 11 (Winter 1977): 72-80. The essay appears in Italian in 1980 as the first chapter of *La sfera e il labirinto*, and thus appears for a second time in English in the 1987 translation of this book. There are substantial shifts in the language and phraseology between the two English versions, but they are essentially the same with two exceptions. *La sfera e il labirinto* includes a new opening paragraph, which precedes that published in *Oppositions*. Further, the two essays sport different concluding remarks.

96   Tafuri, 'Borromini e Piranesi: La citta come "ordine infratto",' *Piranesi tra Venezia e l'Europa: Atti del convegno internazionale di studio promossi dall'Istituto di storia dell'arte della Fondazione Giorgio Cini per il secondo centenario della morte di Gian Batista Piranesi, Venice, 13-15 October 1978*, ed. Alessandro Bettagno (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1983), pp. 89-101; published under the same title in Tafuri, 'Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIa (Venice: Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, 1979), pp. 143-147. The two texts are virtually identical, with the rectification of some minor typographical errors distinguishing the 1979 publication from the 1983. For ease of reference, the 'atti di convegno' are cited in this chapter rather than the *IUAV* course notes.

Within this body of work, three of Piranesi's 'projects' conjointly comprise a particularly helpful entry into his relationship with Tafuri on the matter of history and its practice: his archaeological study of the Campo Marzio, *Il Campo Marzio dell'Antica Roma* (published 1762, started in the mid-1750s); his invented dialogue between Protopiro and Didascalo, entitled *Parere su l'architettura* (1765); and the altar in his only realised building, the church of S. Maria del Priorato (1764-1766), commissioned by the Prior of the Knights of Malta and nephew of the Venetian Pope Clemente XIII, Cardinal Giambattista Rezzonico. Tafuri alludes to or directly considers each of these in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' the two texts defining his earliest explicit reflections on historical practice. They hardly represent the entirety of Piranesi's complex and intriguing *œuvre*, but insofar as they directly inform Tafuri's understanding of Piranesi's 'historiography,' they describe tendencies that we can observe elsewhere. Notable exceptions to this assertion are the *Carceri*; we will return to these in terms of Piranesi's 'adoption' by the twentieth century avant-garde. So too are the tendencies that Fabio Barry has dubbed 'virtual spoliation,' demonstrated in the projective yet non-programmatic reuse of historical fragments in San Giovanni Laterano, an unrealised project also commissioned under Clemente XIII's papacy (1763-1767).[97] In each of the cases where Tafuri cites Piranesi, he activates his example within a dialectical 'uncertainty' between homage to the past as a partly known, but ultimately recoverable burden and the future as an unknown void, though retrospectively open to historical reconstruction as an idealised past-future. This is less Tafuri paraphrasing Tafuri than it is suggesting what he identifies with in Piranesi's historical views of Rome: images of an idealised future, partly realised over time, but ultimately incongruous with documentation of the present.

Tafuri's most elaborate reading of Piranesi's work takes the Campo Marzio as subject. The images comprising this folio combine two visual strategies: presentation of artefacts, and reconstruction of the urban environment through superimposed cartographic fragments. Tafuri first draws attention to this project in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica,' where he observes: "Since Roman antiquity is not only a reference charged with ideological nostalgia and revolutionary expectation, but a myth to be contested, every form of classicist derivation is treated as mere fragment, deformed symbol, broken hallucination of an 'order' wasting away."[98] As Tafuri appears to understand this project, the effect of Piranesi's introduction of the fragment into the image of Ancient Rome is the confrontation of "the late Baroque principle of *variety*" with the 'memory' of Rome's grandeur. However, as Piranesi sets about the recovery of that grandeur through archaeological excavation and the representation of his findings and those of French, English and German 'digs,' he refuses to distinguish *within* the homogeneous notion of *Roma antichità*, rather piling up disparate fragments that describe several hundred years

---

97 Fabio Barry, lecture to the Department of Architecture and Urban Planning, Ghent University, December 2004.

98 Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology' (1969), trans. Stephen Sartorelli, *Architecture Theory since 1968*, ed. K. Michael Hays (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), p. 11.

worth of Roman past, conflicting and superimposed. Piranesi is, of course, guilty of precisely the form of nostalgia for 'Rome' that Tafuri identifies as challenged in the *Campo Marzio*; yet he understands that the proof of Rome's essential heterogeneity comprises its defence against detractors and especially against those who accuse Rome's artists of copying the Greeks. Piranesi's fragmented maps comprise, therefore, irreconcilable juxtapositions; they describe ancient Rome, but do so by exposing its elusiveness, its inability to sustain the image of the city. Tafuri finds this confrontation between city and fragment important, a kind of "reason awake" made out of "a monstrous pullulation of symbols bereft of meaning."[99]

Tafuri's essay begins with the Enlightenment plan as a natural *ensemble* to the modernist plan as an imposed order. He sees in Piranesi's Rome neither the Baroque sense of 'accommodation' nor the labyrinthine accumulation, even now a fair description of the area surrounding the Piazza Navona. Rather, in Piranesi's images, Tafuri identifies his unraveling of the complexity of the city as accumulation and his exposure of the difficulty of defending the simple idea of 'Rome' as an ancient inheritance. By extension, the concept of a classical tradition bound to a single notion of Rome, as Tafuri had earlier explored in the fifteenth century Florentine classical 'renaissance' could never be tenable if based on an imaginary homogeneity. Piranesi problematises both the fragment and the image by imposing a general cultural framework upon the autonomous archaeological artefact, but subverting that very image with the fragment's presence.

> These fragments, in the city, were pitilessly absorbed and deprived of all autonomy, despite their obstinate wish to assume articulated, composite configurations. In the *Iconografia Campi Martii* we witness an epic representation of the battle waged by architecture against itself.[100]

We could reposition this judgement to observe in the Campo Marzio an "epic representation of the battle waged" between the past and its memory, between historical knowledge and historical abstraction, between architecture as fact and architecture as theoretically circumscribed through these very constructions as Piranesi exposes for their untenability. Tafuri acutely perceives that Piranesi is ill-equipped to do little more than declare the contradiction; he cannot formalise his observations: "he must therefore limit himself to proclaiming, emphatically, that the great, new problem is that of balancing opposites."[101] Tafuri might claim that the site of this confrontation is in 'the city,' but his observations are equally, if not more poignant in thinking about history. "The individual architectural fragments collide with one another," he writes, "indifferent even to the clash, while their accumulation attests to the uselessness of the inventive effort made

---

99   Ibid.

100   Ibid.

101   Ibid., p. 12.

to define their form."[102] Borrowing the substance of Tafuri's judgement of Quatremère de Quincy's contribution to eighteenth century architectural polemics, we might see in Piranesi's images of the Campo Marzio the dissolution of the mechanisms maintaining the illusion of "control over [an historical] reality lacking organic structure."[103]

To describe this in another way, as Tafuri does in his essay 'The Wicked Architect,' Piranesi demonstrates the notion of *parole senza linguaggio*: comprehensible fragments without a general ordering principle, but also a resistance against that which 'acts *upon* the world' in order to bring it to order.[104] In this text, Tafuri attempts to understand the continuities that exist between Piranesi's *Carceri* and *Campo Marzio*. We will return to the general argument of this a little later, but for now it is useful to see how Tafuri considers the *Campo Marzio* works as an historiographical argument. If the *Carceri* ably describe the dissolution of perspectival and formal structure, he argues, then *Campo Marzio* describes the consequences of a mannerist dissolution of form played out at an urban scale.[105] Tafuri accuses Piranesi of a high degree of invention, 'representing' "a succession of groups of monuments totally without archaeological basis and characterised rather as public facilities."[106] On the other hand, he relegates such known, surviving, monuments as the Pantheon, Hadrian's tomb, and the Theatre of Marcellus, to a secondary level, which are "arbitrarily reduced to minor, almost unrecognisable incidents, even as they are inserted into a continuum of fragments that deprives them of any autonomy as well as the very status of monument."[107] This has two consequences. Firstly, it questions the importance of those monuments known better simply by their survival from antiquity to the present day. That is, Piranesi questions the criterion of longevity as principal among those by which we value individual works of architecture, apart from the city. Secondly, it challenges the viewer to contemplate "just how vast the field of these *exceptions* can be." If it is possible to see *Roma antichità* as an urban complex and not as an accumulation of monuments, then the logical consequences of such a deformation process are the reduction of all monuments, which by definition *index* the past in a highly mediated manner, to fragments, and thus to a kind of homogeneous status, homogeneous not in being subjugated by order, but by being rendered *equally meaningless*.

> Not by accident does it take on the appearance of a homogeneous magnetic field jammed with objects having nothing to do with each other. Only with extreme effort is it possible to extract from that field well-defined typological structures. And even when we have established a casuistic complex of organisms based on triadic, polycentric, multilineal laws, or on virtuoso curvilinear layouts, we end up

---

[102] Ibid., p. 11.

[103] Ibid., p. 12.

[104] Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Barbara Luigi La Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987), p. 34.

[105] Ibid., p. 33.

[106] Ibid., p. 35.

[107] Ibid., p. 35.

with a kind of *typological negation*, an 'architectural banquet of nausea,' a semantic void created by an excess of visual noise.[108]

In these terms, Tafuri suggests, Piranesi presents an argument against the privileged status of architecture in the city, of building as differentiated from its context, and offers a critique of the "breathless pursuit of exceptional structures."[109] It 'excludes,' by extension, "the characterisation of the city as a completed formal structure," "dissolves even the remotest memory of the city as a *place of Form*."[110] In turn, *Campo Marzio* breaks down the correlation between 'form' and 'content' as characterising 'civilisation.'[111] Tafuri observes the amplification of this notion in the constant presence of the Tiber as a singular, but unchanging, natural form: pitted against the city, which then turns away from a naturalistic notion of civilisation. "Here, moreover, it is no longer a question of a *criticism*; it is a question of the representation of an active decomposition. The *ordo* whose dissolution is presented is none other than the totality of Form."[112]

Tafuri thus identifies a process at work in *Campo Marzio* that is simultaneously projective and denunciatory. It is "a disenchanted documentation" of the ancient city that persistently represents form after form of the architecture of the ancient world, but that by doing so without belief in the entirety of the city as a static representation, it reveals the lack of language and thus the contemporary (eighteenth century) call for strategies for ordering the city according to rational structures and images.[113] For this reason, perspective as the quintessential Renaissance invention bound up in the 'recovery' of a superhistorical classical language, is completely set aside in these images. "On one side, there is the painstaking, scientific study of archaeological findings; on the other, the most absolute arbitrariness in their restitution."[114] Tafuri thus finds in Piranesi the proof of his own practice: "History no longer offers values as such. Subjected to a merciless inspection, it is revealed as a new principle of authority, which as such must be disputed."[115] Following this logic, Tafuri introduces to his reading of *Campo Marzio* a 'naïve dialectic' in which 'negation' and 'affirmation' play out in Piranesi's pursuit of historical knowledge to the caves and underground passages that underpin the certain forms that sit above ground, confirming their existence, but denying their abstraction into a rationalised urban superstructure. Tafuri asks: "Cannot this interest in 'what is hidden' in ancient architecture be interpreted as a metaphor for the search for a place in which the exploration of the 'roots' of the monuments meets with the

---

108 Ibid.

109 Ibid.

110 Ibid., p. 36.

111 Ibid. Cf. Massimo Cacciari, 'Dialettica e tradizione,' *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1, 1968, p. 133.

112 Tafuri, ibid., p. 37.

113 Ibid., p. 38.

114 Ibid.

115 Ibid.

exploration of the depths of the subject?"[116] Piranesi's archaeology then presents Tafuri with an extraordinary possibility: the application of a programmatic deformation of ideological or theoretical ordering systems simply through their confrontation with knowledge. By methodologically distancing analysis from action (from the future, we could also say), Piranesi exposes the preconceptions on which projection into the future might rely. Architectural theory, consequently and by extension, can no longer rely on historical justifications; history, too, is exonerated as a tool for the critique of architectural ideology.

<p style="text-align:center">❧</p>

The second example of Piranesi's 'projects' that inform our understanding of Tafuri's approach to questions of history and its representation is *Parere su l'architettura*. This text constitutes one of three parts in Piranesi's refutation of the 'glory' of *Roma antichità* in the face of rising graecophilia. The others: a "line-by-line refutation" of a letter written by one M. Mariette, entitled *Osservazione sopra la lettre de Monsieur Mariette* and the preface to a treatise called *Della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arte in Europa ne' tempi antichi*.[117] The *Parere* describes several 'dialectical opposites' that we could explore to equal effect. However, since Tafuri observes in the *Parere* the same 'agonising dialectics' as he discovers in the altar at S. Maria del Priorato, we might reflect on one of these in some detail. Indeed, the debate between the precocious Didascalo and the conservative Protopiro offers an introduction to several contemporary polemics: the cultural supremacy of Ancient Greece versus that of Ancient Rome; the Laugian reduction of the architect's task to the recovery of organic formal simplicity versus artistic licence within a classical tradition; similarly, the necessity for rules versus the compulsion to express. In addition, Piranesi's *Parere* introduces the question of the degree to which architects ought to look backwards or to the past while designing for the present moment, looking towards a future that, no matter how immediate or distant the individual commission might render that future, remains in advance of the present. For this reason, Tafuri can legitimately present Piranesi's *Parere* on the same terms as he considers the Altar of Saint Basil, as we shall see.

That these two 'projects' share a basic theoretical premise is hardly surprising considering their historical proximity. Piranesi received the commission for S. Maria del Priorato in 1764, the same year in which Mariette penned his letter to the *Gazette littérature de l'Europe* prompting Piranesi's response in 1765 with his *Osservazione*. The two 'projects' are thus contemporaneous, one a sustained reflection on the defensibility

<div style="border-top:1px solid; width:30%"></div>

[116] Ibid., p. 38.

[117] Giovanni Battista Piranesi, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Mariette; with Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Ancient Europe in Ancient Times*, trans. Caroline Beamish and David Britt from *Osservazione sopra la lettre de M Mariette aux auteurs de la* Gazette littérature de l'Europe*, inserita nel supplemento dell'istessa gazzetta stampata dimanche 4, novembre MDCCLIV; e Parere su l'architettura, con una prefazione ad un nuovo trattato Della introduzione e del progresso delle belle arte in Europa ne' tempi antichi* (1765, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002).

of Roman cultural supremacy and the other Piranesi's first (only, as it happened) built contribution to that vast accumulation of pasts. In the *Parere*, Didascalo presents his older counterpart with a defence of Piranesi's 'caprice,' which extends to a defence of ornament in architecture of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. At the heart of Protopiro's position is the argument forwarded by Marc Antoine Laugier, that the origins of architecture are 'natural': columns stand for great trees, pediments for the forms of foliage, and so on. Protopiro defends the 'rigorist' position that all use of ornaments and architectural elements that are superfluous to this naturalist conception of architecture as subject to botanic evolution comprises a basic dismissal of inherent architectural quality. By designing buildings in such a way as to dismiss the simplicity of the originating forms identified by Laugier in nature, the baroque architect furthermore undermines the legacy of the ancient Greeks, whose devotion to simplicity and rejection of caprice lies at the heart of Mariette's (and thus Protopiro's) criticism of the contemporary and such forebears as the capricious Bernini and Borromini. For Protopiro, then, 'Greece' offers the closest approximation to the origins of architecture; all 'subsequent' deformations constitute a straying away from the 'rule,' for which artistic restitution must somehow be sought.

Piranesi's dialogue thus exposes the logical consequences of such a rigorist view. If all formal developments since the prototypical, platonically pure architectural work exist only as 'infections,' then, Piranesi argues through the agency of Didascalo, all such infections must be exposed as such and 'cured.' Architects must decide between columns, pilasters and walls. If columns remain true to the primitive hut, while other 'supporting' elements are ultimately superfluous, then they must exorcise these latter elements from their practice. If, to continue, Protopiro removes from his vocabulary those elements not intrinsic to 'pure' architectural form (embodied in Laugier's hut, demonstrated in the architecture of Ancient Greece), then Didascalo proposes a series of pertinent rules in response: "smooth columns" (rejecting fluting); "no bases, and no capitals" (for neither is 'natural'); "architraves with no fasciae and no band" (to be true to the image of the architrave as "tree trunks placed horizontally across the forked props or like beams laid out to span the tree trunks"); "friezes without triglyphs" (removing "clutter"); "internal walls with no architraves, friezes and cornices" (removing the confusion of inside and outside, "such travesties of architecture"); "buildings with no vaults" (an "impropriety"); finally, "buildings with no walls, no columns, no pilasters, no friezes, no cornices, no vaults, no roofs" ("a clean sweep").[118] Piranesi's point is not simply to expose graecophilic rigorism as conservative, even though its defendant in the *Parere*, Protopiro, is clearly this. Neither is it evident that Piranesi simply wishes to issue a call to arms for such defenders of architectural creation as are represented by the words of the young Didascalo, though the text of course maintains this mission as an undercurrent.

One line of Didascalo's argument suggests a broader implication. He asks Protopiro: "You would like me to agree with you that the architectural manners laid down by

255

---

[118]   Piranesi, 'Opinions on Architecture,' pp. 105-106.

Vitruvius are rational? That they imitate truth?"[119] Protopiro, who has already let slip, "Well, I love truth,"[120] responds that a comparison with contemporary architecture reveals the truthfulness of these ancient Greek models, to which Vitruvius looked in preparation of his treatise. In understanding truth through the eyes of the present, and with a view towards a mode of design to be pursued in the future, renders the very notion of 'truth' far more open, to Didascalo's eyes, to the deformations that are already inherent in history. For instance, he counters Protopiro's point that all architecture is beholden to an originating moment and therefore open to a comparative judgement by saying that any attempt to impose an image of the perfect past upon the present has two consequences: monotony, and falsehood. The first results from architects being so tightly constrained by their historical exemplar that they can but repeat that exemplar *ad infinitum*. The second is the logical result of suggesting that architecture exists as a series of homogeneous, historically recoverable models: mathematically circumscribed orders describing perfect numeration systems and representing specific qualities in a time-honoured manner. Insofar as Piranesi writes of truth, he has Didascalo demonstrate that there is no truth, wherein lies the only reliable lesson of history. Within any given order there is such variation that it is impossible to differentiate between one order and the other in definitive terms. Likewise any attempt at inventing new orders results simply in the perpetuation of an age-old experimentation with a basic architectural language, its syntax and lexicon tested over time, but ultimately evolving from century to century. "If one were to consider examples of the Corinthian order," Didascalo suggests, "one would find so many different manners of ornamental detail that one could define as many orders as there are monuments."[121]

For Tafuri, this dialogue fuels an argument that pervades his entire *œuvre*, namely that any rational theory applied as a limiting condition for an ultimately experimental system is limited by the degree to which the exponents of that system can maintain a substantial enough conviction to camouflage the entropic tendency of all systems. In *Progetto e utopia*, this is exercised as an argument against architectural theory in the face of free economic development in the building sector. In *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, it appears as a case against the utility of history for theoretical ends, or against the abstraction of a fundamentally irrational past into proof for rational theoretical agendas. Both of these arguments of Tafuri's are enriched by consideration alongside Piranesi's *Parere*. Therein, Piranesi suggests that a rigorist position deconstructs when fully extended. For Tafuri, this risk is shared by any architectural theory that purports to govern over architectural production. History comprises both the evidence underpinning the theorisation of production *and* the vehicle for its entropic demise. In the specific examples proffered by Piranesi through Didascalo and Protopiro, the assurances bound up in an image of solid historical knowledge atrophy when the image dissolves. Thus

---

[119]   Ibid., p. 107.
[120]   Ibid., p. 102.
[121]   Ibid., p. 109.

Protopiro's argument that a comparative study of eighteenth century architecture and that of Ancient Greece demonstrates clear principles since abandoned in contemporary architecture is annulled by Didascalo's assurance that once the superhistorical comparison with Antiquity is set aside, any distinctions from region to region, order to order and within any definition that Protopiro might care to advance, comprise nothing short of an heterogeneous and ultimately irrecoverable field of differentiated examples within a broadly comprehensible classical tradition. The lessons contained in the past, as Didascalo appears to understand them, reassure architects of their creative license. Protopiro, as Tafuri observes, experiences a form of theoretical Catch-22: "rigorism is annulled only because it is insufficiently rigorous."[122]

❧

Tafuri rightly observes that Piranesi's cases for and against a rigorist position, or for and against a programmatic use of abstracted historical knowledge, is not entirely external to Piranesi himself. The internalisation of an historical mentality (evidencing the past in the present) in an architectural practice (aligned with architecture through media and disciplinary ideology), results in a trans-disciplinary practice that appears to embrace one discipline through the tools of the other. To the extent that this comprises a decision, in Piranesi's case, to explore the full consequences of historical knowledge through architectural media (and, in a limited sense, through a design practice that anticipates realisation), then Piranesi is an important historical example, for Tafuri, of an architect choosing history. The decision that Tafuri might well have identified in Piranesi is far from clear-cut, at least in the sense that it appears with great clarity in Tafuri's intellectual development. Nonetheless, it is possible to identify in the *Parere su l'architettura* a dialectical treatise on history, or on the status of history in architectural practice. Piranesi's ongoing exploration of the limits of architectural representation and the propriety of communicating historical knowledge through architectural media belies an ambivalent disciplinary stance. He accepts commissions when offered, signs his name 'Piranesi, Venetian Architect' and designs highly inventive imaginary spaces in both the *Carceri* and the *Groteschi*. However, even Piranesi's most inventive works directly test the historical authority accorded, for instance, Albertian perspectival space. Likewise, he refuses to rationalise the inventive elements of his archaeological works, represented by *Campo Marzio* in its projection of potential historical realities onto a known archaeological field, but refusing to present a homogenised (and thus recoverable) image of Ancient Rome. He places fragments side by side; alongside, also, such historical elaborations as the landscaping around the Castel Sant Angelo. Those images tending towards complete coherence, even, are subverted by Piranesi's manipulation of the rules of both perspective and scale. For these reasons, Tafuri can speak of an 'agonising dialectic,' and point towards its embodiment in Piranesi's design for the altar at S. Maria del Priorato.

257

---

[122]   Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 44.

Compositionally, it comprises two sarcophagi, upon which rests a third. Above the third is a sphere, atop which is a sculptural depiction of the *Apotheosis of Saint Basil*, first protector of the Priory's church on the *Foro romano*. The precise design of Saint Basel and his angelic companions may be been either Piranesi's or its sculptor's, Tommaso Righi, but in any case the structural composition most surely bears Piranesi's signature. Regarding the altar, which (as we have seen) corresponds to the 'agonising dialectic' of the *Parere su l'architettura*, Tafuri describes the front as "narrative, didactic and caustically late-Baroque," the rear as "abstract, anti-descriptive and of haunting Illuminist symbolism."[123] The rear face of the altar is the composition of a naked sphere (that of *La sfera e il labirinto*, illustrated on the cover of the English edition) firmly held in place by the altar structure. "Abstraction and representation, silence and communication, the freezing of the signs and the abundance of images—these pairs of opposites are closely linked in the altar of S. Basilio."[124] He identifies it as "the protagonist of the restructuring of the church of the Priorato."[125] It is, he argues, "an isolated object and thus perceivable as such, is nothing more than a mechanism that flaunts its duplicity."[126] Its duplicity, in turn, is exposed on the altar's hidden side: while the front describes Piranesi's recovery of history, his capacity for accumulation and thus his tendency to order historical knowledge, the rear describes the impossibility of recovering the past or of representing it except in the most arbitrary manner. "What is given as *evident*, as an immediate visual stimulus from a *common* point of view, reappears purified, rendered pure intellectual structure, on the reverse side, on the *hidden* side."[127] Tafuri celebrates Piranesi's consciousness of the mechanisms of historical representation, his refusal "to be deceived by the 'evident' aspect of things."[128] And yet, as Tafuri further notes, Piranesi is at once compelled to represent the past, and to know the impossibility of such a task. For this reason, Piranesi's sphere does not 'herald in' the future in the later manner of Boullée's or Ledoux's monumental, neo-classical forms. Their eyes are too firmly set on the future, conditioned by the full implications of reason and thus capable of total knowledge, encyclopaedic and subjugating; Piranesi's, in contrast, are not. "When Ledoux, Boullée, Sobre, and Vaudoyer point out Piranesi's geometric silence, they will feel obligated to substitute for the ancient symbolism of transcendence a symbolism of man made sacred to himself."[129]

The sphere upon which Piranesi depicts S. Basilio's apotheosis is immutable, precisely because it forms the lynchpin of a dialectical expression of both the necessity for and the impossibility of the past. Yet the altar structure itself clearly states (through

---

[123] Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, trans. Georgio Verrecchia (1968, London: Granada, 1980) p. 28.

[124] Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*, p. 49.

[125] Ibid., p. 48.

[126] Ibid, p. 49.

[127] Ibid.

[128] Ibid.

[129] Ibid.

the sarcophagi) that this truth resides upon the repositories of the dead; those of the ancients, indeed, but those accumulating the vast totality of past human life. Knowledge of this kind is impossible, and the sphere, rather than acting to signify this totality (in the aspirate sense that we find in Boullée's sublime Newton Cenotaph) comprises an inversion, wherein the sphere describes the negation of everything, the entire past, which is conceivably enveloped by its platonic form. That the sphere, furthermore, comprises a weight, a burden upheld by forms unambiguously invoking death and its negation through containment, forms a further allusion to the weight of this knowledge that the past exists, even if its specificity remains beyond reach. If Piranesi's 'agonizing dialectic' of *Parere su l'architettura* implicates the tension between the knowing or knowledge of the past, and attempting its representation or appropriation for programmatic uses, then memory comprises the medium of its negotiation. Two factors are here at stake: the nature of the past relative to the present, and its representation *in* the present. The sphere forms a highly charged symbol: the past comprises a burden that can never be recovered, only ever translated from its 'fact' to a present that seeks to know it. Nonetheless, he attempts its representation in complete awareness of this condition of his historical practice. In the sense that this dialectic is expressed by Piranesi, both he and Tafuri share its 'agony.'

❦

The historiographical theme of the Altar to San Basilio thus corresponds with those of *Campo Marzio* and *Parere su l'architettura*: the challenge offered to 'history' as representation by historical knowledge as recovery. Framed as a metaphor for recovery of the past and ascribing to Piranesi's archaeological practice a theoretical significance, evidentiary 'fragments' do not acquire autonomous meaning, but rather abstractly index a necessarily lost past. The past to which Piranesi's fragments point eludes representation, except as programmatically determined and thus conditioned by the present. All fragments taken together, Tafuri observes of Piranesi, do not constitute an increasingly complete body of knowledge about the past, but rather mounting evidence that the past, beyond reach, does not exist as a field that can be returned to the present as a rationalised memory—not even with the correct analytical tools or the proper ideological insight. To the extent that both Piranesi and Tafuri represent the past, in images, analyses, the proposition of fragments of knowledge, they inevitably condition their representation with a sense of the past as a burden, with full and clearly communicated knowledge of the impossibility of an homogenous whole. Tafuri's historiography, as Piranesi's, constructs the past as a weight upon the present. Piranesi, in his architectural practice, thus corresponds to the kind of historical practice that Tafuri advances: rejecting the future, revealing the responsibility of the present to the past, undermining modes of historical representation; all the while, provoking architectural practice to test its own uses of history, while remaining within the broad parameters of architectural culture. In this sense, Piranesi's

defence of Rome is not nostalgic under the same terms as the nostalgia for Greece that he engages in the *Parere*.

The confrontation of historical 'lessons' with mute archaeological facts corresponds, as a disciplinary issue, to the status of history in architectural practice versus that of historical practice. In the case of Piranesi, this translates into an issue of technique: the viewer confronts 'the fragment,' but within the ordering mechanism of the image, which is inevitably informed by framing devices that correspond to 'ideology.'

<div align="center">⚜</div>

Among the analyses that constitute Tafuri's reading of Piranesi's appropriation (documented, or by inference) by the history of the avant-garde, the explicit claim made upon Piranesi's legacy by Eisenstein prompts us to consider an important disciplinary issue. If we can claim that Tafuri identifies Piranesi as an architect whose concerns with the past, primarily, and the nature of historical knowledge in architectural practice, secondarily, inform his own disciplinary questions in the twentieth century, then we must acknowledge that Eisenstein makes an equally valid claim upon Piranesi's artistic legacy. We may consider the presence of these two 'claims' upon Piranesi as indicative of two basic disciplinary 'availabilities' in his work: to the historian-critic and to the architect-artist.[130] As we have seen already, Piranesi's *œuvre* resists such a simple formulation as a two-Piranesi doctrine might call for. To treat it, rather, as descriptive of a disciplinary dialectic informs a somewhat different conception of these two 'legacies.' That is, by perceiving in the artistic production of Piranesi's images a sustained critico-historical practice and by understanding this practice as conducted through the media and with the disciplinary *bagage* of the architect, it remains impossible to make any unambiguous separation, or to conceive of one position uncontaminated by the other.

That two distinct disciplinary claims follow, purporting to be informed by either critical or artistic 'lessons' (though never explicitly invoking a sense of Piranesi's disciplinary duplicity), or at least by certain strategies, has internal consequences to each of these legacies. Tafuri, for instance, identifies Piranesi as an architect consciously and conscientiously problematising historical memory, as an architect turned away from history; in other words, Tafuri appears to understand Piranesi as an architect turned historian, like himself. Eisenstein, at least as Tafuri portrays him, claims Piranesi's legacy in the *opposite* terms, describing Piranesi's 'lesson' for the avant-garde, mediated by such artists as Cézanne and Picasso, as informing artistic 'explosion,' releasing (with specific reference to the *Carceri*) an artistic programme from the rule-bound visual traditions embedded in modern Western culture. In Piranesi, Eisenstein thus identifies mechanisms set in place through the subjection of his *Carceri* to a second state, implemented further by Eisenstein's programmatic appropriation of them for avant-garde visuality in service

---

[130] Tafuri, 'The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Piranesi and Eisenstein,' *Oppositions*, no. 11 (Winter 1977): 72-80.

of a political release from the structures of bourgeois capitalist society, encapsulated in Eisenstein's own cinematography. Yet the presence of these two claims, pulling Piranesi in two contradictory disciplinary directions, critical and programmatic, are indebted to a dialectical state inherited by both Tafuri and Eisenstein: the loss of innocence, and the principle of hope. The former rests upon the confrontation of historical representation (as a device underpinning the production of architectural theory) with historical fact (the artefact of Piranesi's archaeological research, the documentation of Tafuri's). The latter relies upon the perpetuation of utopian devices (enabling the preconception of the future), even if deployed without innocence: the image, programme, project, and so on. To this extent, Tafuri's analysis of Eisenstein's reading of Piranesi becomes an important case in considering how Piranesi's critical fortunes are elaborated in pursuit of a different, though fundamentally inextricable, path from that followed by Tafuri.

✤

Tafuri offers his 'last word' on Borromini and Piranesi in the dual settings of the *anno piranesiano* and his 1978-1979 Borromini seminar. In these two settings, Tafuri casts into relief the full implications of their examples to an analytical-historical practice. Two contemporaneous essays explore the broader implications of their capacity for critical operativity, the preface to Tafuri's *IUAV* seminar and his presentation to the 1978 *convegno* 'Piranesi tra Venezia e l'Europa' (1983). The latter appears in the portfolio of readings for the former, under the title 'Borromini e Piranesi. La città come "ordine infranto".' Introducing the seminar as a whole, Tafuri identifies its positions in his own development of historical and historiographical themes within the middle 1970s. He writes that 'Borromini' continues a line of thought ignited two years earlier (1976-1977) with a seminar on the problem of 'transgression' in artistic languages, a seminar (as we have seen) shaped significantly by an intellectual exchange with Franco Rella. Tafuri perceives the Baroque, following Benjamin (*Der Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiels*, 1928) and particularly thinking of Borromini, as an initial manifestation of a dialectical exchange between rationality and irrationality, in turn introducing 'the provisional' as a condition of critical artistic production.[131]

Tafuri singles out Piranesi's twelfth table in the series *Prima parte di architettura* (1743) to demonstrate his critical debt to Borromini. He writes that Piranesi's persistent visual reference to the Tower of Babel indexes S. Ivo alla Sapienza. They at once question the myth of 'origin' and return to that myth in order to 'perturb' (as Freud would put it). Babel poses at once an 'origin' from which the multiplication of languages ensues and against which rebellion is directed, *and* an impossibility, an imaginary foundation. Borromini's negation of tradition in exchange for an acceptance of the tools and tasks of architectural practice (as we observed above) offers an initial disciplinary consequence of this view. In the cases of both *progettisti*, understanding that myths or representations have

---

[131] Tafuri, 'Introduzione al corso. Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico,' p. 3.

some grounding in the 'perfect language' of a point of origin does not compel them to recover the correct origins of those images, but rather to acknowledge the provisionality of tradition or, in Tafuri's terms, of history as a construction that approximates according to a predetermined value. Perturbance as a critical strategy proper to the modern world commences from a loss of innocence predicated on understanding the artificiality of knowledge *and* its irrecoverability as fact. This knowledge underpins what Tafuri calls Borromini's negation of the 'grand theatre of the world,' his exposure of the artificiality of tradition through a direct mediation.

Tafuri points to the critical synchrony of Borromini's internalisation of the city's complexity and Piranesi's elaboration of its 'profound mundanity' in reducing their thinking to a "subtle dialectic between the real and the unreal" in which the image is sustained only with irony, simultaneously the object of regard and the target of destruction.[132] He renders equivalent, directly or by implication, several recurring terms: nature, image, history.[133] The latter implicates, by necessity, his own practice. We can understand the meeting of 'material' with a 'new science,' as Tafuri observes in Borromini's practice, as useful terms for articulating disciplinary consequences for architectural history from these two architects. If, as we observed above, Borromini and Piranesi both enact (as 'colloquio') a dialectic between the fragment and the image, we can consider a second dialectic in consequence, between practice and discipline. If 'discipline' comprises an image of knowledge, a formalisation of theories and material, then (disciplinary) practice conducted with such critical rigour as Borromini and Piranesi approach tradition and 'myth' sets aside formalised knowledge by enacting a direct engagement with the material of disciplinary practice. This, in turn, directly affects the construction of discipline as image. The image is not, then, to be surpassed or destroyed; in negating its role in disciplinary practice, that practice is a catalyst for the deconstruction of the image, the confrontation of representation with that which is represented. For Tafuri reading Borromini through Benjamin's eyes, the inverse of knowledge is doubt, a disciplinary principle akin to the weakness considered in the previous section: so, too, the image, which is constantly undone and remade in practice, which in turn itself comprises an image as disciplined knowledge.

132 Tafuri, 'Borromini e Piranesi. La città come "ordine infranto",' pp. 92-93. Orig. phrase: "sottile dialettica fra reale e irreale."—our trans.

133 Ibid., p. 93.

Chapter VIII
The Solitude of the Project

The 'project' holds a place of particular importance in the reception of Tafuri's work. While there is little, if any, consensus regarding the terms under which architectural historiography or architectural culture writ large ought to engage with his 'legacy,' the spectre of the 'project' stands in place, time and again of direct engagements with his thought. As a device, it guarantees some distance between historiographical, critical or theoretical readings of his work and an unnamed question widely deemed proper to Tafuri himself. This question, permeating the books, papers, articles and catalogues he left behind, has some relevance to the responsibilities borne, as he understood them, by individual intellectuals within the confines of their institutions, teaching and research. That the 'project' distils into as a concept proper to Tafuri himself is readily traceable to both *Progetto e utopia* (1973) and 'Il "progetto" storico' (1977), in which he argues for a notion of 'history as project' and assesses (though not for the first time) the architectural project as historically precluded by modernity except as an isolated event, beyond conditions of the real world.[1] Attempts to define the nature and 'target' of Tafuri's 'project' occupy as much of his analysts' attention as do efforts to identify the mechanisms and referents of his politicised 'critique of ideology.' It lends authority to the monographic issues of *Casabella* and *ANY*, both of which invoke the 'project' in their titles: 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' and the notion of 'History as Project.'[2] Within a search for 'legacies'—to invoke Rafael Moneo's reflections upon *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985) and *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992)—the 'project' is a fluid vehicle for organising and analysing Tafuri's work without recourse to 'answers.'[3]

---

1   Tafuri, 'Il "progetto" storico,' *Casabella*, no. 429 (October 1977): 11-18. 'Il progetto' was introduced even earlier by Tafuri in his book *Progetto e Utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico* (Bari: Laterza, 1973), which although published first as 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica' (*Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79), was more widely circulated in its 1973 pamphlet form. In its reception, 'Il "progetto" storico'—and its English translation 'The Historical "Project",' *Oppositions*, no. 17 (1979): 54-75—closely followed the English publication of *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigi La Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976), which made the idea of 'project' very present in the reception of Tafuri's work in an Anglo-American context. In France, too, the proximity of this essay's publication—in *La nouvelle critique*, no. 103 (April 1977)—with that of *Projet et utopie. De l'Avant-garde à la métropole*, translated by Ligia Ravé-Emy (Paris: Dunod, 1979) facilitated a similar perception of the term 'project' as somehow integral to Tafuri's thinking.

2   Vittorio Gregotti, ed., 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri' / 'The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995); Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid.: 10-70. Another series of articles invoking 'the project' appear in *Architectural Theory Review* 8, no. 2 (November 2003)—including Ken Tadashi Oshima, 'Manfredo Tafuri and Japan: An Incomplete Project' (pp. 16-29), Gevork Hartoonian, 'Reading Manfredo Tafuri Today' (p. 15) and 'The Project of Modernity: Can Architecture Make It?' (pp. 44-56) and my own 'Death in Venice: Tafuri's Life in the Project' (pp. 30-43).

3   He writes: "Ho detto in altra occasione che le sue ultima opere—principalmente *L'armonia e i conflitti* (frutto della collaborazione con Antonio Foscari), *Venezia e il rinascimento* e *La ricerca del Rinascimento*—sono per me un testamento spirituale vero e proprio. Secondo me, Tafuri qui communica come lui vede l'architettura dopo una carriera lunghissima e impegnata come storico e critico."—Rafael Moneo, 'Architettura, storia, critica,' *Casabella*, no. 653 (February 1998), pp. 46-47. Moneo refers to Tafuri and

Yet it is also, as we have seen in the previous chapter, a concept proper to architecture, a utopian construction within the architect's worldview. The project is the domain of the 'not yet': drawing, model, plan, treatise, etc. It is, Tafuri argues, readily corruptible, fatally fragile in its engagement with 'reality.' Its architectonic resonances, though, offer a useful (if unintentional) bridge between Tafuri's denouncements of architectural theory and his audience of architectural theoreticians. The difficulty of translating Tafuri's 'project' into the terms of architectural practice are bound up in the notion of indecision, as it was for Borromini and Piranesi. Yet the full implications of the project, as in Italian ('progetto') and French ('projet'), index a utopianism without hope, a perpetual future. It points towards a kind of intellectual work—just as the 'projected' elements of architectural design correspond to the notion of paper architecture, architecture before building—uncomplicated by external economics, technique or politics.[4] Through the 'project,' historiographical 'production' acquires a currency readily traded with architectural practice in its reception as an idea, rendering Tafuri's work 'acceptable.' But in contrast to a model where the 'project' comprises a space for intellectualising problems that lead to solutions, as buildings, for instance, Tafuri's own 'project' is underpinned by the programmatic indecision he observed elsewhere. It shies away from representation, while remaining bound in the vicissitudes of historical representation out of necessity. Painfully aware of his disciplinary limitation, he sought an exchange, we will show in this final chapter, with those possibilities for thinking *outside* the discipline as a was of retaining disciplinary integrity. Analysis of his 'project' thus calls for different terms than analysis of the architectural project.

Key to this argument is a sense of incompletion, acknowledgement that Tafuri's private world remains locked up, forever out of reach.[5] This observation explains the tendency in recent commentary to advance 'answers' for Tafuri's biographical twists and turns. Most elusive of these manoeuvres, it seems, is his purported 'retreat' from conducting a 'critique of architectural ideology' to pursuing a 'philological' analysis of Renaissance architectural history. A growing game of 'join-the-dots' has emerged—with which we are doubtless complicit—'explaining' the terms under which this 'retreat' is negated within Tafuri's *œuvre*. Yet a nagging sense of isolation, futility and elusion pervades any such analysis. The present chapter suggests that we have much to gain by returning, as in Chapter Two,

---

Foscari, *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di S. Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983); Tafuri, *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985); and *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architetti* (Turin: Einaudi, 1992).

4   For this reason, the Dutch translation of *Progetto e utopia*, *Ontwerp en Utopie: Architectuur en Ontwikkeling van het Kapitalisme*, trans. Umberto Barbieri, Cees Boekraad, et al. (Nijmegen: Socialistiese Uitgeverij, 1978) translates 'project' as 'design.' Only the English translation takes the idea of *Progetto* so far from its definite meaning in translating it to 'architecture.' To compare the Italian meaning of 'progetto' elsewhere in terms of architectural nomenclature, consider the formulation of the Dipartimento di progettazione architettonica at the Università Iuav di Venezia or the title of Tafuri's survey *Vittorio Gregotti: Progetti e architetture*, Milan: Electa, 1982.

5   Mark Wigley astutely translates this into an historiographical challenge in *ANY*: "To be faithful to his research would be precisely to reread it in terms of its capacity to cover over the very complexities that it appears to uncover. Rather than killing his work by monumentalising it, scholars have to keep it alive by cruelly paying attention to what it neglects."—Wigley, 'Post-Operative History,' de Solà-Morales, ed., ibid., p. 53.

to the preconditions of Tafuri's historical practice to perceive the intellectual climate in which his 'choice' for history occurs. The new freedoms of the post-War (and increasingly post-Fascist) university in Italy during the 1950s and 1960s, combined with the literal freedom of entry into an intellectual environment from the late 1950s resulted, in simple terms, in an open field of possibilities. Not handed to this generation unconditionally, the new freedom required struggle, and gave birth to fresh intolerance of conservative politics and ideology. While Tafuri shared this intolerance with his 'generation'—a word we use in sympathy with Passerini's *Autoritratto del gruppo*—he remains readily detachable from generational abstractions through an individualistic ethic with origins in several of the autobiographical 'factors,' described at the outset of this dissertation, in his early adult years. To rephrase, what concerns us here is the potential 'legacy' of Tafuri's youthful intellectual climate and 'private' response to the post-War university for an operational choice for his discipline, in which he persistently resists the resolution of historical images while pursuing something beyond that most immediately at stake in his practice.

This is not to undermine our earlier dismissal of biographical causality—or, indeed, of the 'possibility' of biography itself—as a way of understanding Tafuri's contribution to the intellectualisation of architecture and its history. It is irresponsible to test the recollections of a fifty-six year-old man as unmediated, without the added weight of intention. However, whatever Tafuri's childhood might have been for him, we can well imagine that his claim to have encountered and to have been open to new waves of fashionable thought is not far from accurate. He was certainly in a position to read translations of Heidegger, Sartre, Camus, Kierkegaard and many other widely sold European philosophers; his self-diagnosed predisposition for existentialist philosophy as a teenager is not without correspondence to many of his generation and not without rational, historical explanation.[6] While this might be interesting to note, its importance lies in the capacity for this light reading of the existentialists—it could have been nothing other than lightweight at this time—to become a foundation for an individual subjectivity in Tafuri's generational experience of isolation—for Passerini the dislocation of post-War youth from their fascist or sympathetic parents, both literally and abstractly—that, as a whole, embraced the self-determinism and self-accountability embedded in the range of existentialist doctrine, from Kierkegaard's

---

6   Between the end of the Second World War and '1968' the widespread popularity of French existentialism owed much to the cult-value of Jean-Paul Sartre's 1943 *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1943). Therein, Sartre articulates a precise (if complex) relationship between being, nothingness, place, perception, existence and essence that draws on over a century of German philosophical tradition (from Kant to Husserl) and calls for a sound knowledge of discourses shaped by Descartes, Nietzsche and Heidegger. It was widely read in France and elsewhere; however, direct philosophical engagement with Sartre's ideas on either existentialism or phenomenology was relatively low in comparison with the popularity of the book itself. The importance of *L'être et le néant* lies not solely in the technicalities of its argument, but rather in a broad appreciation for Sartre's 'existentialist man,' particularly within those nations in recovery from a period of domestic or occupying fascism. However, the context is not simply one of reception. Sartre writes *L'être et le néant* after a period of imprisonment in Germany, having been captured while serving in the French army. In an occupied Paris, therefore, Sartre regards the choices available to man as fundamental: to collaborate or to resist (though not to do nothing, which is a choice, says Sartre, for collaboration). Further evidence of Sartre's widely considered importance lies in his nomination as Nobel Laureate in Literature in 1964; he turned down the prize money, but once named had no control over his status as Laureate—http://nobelprize.org/literature/laureates/1964/press.html (accessed January 16, 2005).

Christianity to Sartre's nihilism. Whatever the specific conditions of Tafuri's own "perverse sense of solitude," they were shared at a wider and more abstract level by his generation. A generational experience of alienation in the European 1950s and 1960s was manifest for Tafuri in a tendency "to appreciate everything that was tragic": "There was both pain and pleasure in this intellectual solitude, even my own intellectual solitude."[7] This sense was popularly formalised in the writings of Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre; there is little surprise, or deviation from any norm, when Tafuri later described his own affinity for their ideas. That this would have autobiographical repercussions is likewise unsurprising: "So there was solitude in my family, and also isolation on the outside, because mine was a generation of total ignorance."[8]

<div align="center">❦</div>

Passerini suggests that the experience widely shared by the youth of the late 1940s and 1950s of overcoming Fascism and realising an Italy couched neither in conservative politics nor in an artificially unifying monarchy, but rather in the moderate yet progressive voice of the *centro-sinistra*, saw many university students enter party political efforts as a judgement, in part, of those of their professors who supported or tolerated fascism; and of their parents, who had chosen, in their view, passive defeat.[9] By not actively resisting, demonstrating, seeking to undermine Government or authorities—or by not succeeding when they did try—their parents had demonstrated an incapacity for action predicated by a *choice* not to act. In necessarily abstract terms, this view is indebted as much to a Sartrean worldview as it is to the terms of Italy's class struggle. In the simplest of terms, the latter depends upon the subjugated classes to rise up; the former devolves choice to the individual, whose personal judgement is at once a denouncement on behalf of all and a dismissal of the 'myth' of collective experience. This tension explains, in a limited way, the difference between the intellectual and party political experiences of '1968' in Italy. While many intellectuals abandoned their parties by the mid-1970s, such thinkers as Antonio Negri showed how intellectual action could be supplanted by a persistent belief in the goals of political action.[10]

---

7   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 13.

8   Ibid., p. 15.

9   We should note also that much of the reform called for by student groups from the early 1960s onwards was anchored also in a university climate that had recently changed dramatically as a consequence of new legislation that freed up entry into the university. This, coupled with an unprecedented number of students completing secondary studies and entering the university, placed extraordinary pressure on both professors and the didactic system as a whole. What could now be regarded as a systemic failure to accommodate an exponential growth in university populations was widely perceived—and perhaps also correctly—as a rejection on the part of professors to play the part of teachers or to nurture the intellectual cultures of freedom that had grown out of the demise of fascism and an ambiguous capitulation to the allied nations of the second world war.—Ginsborg, *A History of Contemporary Italy, 1943-1980* (London: Penguin, 1990), pp. 288-309; Passerini, ibid., pp. 61-68.

10 For instance, in the first issues of *Contropiano* (published 1968-1972), Negri appears among such company as Massimo Cacciari, Mario Tronti, Alberto Asor Rosa, Francesco Dal Co and Tafuri, among others. However, while others of this group focussed their critical writing on the ideological systems governing their own disciplines, Negri persistently saw his target as capitalist society, *per se*.—Cf.

Twenty years earlier, in 1943, Italy's surrender to the Allies and subsequent battles to vanquish German forces left a void that was filled, many thought, with passivity and compromise.[11] In recounting his personal and intellectual life, then, a programmatic form of loneliness prevails; a sustained strategy of isolation and alienation figures importantly. It is useful to recall that in this setting, Tafuri's isolation—or the simulation of personal isolation through formation of antagonistic minorities—formed not a passive position but a mode of political or intellectual engagement that traded the capacity to enact significant change for a clarity of voice and purpose. He recognised, also, that large groups were incapable of offering uncorrupted criticism of dominant 'forces.' Isolation, almost by definition, rescinds corruption. His capacity to conduct himself in such terms in the face of a growing student political movement clearly referencing the parties of the Left is understandable if we draw distinctions between the Tafuri often cast as a politicised student and another Tafuri for whom political thought formed the extension of a philosophical education, thus *not* born of party involvement. In such terms, it is useful to recall that he regarded his first encounter with Marxism in the 1950s as a direct challenge to a philosophical self-education based upon a devotion to existentialism and Jean Paul Sartre's "'French' mode of thinking."[12]

Common to an abstracted view of both Marxist revolutionism and existentialism is the notion of critical action. For Tafuri, this notion is rendered complex by a sense that the future ought not be prefigured by operative analyses—as in a Marxist critique that 'naturally' concludes with an imperative for actions—but should rather be detached from the mechanisms of action, providing the groundwork for those engaged in action—political or otherwise—to make better informed choices.[13] In this sense, while Marxism *come Marx* endorses a critical history that results in action—either direct or oblique—the tenets of existentialism, in Sartre's terms, treat isolation and counterpoint as intellectual stances positioning action as the both basis for existence and as the evidence of an existence open to judgement. This, too, invokes a complex sense of the status of both intellectual action and practice as forms of engagement with the conditions of the surrounding world. In reflecting upon existentialist discourse, we can

---

Negri, *Time for Revolution*, trans. Matteo Mandarini from *La constituzione del tempo* (Rome: Manifesto libri, 1997) and *Kairòs, Alma Venus Multitudo* (Rome: Manifesto libri, 2000) (London and New York: Continuum, 2003); '*N* for Negri: Antonio Negri in Conversation with Carles Guerra,' edited and translated by Jorge Mestre, Ivan Bercedo and Raimon Vilatovà, in *Grey Room*, no. 11 (Spring 2003): 86-109; Negri and Michael Hardt, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001). This divide might be seen as a basic distinction between 'factory' actions and 'university' action.

[11] 'Surrender' is an ambiguous word, in this case. "The uneasy interlude of the Forty-five days was ended on 3 September 1943 by the signing of the secret armistice between Italy and the Allies. The terms were severe, amounting to unconditional surrender, and Italy was not allowed to become one of the Allies. Instead she was to be granted the strange status of 'co-belligerent.'"—Ginsborg, ibid., p. 13.

[12] He identifies his most significant formal education in this regard as in the philosophy classes of Bruno Widmar, who founded the journal *Il protagora* in 1959 and who assumed importance for Tafuri by demonstrating the capacity of Marxist critique to set aside the 'lessons' of Marx.—Ibid., pp. 13-14.

[13] His earliest application of this idea to the relation of architectural history to architectural practice occurs in *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968), writing: "Meglio, sarebbe, quindi, accettare la realtà come essa è, e riconoscere allo storico un ruolo dialettico rispetto all'architetto: al limite di costante opposizione."—Ibid., p. 94

potentially understand the *importance* of isolation for Tafuri and the existence of a parallel operation of historical practice and internalised intellectual action. For both tasks, it remains crucial to consider the nature of 'action,' given the importance placed upon it by Sartre in terms of the intellectual amid conflict, and to reflect upon those terms of Sartre notion of 'intellectual action' that Tafuri appears to share.

<center>⚜</center>

It remains difficult to recover anything of Tafuri's early philosophical environment or his readings of Sartre in detail, but he tells Passerini that from the age of sixteen or seventeen years he diligently followed the publication of French and German-language philosophical works into Italian:

> I remember July of 1953. In the piazza in Corso Trieste, there was a very tiny bookstore where I first saw a new Italian edition of Heidegger's *Being and Time* translated by Pietro Chiodi. I brought the book, and that same summer started to read Heidegger. What could I understand? I understood the atmosphere. I understood some other things, too, but it was mainly the atmosphere that struck me so forcefully. I remember lying under a tree, and instead of reading the *Elogies* or the *Bucolics*, I read Heidegger. Then I tried to explain it to my friends. It was probably very funny, but it helped … because it forced me to remember certain lines and moved me to clarify them.[14]

Already by this time, Mondadori (among other publishing houses) published many important works of phenomenological and existential philosophy and literature, primarily following schools of thought from Germany and France. In Italy, the primary exponent of this field was the Milanese philosopher Enzo Paci, who delivered public lectures on the subject and who wrote, in 1943, an 'introductory guide' to the field of existentialist thought. Paci promoted the translation of several important philosophical works, writing also the introductions to Italian editions of Heidegger (*Che cosa e la metafisica?*), Nietzsche (*Federico Nietzsche*, edited by Paci), Karl Jaspers (*Ragione ed esistenza*), Paul Valéry (*Eupalinos*) Spinoza (*Etica*), Plato (*Teeteto*) and Aldous Huxley (*Scienza, liberta e pace*).[15] In addition, he penned several of his own books that either act as guides to the

---

14 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 15. Already, by 1953, many of Heidegger's books were widely available by this time—*Essere e tempo*, trans. Pietro Chiodi (Milan and Rome: Longanesi, 1953) from *Sein und Zeit* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1927); *Che cosa e la metafisica?* trans. Enzo Paci (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952) from *Was ist Metaphysik?* (Bonn: F Cohen, 1929); *Dell'essenza della verita*, trans. *Armando Carlini* (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952) from *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit* (Frankfurt am Main: Kostermann, 1943); and *Dell'essenza del fondamento*, trans. Pietro Chiodi (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952) from *Vom Wesen des Grundes* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1929).

15 Enzo Paci, ed., *Federico Nietzsche* (Milan: Grazanti, 1940); Karl Jaspers, *Ragione ed esistenza*, trans. and intro. Enzo Paci (Milan: Bocca, 1942); Paul Valéry, *Eupalinos. L'anima e la danza*, trans. Vittorio Sereni, intro. Paci (Milan and Verona: Mondadori, 1947); Benedetto de Spinoza, *Etica: Passi scelti*, intro. Paci (Messina and Milan: Principato, 1938); Plato, *Teeteto*, trans. and intro. Paci (Milan: Mondadori, 1940); and Aldous Huxley, *Scienza, liberta e pace*, intro. Paci (Milan: IEI, 1948).

field of existentialism, or that address existentialist questions as philosophical works in their own right: *Il significato del Parmenide nella filosofica di Platone* (1930), *Principi di una filosofia dell'essere* (1939), *Pensiero, esistenza e valore* (1940), *L'esistenzialismo* (1943), *Socialita della nuova scuola* (1943), *Esistenza ed immagine* (1947), *Studi di filosofia antica e moderna* (1949), *Ingens Sylvia* (1949), *Esitenzialismo e stocicismo* (1950), *Il pensiero scientifico contemporaneo* (1950), *Fondamenti di una sintesi filosofica* (1951) and *Il nulla e il problema dell'uomo* (1950).[16] For Paci, 'existentialism' described a modern philosophy secured to such figures as Heidegger, Husserl, Nietzsche and Keirkegaard; it also referenced much older debates present in antiquarian Greek thought.

There is evidence enough to start identifying the referents for what Tafuri himself called his "devotion to so-called existentialism" and to speculate on how this 'devotion' may have become manifest in his intellectual life. His own admission that the existentialism to which he once subscribed might be something other than the open discourse introduced to an Italian public by Paci—though his idea of 'existentialism proper' is, too, naturally fraught—and his reflection that 'so called' existentialism was for him somehow foreign—"a 'French' mode of thinking"—authorizes a far more subjective reading of existentialism than one testing his ideas against a specific philosophical manifestation. We can propose, to a limited degree, a list of works available to Tafuri in translation as a teenager and university student, observing the operation of an ethic referencing Sartre's more popular ideas.[17] Insofar as Tafuri distances his philosophical education from any formal programme, it makes little sense to hold him to a school of existentialist thought. What remains, though, is the overall consequence of Tafuri's capacity to immerse himself in a discourse—through his reading, conversations, attendance at lectures—and to draw from it 'lessons' and 'ethics' that either reinforce or reconstitute meta-questions pertaining to historical practice—or even more generally to the topic of the intellectual's role in society and its 'battles'—long after the active

---

16   Enzo Paci, *Il significato del Parmenide nella filosofia di Platone* (Milan: Messina,1930); *Principi di una filosofia dell'essere* (Modena: Guanda, 1939); *Pensiero, esistenza e valore* (Milan and Messina: Principato, 1940); *L'esistenzialismo* (Padua: Cedam, 1943); *Socialita della nuova scuola*, intro. Giuseppe Botai (Florence: F Le Monnier, 1943); *Esistenza ed immagine* (Milan: Antonio Tarantola, 1947), *Studi di filosofia antica e moderna* (Turin: Paravia, 1949), *Ingens Sylva: Saggi sulla filosofia di G B Vico* (Milan: Mondadori, 1949); *Esistenzialismo e storicismo* (Milan and Verona: Mondadori, 1950); *Il pensiero scientifico contemporaneo* (Florence: G C Sansoni, 1950); *Fondamenti di una sintesi filosofica* (Milan: aut aut, 1951); and *Il nulla e il problema dell'uomo* (Turin: Taylor, 1950).

17   It is important that Tafuri does not engage philosophically with Sartre or existentialism. However, he references Sartre in passing already during the 1960s.—Cf. Tafuri, *L'architettura moderna in giapone* (Bologna: Cappelli, 1964) and *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, pp. 175-176 (writing of those who "colmare il salto fra impegno civile e azone culturale") and pp. 271-272 (noting: "Sartre affermava che il compito della letteratura è quello di 'chiamare alla libertà esibendo la propria libertà.'"). Again, in the conference 'Strutture ambientali' he comments: "Io credo che esista un solo compito che rimane oggi all'intellettuale, un solo compito storico, individuate in maniera correttissima dall'operaio francese nel suo primo discorso, quello di suicidarsi in quanto intellettuali."—Enzi Gianotti, ed., *Strutture ambientali. Dagli atti del 17° convegno internazionale artisti, critici e stuidiosi d'arte* (Bologna: Cappelli, 1969), p. 230. It is interesting to note in this regard that he does not enter the Milanese industrial design debates in which Paci's philosophical influence (and involvement) proved important during the 1950s and 1960s. Cf. Paci, 'Presentation at the 10th Triennal,' *Design Issues* 18, no. 4 (Autumn 2002): 48-53; 'Continuità e coerenza dei BBPR,' *Zodiac*, no. 4 (1959): 82-115; 'Problematica dell'architettura contemporanea,' *Casabella-continuità*, no. 209 (January-February 1956): 41-46.

phase of his 'engagement' has passed.[18] To what extent, we might therefore ask, does his one-time "devotion to existentialism" as a teenager survive as a mode of thinking and practice beyond these formative years?

Tafuri suggests that around the age of sixteen "something exploded" and he "began to buy a huge quantity of books by Camus and Sartre in Italian."[19] He attributes his introduction to this philosophical field—including such figures as Heidegger, Husserl, Camus and Sartre—to public lectures by Paci delivered both in person and through the cultural programme of Radio Italia. Paci broadcast two series of radio lectures during 1952 and 1955 "on what was at that time generically called 'existentialism,'" which he recalls "ranged from Kierkegaard to Sartre."[20] Paci's own frames of reference were spread across a wide geography—from France to Russia, with a long layover in Germany—even if Tafuri later regarded existentialism as something specifically 'French,' equating it with the works of Sartre. Paci subscribed to a Greek philosophical debate reinvigorated in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For him, existentialism was specifically *not* French, and he later (given the contemporaneity of the two books) recognised in Sartre's *L'être et le néant* an engagement with the German tradition parallel to his own. Paci, for instance, published *L'esistenzialismo* in 1943, in the same year as Sartre's *L'être et le néant*; there is nothing in this book indicating Paci's awareness at that time of Sartre as either an existentialist philosopher or writer (or Camus, for that matter), even though they engage similar debates in Germany.[21] While Sartre's book is itself a work of

---

18   In this, we speak not simply of existentialism, but of Tafuri's more general propensity to make reasoned assessments of theoretical referents and to draw from them very specific 'lessons' pertaining to his broader interests. Sartre was treated, we can argue, in such terms, as were Benjamin, Foucault, Derrida, Ginzburg, and others.

19   Passerini, p. 11. Tafuri recalls that the books were published in the *Rossa e verde* series of Biblioteca Moderna Mondadori. Italian translations of works by Albert Camus that were available to Tafuri included *La Peste*, trans. Beniamino Dal Fabbro (Milan: Bompiani, 1948) from *La peste* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947); *Lo straniero*, trans. Alberto Zevi (Milan: Bompiani, 1948) from *L'étranger* (Paris: Gallimard, 1942); *Il mito di sisifo*, trans. and intro. Federico Federici (Milan: Bompiani 1947) from *Le mythe de Sisyphe. Essai sur l'absurde* (Paris: Gallimard, 1942); and *Il malinteso*, trans. Vito Pandolfi (Milan: Bompiani, 1947) from *La malentendu: pièce en trois actes; Caligula: pièce en quatre actes* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947). Works by Jean-Paul Sartre published in translation by 1952 included *Il muro*, trans. Paolo Mieli (Turin: Einaudi, 1947) from *Le mur* (Paris: Gallimard, 1939); *Le mosche*, trans. Giusepe Lanza (Milan: Bompiani, 1947) from *Les mouches* (Paris: Gallimard, 1947); *La nausea*, trans. Bruno Fonzi (Turin: Einaudi, 1948) from *La nausée* (Paris: Gallimard, 1938); *L'eta della ragione*, trans. Orio Vergani (Milan: Bompiani, 1946) from *L'age de raison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945); *L'esistenzialismo è un umanesimo*, trans. Giancarla Mursia Re (Milan: Mursia, 1946) from *L'existialisme est un humanisme* (Paris: Gallimard, 1946); *La squaldrina timorata. Dramma in un atto e due quadri*, trans. Giorgio Monicelli and Roberto Cantini (Milan: Mondadori, 1947) from *La putain respectueuse* (Paris: Gallimard, 1946); *Ebrei*, trans. Ignazio Weiss (Milan: Edizione di comunità,1948) from *Reflexions sur la question juive* (Paris: Paul Morihien, 1947); *Immagine e coscienza. Psicologia fenomenologica dell'immaginazione*, trans. Enzo Bottasso (Turin: Einaudi, 1948) from *L'imaginaire. Psychologie phenomenologique de l'imagination* (Paris: Gallimard, 1940); *Il rinvio*, trans. Giorgio Monicelli (Milan: Mondadori, 1948) from *Le sursis* (Paris: Gallimard, 1945) and *Morti senza tomba. Dramma in due atti e quattro quadri*; *Le mani sporche: dramma in sette quadri*, trans. Giorgio Monicelli (Milan: Mondadori, 1949) from *Morts sans sépulcre* (Lausanne: Marguerat, 1946) and *Le mains sales* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948).

20   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 11. The two lecture series were published as Enzo Paci and Luigi Rognoni, *L'espressionismo / L'esistenzialismo* (Turin: Edizione radio italiana, 1953); Paci, *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo* (Turin: Edizione radio italiana, 1956).

21   It is quite possible that Paci, while reading work in German and Greek, was not reading works in French. This could offer a simple explanation of his apparent oversight of these referents. Equally, that

philosophy—intended for a philosophical audience—Paci rather writes an introduction to the broad philosophical field of existentialism with a popular audience in mind. The latter's book is short, clearly written and concise, in contrast to Sartre's intimidating tome; it briefly introduces a short series of figures important to Paci's understanding of existentialist debate: Kierkegaard (pp. 8-17), Nietzsche (pp. 18-27), Heidegger (pp. 28-39), Jaspers (pp. 40-50) and Abbagnano (pp. 51-57). However, Paci also acknowledges the narrowness of this field: "The master line of existentialism is that which goes from Heidegger to Abbagnano. But existentialism is a vast and profound movement that has roots in the culture of twentieth century literature."[22] French existentialism, Paci thought, was rooted in seventeenth and eighteenth century moralism, bound up in the Catholic tradition: "French existentialism is, in a certain sense, autonomous, inexplicable, also chronologically, reconnecting to German existentialism."[23]

Drawing a contrast with the proposed philosophical autonomy of France, Paci argued that the Italian existentialist tradition was rooted in the spiritualism of Carlini and Guzzo,[24] and that the primary effort of contemporary existentialist writing in Italy—led by himself—was the reconciliation of this foundation with the broader *milieu* of European intellectual thought.[25] To restate the issue, Paci argues that while the tradition of existentialist thinking in Italy is connected with broader European philosophical debates, France remains isolated. Paci's sense of French philosophy therefore reveals that he likely did not know, in 1943, of Sartre's *L'être et le néant*, nor of Sartre and Camus as contemporary exponents of an existentialist literary practice.[26] In 1943, this is hardly surprising; the possibilities for open intellectual exchange were severely retarded in both France and Italy. However, even by 1947 and the publication of Paci's *Esistenza ed imagine*, Sartre's place within a literary or philosophical French canon remains unacknowledged

the year in which both of these books appeared in print saw both France and Italy still occupied by German forces suggests that had they known of each other, that intellectual exchange may have proven difficult.

22 Paci, *L'esistenzialismo* (Padua: Cedam, 1943), p. 58. Original passage: "La linea maestra dell'esistenzialismo è quella che va da Heidegger ad Abbagnano. Ma estistenzialismo è un movimento vasto e profondo che trova radici nella cultura e nella letteratura del '900."—our trans.

23 Ibid., p. 59. Orig. passage: "L'esistenzialismo francese è in un certo senso autonomo e non si può spiegare, anche per i dati cronologici, ricollegandolo all'esistenzialismo tedesco."—our trans. His main French referent was philosopher and artist Gabriel Marcel's *Journal metaphysique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1927).

24 In making this claim, Paci echoes the work of a contemporary thinker, Luigi Pareyson, whose *Studi sull'esistenzialismo* (Milan: Mursia, 1943) is published in the same year as Paci's *L'esistenzialismo*. The former book appears covers more ground than the latter, and offers a more comparative approach to the field than Paci attempts in this specific book. Pareyson writes three chapters that specifically cover the 'spiritualist' current in Italian existentialism: 'Dalla concretezza dell'atto gentiliano ai concetti di "situazione" e "forma" presso il Guzzo' (p. 189), 'Dall'interiorità dell'atto gentiliano ai concetti di "persona" e "spiritualità pura" presso il Carlini' (p. 190) and 'Dalla gentiliana eticità dello spirito all'assiologia del Guzzo e del Carlini: importanza dell'esigenza del valore' (pp. 191-193).

25 Paci, ibid., p. 60.

26 There remains, of course, the possibility that *within* 1943, Sartre's book appeared after Paci's, or within sufficiently close proximity that Paci could not have accounted for the new work. However, *L'être et le néant* was not the first of Sartre's books to deal with existentialist themes, and for this reason it remains useful to point out his absence from Paci's pamphlet.

by Paci, who persists with a clear impression of a discourse dominated by German and (classical) Greek thought.[27]

<center>❧</center>

Paci initially raises Sartre as an important figure in post-War existentialism in the context of two radio lecture series. Aired in 1952, the first treats existentialism and—with Luigi Rognoni—expressionism. The second series, delivered solely by Paci and titled *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo*, repeats several of his lectures from the first series and adds a new lecture, 'Sartre e il problema del teatro.' Paci's presentation of existentialist discourse does not, then, change markedly over the course of the early 1950s; his second book becomes a more useful index of the presence of an Italian existentialist debate than the first because it contains a more clearly structured and unambiguous guide to his understanding of the contemporary field up until the mid-1950s. Retaining his reference to Heidegger, Jaspers, Mann and Abbagnano—though the content of his 'lectures' differs markedly in size and complexity from the much smaller summaries contained in the earlier *L'esistenzialismo*—it seems clear that Paci's view of these figures' importance does not shift between 1943 and 1955.[28] However, in accordance with the broad brief of the radio series, Paci also offers a lecture entitled 'Marcel, Lavelle, Le Senne'[29] and others dealing with theological existentialism, literary existentialist discourse, positivist existentialism, the status of existentialism in contemporary philosophy and the 'inheritance' of Husserl as manifest in the thought of Merleau-Ponty.[30] Further, two lectures address the role of Sartre in contemporary existentialist debate: 'L'esistenza negativa in Sartre' and the lecture on theatre mentioned above.[31]

In his introduction to *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo*, Paci declares problematic Sartre's basic equivalence with contemporary existentialism. He suggests that this perception lent an atmosphere of 'curiosity,' and 'scandal' grew around existentialism after the Second World War. He counters this image with one of the movement as multifaceted and conflicting, its individual components "difficult to include together": Christian and non-Christian, rationalist and non-rationalist, negative and positive. Nonetheless, he presents these multiple positions under the premise that such internal disagreements do

---

27   Paci, *Esistenza ed immagine* (Milan: Antonio Tarantola, 1947). Paci's chapters are entitled 'Musica, mito e psicologia in Thomas Mann' (pp. 15-47), 'Thomas Mann e la filosofia' (pp. 51-85), 'Verità ed esistenza in T S Eliot' (pp. 89-122), 'Rilka e la nascita della terra' (pp. 125-148), 'Valéry o della construzione' (pp. 151-176) and 'L'uomo di Proust' (pp. 179-198).

28   Paci, *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo*: 'Heidegger' (pp. 31-49), 'Jaspers' (pp. 51-61) 'L'esistenza diabolico in Thomas Mann' (pp. 129-144) and 'Abbagnano' (pp. 155-164).

29   Ibid., pp. 63-75.

30   Ibid.: 'Esistenzialismo teologico' (pp. 77-87), 'Aspetti letterari' (pp. 89-113), 'La positivizzazione dell'esistenzialismo' (pp. 145-153), 'Sartre e il problema del teatro' (pp. 165-181), 'L'esistenzialismo nelle filosofia contemporanea' (pp. 183-202) and 'L'eredità di Husserl e l'esistenzialism di Meleau-Ponty' (pp. 203-212).

31   Ibid., pp. 115-127 and 165-181 respectively.

not complicate 'existentialism,' but are rather integral to its overall importance.[32] Paci's trajectory nonetheless commences from Germany and the First World War, from Jaspers upon a foundation of the Christian Kierkegaard and the non-Christian Nietzsche, and upon 'certain aspects of romanticism.'[33] To Sartre, Paci attributes the restatement of themes present in Dostoevsky, whose premised that "good and bad are dangerously close" remains fundamental to the notion of 'diabolical existence.'[34] Paci positions this diabolism as a modern condition of crisis, suggesting that existentialism offers a device for overcoming crisis, which for Paci as well as Sartre is a condition of modern life.

That Paci constructs his field in such terms is important for our understanding of how Tafuri might have regarded himself as an existentialist, at a moment in his young adulthood contemporary with these later developments on Paci's part. If *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo* approximates the terms in which Paci introduces this philosophical field—on radio and in public—then Tafuri's introduction to existentialism included two clear caveats: to treat existentialism as a wide and diverse territory (though indebted to German thinking); and to be wary of equating existentialism with Sartre. Nonetheless, Tafuri later locates Paci as a catalyst to his introduction to and absorption of works by Sartre and Camus and qualifies his experience of existentialism as being with a 'French mode of thinking.' Given that the vehicle for Tafuri's introduction to existentialist thinking by no means classified existentialism as primarily 'French'—or more precisely, as 'Sartrean'—and given that we know Tafuri had read works by a number of the figures in Paci's spectrum, we might regard Tafuri's tendency to view existentialism as a French philosophy as the result of an engagement with Sartre's writing (and Camus's also) played out to a more advanced degree than with those other figures promoted by and including Paci among the territory of existentialist debate.[35] This, in turn, we might well attribute to Sartre's widespread popularity as a cult figure for 1950s youth reading every language into which he was translated. Yet insofar as Tafuri's engagement with Sartre never extends to a philosophical debate on the central question, in Sartre's work and in existentialism and phenomenological discourse, that of *being*, then we might infer suggest that Tafuri's 'dedication' to existentialism resided at another level, one we might regard as ethical rather than philosophical.

Upon the publication of *L'être et le néant* (1943), Sartre met with negative criticism from two specific communities, communist and Christian, prompting a response on his

---

32   Ibid., p. 11. Orig. phrase: "difficile da comprendere insieme."—our trans.

33   Ibid., pp. 12-13.

34   Ibid. Orig. Phrase: "il male e il bene siano pericolosamente vicini."—our trans.

35   One important exception is Tafuri's later engagement with Heidegger. Perhaps we should note, in this context, that it is precisely in terms of Heidegger that Massimo Cacciari confronts Tafuri and Francesco Dal Co's *Architettura contemporanea*; given Dal Co's writing elsewhere—*Abitare nel moderno* and *Teorie del moderno*, for instance—it would seem possible that the inclination to conclude with an invocation of the impossibility of reconciling modern architecture with 'place' is due more to Dal Co than to Tafuri's early readings of the German philosopher.—Tafuri and Dal Co, *Architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Electa, 1976); Massimo Cacciari, 'Eupalinos ou l'architecture,' *Critique*, no. 476-477 (January-February 1987): 87-99; Dal Co, *Abitare nel moderno* (Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1982) and *Teorie del moderno. Architettura, Germania 1880-1920* (Rome and Bari: Laterza, 1982).

part towards the end of 1945 that offered a more accessible entrance into the philosophical issues addressed by that earlier work. In a public lecture at the *Club maintenant* in October 1945 entitled *Existentialisme est un humanisme*, he set aside the philosophical precision of *L'être et le néant* in order to consider the broader implications of the status accorded it to 'man' and 'freedom.' As a message addressed to Sartre's popular rather than philosophical audience, *Existentialisme est un humanisme* codifies the 'existentialist,' thus forming a useful litmus paper against which to test the outlook of a self-declared disciple of Sartre's thinking. A teenaged Tafuri doubtless had little more luck reading Sartre than he did reading Heidegger, relying heavily on the book's 'atmosphere' and this heavily reliant, we might suppose, upon the clear logic of a work like *Existentialisme est un humanisme* rather than the precise and difficult *L'être et le néant*.[36] In Sartre's later clarification of his thinking, several basic points stand out as important to an existentialist ethic, points we will continue to distinguish from the technicalities of its philosophical argumentation. Moreover, it offers a series of keys for the reconciliation of 'existentialist' with 'Christian' or 'communist,' and by implication for the possibility of retaining the capacity for self-determinism and the need for self-accountability while allowing for the subscription to broader moral or intellectual systems.[37]

Sartre identifies an intrinsic condition of loneliness in the relationship of the individual to forces of external moral governance, on one hand and, on the other, the individual and all those others who comprise society. One might share the territory of others—at an institutional level also—but one is capable of establishing behavioural and operational practices that insulate the individual right to choose from thought systems that subvert that same right. Many 'existentialists' who entered student movements in Italy during the early 1960s experienced the quandary of choosing to endorse established Party positions as a device to enact change at a scale beyond the reach of individual actions. For them, an apparent incongruity between the sovereignty of the individual and necessary force predicating change saw many apparently 'choose' the latter. Many individuals among the crowds that occupied faculties throughout Italy from 1963 until the end of the decade, though, retained the right for choice inherent to Sartre's conception of, above all, the intellectual amidst conflict. Even if choice is limited, or dire, one may still exercise it. Yet bound up in the capacity for choice is the responsibility to act: "It is in this projecting and losing himself beyond himself that he makes man to exist: and, on the other hand, it is by pursuing transcendent aims that he himself is able to exist."[38]

---

36 Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 15.

37 Sartre also responds to the Christian and Communist criticisms of his work in order to address the relativity of individuality in two contexts. In communist life, the individual belongs to the movement, the destiny of which is protected forwards by a conception of a future end point (even if by the sort of economic historical analyses conducted by Marx himself), the revolution. For Christians, the idea of individual relativity is incongruous with the idea of God, to whom all individuals are subject; morality is therefore not something one subscribes to from choice, in this setting, but from obligation.—Sartre, *L'existentialisme est un humanisme*, pp. 21-31; Engl. trans. in *Basic Writings*, ed. Stephen Priest (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), pp. 28-30.

38 Sartre, *Basic Writings*, p. 45. Original text: "C'est en se projetant et en se perdant hors de lui qu'il fait exister l'homme et, l'autre part, c'est en poursuivant des buts transcendant qu'il peut exister."—Sartre,

Given these prefaces, we can understand Tafuri's endorsement of a programmatically isolated intellectual existence on two bases. The first involves his assumption of a position of 'loneliness' in his life and work, the strategic distancing or dislocation from dominant—or even clearly discernible—schools of thought or modes of practice. Even when working in collaboration with others—out of choice or necessity—he methodologically endorses the idea of a productive antagonism that comes from taking an isolated stance, simulating, in effect, a state of intellectual seclusion. The second is evidenced in his retention of such notions as 'choice' and 'future' as proper to the individual, and to the intellectual in particular. In this sense, we can begin to return to the 'project' as an ordering device that insulates the 'actions' of Tafuri's life from whatever vision of the future, static or evolving, that these actions pursue. Furthermore, it is here that any concept of 'Tafuri the architectural historian' and 'Tafuri the intellectual' converges irrevocably. Not coincidentally do we feel the pressure of biographical causality most clearly at this moment. However, it is sufficient to identify the *location* where we can find individual motivations that reside behind an institutional practice; or, to rephrase, it is enough to distinguish a sense of 'conflict' or 'anguish' as an existentialist precondition from intellectual action as a choice defining existence. But how is this distinction, or interpretative mechanism evidenced in Tafuri's historical practice?

If we consider Tafuri's practice as a publishing historian of architecture as insulated from his 'project'—his essence, to put it another way, or his choice for the future, to render it even more simply, if abstractly—then we can recognise, by way of analogy, Tafuri's publication as corresponding to those actions by which, according to Sartre, one is open to judgement. Tafuri's bibliography, therefore, offers something distinct from his 'life,' whether approximated by his autobiography or regarded as an independent phenomenon: evidence not of his 'historical project' but rather of his historical practice. This evidence of an historical practice is, to go even further, the sole basis upon which we may (retaining a Sartrean approach) 'judge' the life-project of Tafuri. Furthermore, in 'judging' his actions, we acknowledge the impossibility of knowing the 'project' itself. Given these terms, how can we begin to position Tafuri's collaborations within *IUAV* or with scholars from other—apparently quite different—institutions such as the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio,'* the *Bibliotheca Hertziana* or the *Accademia nazionale di San Luca* as evidence of an individual, insulated 'project'? To what degree do the products of such collaborations describe the possibility of a shared project? How may the study of Tafuri's historiography inform us of the evolving relationship between his intellectual and institutional targets, on one hand, and the evidential trail of his publications, on the other? To what extent may we identify a specific philosophical approach to history and the past within this relationship?

L'existentialisme est un humanisme, pp. 92-93.

At the necessary risk of oversimplifying the field through abstractions, we might consider four models by which Tafuri addresses issues of collaboration, research and the publication of provisional judgements that have some bearing upon these questions, namely upon the relationships between material, analysis and a form of 'realisation' beyond 'the project.' These separate models are represented by one example: *La città americana* (1973), with Giorgio Ciucci, Mario Manieri-Elia and Francesco Dal Co; *Giulio Romano* (1989), principally with Ernst Gombrich and Christoph Frommel, though involving a broad collaborative base in the scientific committee, exhibition curatorship and publication; *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985); and *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980).[39]

❦

La città americana was among the first collaborative projects to emerge from the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura* and as such describes the historiographical ambitions of the so-called 'Venice School.' The book results from collaboration upon a single theme, comprising of four long essays on different topics within the broad territory of the history of the American city.[40] Published in the same year as Tafuri's *Progetto e utopia*, *La città americana* deliberately tests that book's hypothesis by the careful study of specific cases within American urban history.[41] The book treats the theme of "the city in the United States as a problem of historical criticism" while attempting neither a 'complete' history of the American city, nor a broad theory of its historical development.[42] They write in preface:

> It should be clear from the outset that many important arguments have not been touched upon and many critical hypotheses still remain to be tested. This book is presented as a first series of results of an investigation that we consider open to further development.[43]

---

39 Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Mario Manieri-Elia and Tafuri, *La città americana dalla guerra civile alla New Deal* (Bari: Laterza, 1973); Ernst Gombrich, Tafuri, et al., eds., *Giulio Romano* (Milan: Electa, 1989); Tafuri, *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980).

40 While *La città americana* is a useful and important example of Tafuri's construction of a 'project,' we must acknowledge that this book—and thus the framework applied to the American city, relative to *Progetto e utopia*—does not represent the extent of Tafuri's engagement with the American city. See, in addition, his essay 'Neu-Babylon: Das New York der Zwanzigerjahre und die Suche nach dem Amerikanismus,' special issue, 'Amerikanismus, Skyscraper und Ikonografie,' *Metropolis* 3, no. 20 (1976): 12-24; also his 1975-76 'Storia dell'architettura 2A' seminar (taught with assistant Bruno Cassetti) entitled 'Il grattacielo e la struttura della città terziaria in America e in Europa' (Venice: IUAV, 1975). Compare, finally, the brief, general, but useful reflection on the Italian interest in American planning by P. A. Morton, 'Italian Criticism of the Italian Plan,' *Precis*, no. 4 (1983): 26-27.

41 Although it had appeared in the pages of *Contropiano* in 1969, the coincidence of *Progetto e utopia* as a pamphlet at the same publication moment as *La città americana* is worth noting for historiographical reasons.

42 Tafuri, Ciucci, et al., *The American City from the Civil War to the New Deal*, trans. Barbara Luigi la Penta (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1980), p. ix.

43 Ibid., p. xiii.

The individual essay titles reinforce this: Manieri-Elia's 'Per una città "imperiale." D. H. Burnham e il movimento City Beautiful'; Dal Co's 'Dai parchi alla regione. L'ideologia progressista e la riforma della città americana'; Ciucci's 'La città nell'ideologia agraria e F. L. Wright. Origini e sviluppo di Broadacre'; and Tafuri's 'Il montagna disincantata. Il grattacielo e la City.' Each of the four scholars drew upon the central idea of the American city for seminars taught during the 1969-1970 academic year. The archival research and surveys of literature evident in the independent studies describe a shared intent to identify an existing body of research on the topic of the American city, and to complicate a series of historiographical tendencies that undermine the relevance of its problems to historical situations elsewhere.

They target four such tendencies in the existing literature on American architecture and urbanism. The first is the detailed exercise of collecting material, "often presented with a remarkable philological depth and exactness," but offering an information service rather than making historical accounts, presenting facts but not guaranteeing "the completeness of the data"[44] The second contains "a strongly partisan interpretation of the facts" towards the proof of a thesis. While "lively and stimulating," such works are equally selective with evidence. The four authors warn, "readers must be on guard against distortion of the facts that result from omissions or from the emphasis placed on particular episodes."[45] Another problematic approach aims towards "a total reconstruction of the phenomenon of architecture and urban planning." However, they suggest that such historical attempts, based on uneven material fields, are only useful once undermined "after a laborious operation of decomposition."[46] The final works are those that make "specific and specialised contributions" to the literature on American architecture and urbanism. These, the group argues, pursue to great depths specific figures and examples, but "the classification of such as large body of work is nearly impossible."[47]

They argue that *La città americana* offers a different model of history writing because it tests the hypothesis of Tafuri's *Progetto e utopia*—the capitalist city as a setting for the "'grande apocalisse' della cultura borgese europea"—while allowing the material itself to inform the historiographical and theoretical agenda, rendering the thesis constantly provisional in terms of the research materials at stake.[48] Therefore, rather than testing in formulaic terms a Marxian model of American urban development, *La città americana* attempts to test *both* the materials and the critical terms of their deployment. By taking four separate paths within the broad theme, the individual authors open both the thesis and the material to contamination.

> This search for new insights does not mean that we are questioning a method or
> critical conviction already long matured. Rather, it simply reflects the need for new

---

44   Ibid., p. ix.
45   Ibid., p. x.
46   Ibid.
47   Ibid.
48   Ibid.

bases of judgement and new arguments, the need to reveal yet other movements and trends, which may even be contradictory but which are in any case present and operative in the reality we have sought to analyse.[49]

Sacrificing, they write, "more attractive and usual arguments," Ciucci, Dal Co, Manieri-Elia and Tafuri regard the historical challenge thus: "The problem is to bring this point of view up to date in terms of the historical levels of the material analysed by continually applying criticism to both the complex of phenomena and the criticohistorical acquisitions that the values of bourgeois culture present and interpret."[50] The moment at which the four perspectives of this book are synthesised is in the collective effort to "confront a single problem from different perspectives and using different arguments."[51]

> The creative structure, the mechanisms, and thus the scientific efficiency of this causality will never be clarified, however, if those writing history continue to ignore the connections that turn the disciplines of architecture and city planning into agents of the ponderous process of transformation set in motion by the American capitalist system in determining the urban structure.[52]

La città americana therefore not only describes a collaborative search for tools of historical practice, but an attempt to define the degree to which the materials of historical research inform both technique and analysis. The provisionality of this historiographic position depends, to an extent, on the maintenance of a series of independent attempts to gather and assess material on a specific theme. In developing an isolated research programme, in parallel with others sharing the same degree of criticality in their historical work, the material is constantly subject to a number of critical positions, as are those positions themselves. As figurehead of the *Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, Tafuri's 'project' is here manifest as a structured attempt to address an historical theme with an open device, implicating both history of the city and his own ideologically conscious theorisation of modern urban development. Here, publication represents the formalisation of that attempt rather than the conclusion of the study itself.[53]

49 Ibid.

50 Ibid., p. xi. Among the positions that must be updated, or rejected, they note: "Una cultura, di fronte alla quale non lave il disprezzo accademico per il banale, come non vale l'acritica riproposizione di parole d'ordine demolitrici. L'una a l'altra posizione sono da rifiutare: non perché *sbalgliate*, ma in quanto inutili, se ricondotte a una dimensione temporale che sia superiore allo spirare di un giorno; l'una e l'altra sono inutili in quanto non ci aiutano a capire, in quanto tendono a liquidare fenomeni e problemi, le cui forme possono lasciarci a volte indifferenti, ma i cui meccanismi debbono continuamente essere riconosciuti."—*La città americana*, p. viii.

51 Ciucci, Tafuri, et al., *The American City*, p. xi.

52 Ibid., pp. xi-xii.

53 Several projects could equally demonstrate this approach of a number of scholars addressing a broad though historiographically singularised topic with the effect of rendering all judgements provisional.—Tafuri, ed., *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS, 1917-1937. Il contributo degli architetti europei* (Rome: Officina, 1972); Tafuri and Dal Co, *Architettura contemporanea*; Tafuri, Jean-Louis Cohen and Marco De Michelis, eds., *URSS 1917-1978. La citta, architettura / La ville, architecture* (Rome: Officina; Paris: L'esquerre, 1979).

❦

Rather than extending the basis of this 'project' to additional institutions, the three exhibitions that describe Tafuri's capacity for philological scholarship—on Raffaello, Giulio Romano and Francesco di Giorgio—demonstrate a move on Tafuri's part to distinguish *between* his project and the historiographical practices characterising the *Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura* in Venice.[54] While such books as *La città americana* and *URSS* (1972) follow a theme agreed upon within a group of like-minded historians—intent to simultaneously test the materials and tools of their work, as we have seen—the two common factors in *Giulio Romano* are the *œuvre* of the architect and a shared high level of scholastic rigour described by the authors, even if incredibly diverse in approach. The perspectives and historiographies brought to bear upon that *œuvre* appear conservative compared with Tafuri's earlier work, in which the historiography itself, rather than the complete body of practice, is at stake.[55] The historiographical importance of *La città americana* lies in its juxtapositions and willingness to openly test an historical hypothesis. In *Giulio Romano*, though, the historiographical challenge is how to present an *œuvre* without forcing its conformation to a single historiographical perspective. The strategy inherent to these projects involves parallel researches into the catalogue of known works by an individual allows for the material to offer its own complexities, to demonstrate that a life's work is not necessarily capable of sustaining a theoretical agenda.

The catalogue of *Guilio Romano* therefore begins with a series of essays by the exhibition's protagonists, who address the historiographical problem of an *œuvre* through their own disciplinary and institutional perspectives: art historian Ernst H. Gombrich (whose thesis took Romano as subject), Tafuri, Sylvia Ferino Pagden (curator at the *Vienna Kunsthistorisches Museum*), Christoph Frommel (then director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana), Konrad Oberhuber (director of the *Graphische Sammlung Albertina* in Vienna), Amedeo Belluzzi (director of the *Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura e della città* at the *Università di firenze*), Kurt Foster (then director of the Getty Institute in Los Angeles) and Howard Burns (then of Harvard University and the *CISA 'Andrea Palladio'*). The *œuvre* is then thematised and rendered 'public': Romano's activities in Rome, his engagement with 'the Antique' in Mantua, the palazzi, paintings, urban architecture, ville and courts, religious architecture and monuments. Each element of the catalogue accords a heterogeneous weighting to the exposed material. Tafuri's discussion of a painting by Titian of Romano holding a drawn plan of a tempietto (c1536) occupies one page of the catalogue; his study of the Mantuan cathedral is a little over twice as long in text, but extends to eight pages through the inclusion of more drawings and photographs.[56] Each

---

54   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 64.

55   This could be said, for instance, of *L'architettura del Manierismo nel '500 europeo* (Rome: Officina, 1966); *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia* (Venice: Marsilio, 1969); or *L'architettura dell'umanesimo* (Bari: Laterza, 1969).

56   Tafuri, 'Il ritratto di Giulio Romano di Tiziano,' Gombrich, Tafuri, et al., *Giulio Romano*, p. 535; 'Il

profile, written by one or two of a large number of contributors besides the primary authors of the catalogue,[57] is treated autonomously within the catalogue format, which structurally undermines the potential to draw discernible and operative lessons from the historical material. The sheer size of the scientific committee and body of contributing authors makes it difficult to formulate and effectively defend an historical thesis upon which each individual—with all of their disciplinary and institutional perspectives to account for—can reach agreement. So, too, the breadth of institutions evoked both within Italy and in the international field of architectural and art historical research renders immediately provisional and thus weak any attempt to homogenise the body of works or to sustain a broad argument explaining the work in historical terms.

As documentation of Tafuri's own project, though, we might observe two objects to which *Giulio Romano*—and by extension *Raffaello* (1984) and *Francesco di Giorgio* (1993)—attend.[58] Firstly, to contrast *Giulio Romano* with a much earlier exhibition catalogue of similar scope, Zevi and Portoghesi's work on *Michelangelo architetto* (1964), the structure, scope and organization of *Giulio Romano* operates as evidence that an *œuvre* need not be subjected to either a broad historical judgement, nor need it 'serve' contemporary polemical issues.[59] Given Tafuri's 'issues' with *Michelangelo architetto*, which we have discussed on several occasions in this dissertation, we might understand *Giulio Romano* as a tutorial in addressing the scope of an *œuvre* without rendering it a 'lesson' to contemporary architecture. Secondly, if Tafuri's primary historical research and publication until the mid-1980s had kept in view the task of undermining the mythology of 'resolved' histories by introducing new perspectives, additional materials, and 'disruptive' juxtapositions, then the *œuvre* projects demonstrate that Tafuri's historiography is also conscious of the need to estimate the life-work. If, unlike conventional histories (or biographies), he does not construct around that life a narrative, Tafuri's scholarship nonetheless attempts to place limits on a life-work in full knowledge that these limits will deconstruct through the provocation of more time and additional scholarship. In essence, *Giulio Romano* and similarly structured projects declare the value of provisional judgements, but with the condition that these emerge from the material itself and not from a theoretical position consistently present regardless of the artefacts at stake. The overall project therefore forms, as the authors note in introduction, a 'dialogical collaboration.'[60]

---

duomo di Mantova,' Gombrich, Tafuri, et al., ibid., pp. 550-557.

57   The other contributors to this volume are Bruno Adorni, Ugo Bazzotti, Renato Berzaghi, Clifford M. Brown, Jacqueline Burckhardt, Paul Davies, Francesco Paolo Fiore, Antonio Forcellino, Nello Forti Grazzini, David Hemsoll, Pier Nicola Pagliara, Giuseppe Pecorari, Rodolfo Signorini, Bette Talvacchia and Richard J. Tuttle.

58   Tafuri, Christoph Frommel and Stefano Ray, eds., *Raffaello architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1984); Tafuri and Francesco Paolo Fiore, eds., *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* (Milan: Electa, 1993).

59   Franco Barbieri and Lionello Puppi, with Paolo Portoghesi and Bruno Zevi, *Michelangelo architetto* (Turin: Einaudi, 1964).

60   They write: "Di fronte a un esponente della cultura umanistica—cultura del 'civile colloquio' per eccellenza—il metodo è stato quello della collaborazione diaiogica: che è, riteniamo, un risultato in sé, da segnalare ai lettori e ai critici del presente lavoro."—Gombrich, Tafuri, et al., ibid., p. 9.

For Tafuri, then, *œuvres* form a concrete historiographical problem, implicating archives, biographies, existing historiographical treatments and so on. The gradual acceptance of historiographical 'concepts' as historical and non-negotiable poses a different problem. In *Venezia e il rinascimento*, for instance, neither 'Venice' nor 'the Renaissance' exist, in many senses, beyond their signifying capacity as designations. To play the construction of each concept against the other and to declare at the outset that neither is a sound basis upon which to build historical research offers a rather different conception of history to the inclusive and complex studies contained in *Giulio Romano*. Neither is *Venezia e il rinascimento* to be seen as a device for advancing an historical theory of the Venetian Renaissance. On the contrary, his premise is that the 'traditional' historiographical construction of the 'Venetian Renaissance' as a platform upon which to conduct detailed studies is as artificial as the notion of 'foundation' in Venice itself. Thus Tafuri asks "Quale Venezia, infatti?": "The official one, of 'myth' and apologies, satisfied with the fullness of her own representations, or the Venice increasingly shaken by internal conflicts, marked by anxieties that obliquely cut across classes and groups?"[61] And, by implication: "quale Rinascimento?": a macrocosmical Renaissance, a cultural Renaissance at odds with economic conditions in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, a long Renaissance, a Renaissance indexing Europe's entire history, the Renaissance of material culture, or that of high thought and creativity? "There is good reason," Tafuri writes "to abandon the universe constructed by Michelet and Burckhardt, and… dedicate ourselves to the 'particular.'"[62]

The 'particular' of *Venezia e il rinascimento* involve the study of interactions revealing "the ways in which political dimensions, religious anxieties, the art and sciences, the *res aedificatoria* become inextricably interwoven."[63] The historical disciplines encounter difficulty, he writes, when they retreat too far within their own specialist identifications. Such problems as Venice poses calls for "an adequate philology," a research method where the material found in archives, pictorial representations (from portraiture to cartography) and in buildings themselves can be activated through a series of questions not particular to one discipline.[64] In this way, a document may simultaneously be tested by techniques 'proper' to religious, military, nautical, artistic and political history, implicating itself in a matrix of 'known' points that transcends simple categorization or periodisation. This matrix may, in turn, map out an undocumented *histoire de mentalité*, "where the individual and collective, the unconscious and the unintentional, structure

---

61   Tafuri, *Venice and the Renaissance* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989), p. ix.

62   Ibid. Tafuri refers to Jules Michelet and Jacob Buckhardt's historiography of the 'Renaissance' found in Michelet *Histoire de France* (Paris: A. Lacroix, 1855) and Burckhardt, *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1860).

63   Tafuri, ibid., p. x.

64   Ibid., p. xix.

and circumstance converge."[65] In making historical analyses of events occurring within the broad parameters of 'Venice' and 'the Renaissance,' Tafuri claims his intention to be the liberation of historical materials from the histories of architecture and the city that have, in their inadequate manifestations, sought answers judged by Tafuri as too easy and too internal, ignoring the complexity with which the history is itself imbued.

If Venice, as Nietzsche writes, is "a hundred deep solitudes taken together," then Tafuri's historiographical strategy offers something to this conception of his subject.[66] The overall goal may be the deformation of the two historiographical concepts signalled in the title of *Venezia e il rinascimento*, but Tafuri is clear that the pursuit of every historical iteration is impossible, more so within the course of a single volume. Rather, he demonstrates a strategy within which interactions, archival materials, evidence of shared mentalities, artistic and architectural production and institutional contexts are drawn together, instance by instance. His case studies focus closely on specific bodies of material, combining primary research with existing literature from a range of disciplines in order to complicate the urban and architectural histories at stake in Venice. Each chapter, in practical terms, appears as an autonomous study, one of a series of attacks on the two historiographical 'targets' declared at the outset of the book. Collected together, therefore, these multifarious researches within a single topic, *Venezia e il rinascimento*, demonstrate an approach towards writing architectural history that denies the discipline its own specificity. However, in denying specificity, Tafuri too denies the insularity that allows historians too readily to encounter 'the Renaissance' or too easily conjure up an image to illustrate its manifestation in Venice. (For this reason, perhaps, the cover image of Tafuri's book shows not a building, but a portrait by Veronese of his patron Daniele Barbaro, politician and diplomat, patriarch of Aquileia and translator of Vitruvius, holding drawings by Palladio; this image alone illustrates the complexity sought in Tafuri's own work on Venice.) He writes:

> Fascinated by a crystallised continuity, which has been mistaken for banal organic unity—perhaps to be regained—they cannot tolerate the challenge that Venice hurls out to them. And they multiply their violent and faithless attempts, with sadistic traits that are barely hidden beneath the masks of phrases like 'respectful project,' the 'past as friend,' and the 'new Caprice,'—masks of mummification of ephemeral revitalization.[67]

Where *La città americana* describes an institutional agenda to problematise at once a body of historical materials and the analytical tools of architectural and urban history, and where *Giulio Romano* explores and presents the breadth of an architectural *œuvre*, demonstrating (in part) the complexity with which one body of work is imbued, *Venezia e il rinascimento*

---

65 Ibid.
66 Ibid.
67 Ibid., pp. xi-xii.

takes terms from within the disciplines of art and architectural history—historiographical constructions—both systematically and repeatedly demonstrating their incapacity to account for the broader intellectual, historical, artistic, religious, military and political phenomena embedded in history itself. In terms of Tafuri's disciplinary 'project,' *Venezia e il rinascimento* demonstrates a necessity to constantly reassess historical judgements: "we proudly oppose all normative history."[68] Reinforced within the discipline over a period, 'the Renaissance' acquired mythical status that, presented with a fresh examination of the material, was rendered incongruous with the broader phenomena advanced. We might view *Venezia e il rinascimento* as a collection of independent studies that, together, make a case for the deformation of accepted historiographical foundations. Taken in a view of Tafuri's own historical *œuvre*, this work demonstrates one further strategy to test materials and questions in order to privilege the material that, in itself, describes a complex, contradictory and often unrecoverable historical field.

<div align="center">❧</div>

Therefore, at stake in *Venezia e il rinascimento* are the nineteenth century historiographical constructions of 'Venice' and 'Renaissance'; in *Giulio Romano*, Tafuri addresses the problematic idea of a complex life-work; in *La città americana*, he considers the role of material in defining historical tools. Each of these books represent the collection of a series of disparate studies, drawn together (at least) under a coherent theme. In one sense, his writing in *Venezia e il rinascimento* is the most internally complex elaboration of a single theme; the book's introduction announces its incapacity—under the book's own terms—to resolve the contradictions and irrationalities that become rapidly apparent when reading the volume cover to cover. One final representative 'document' of Tafuri's project takes this capacity for complexity and irreconcilability to an even more advanced level. With *La sfera e il labirinto*, Tafuri draws together a body of existing publications from over the course of the 1970s, rationalising them within a single trajectory: avant-garde practices extending from to Tafuri's present day and such practices as the New York Five and the exponents of the 'new objectivity' in Italy. Both in Tafuri's deliberate approximation of an historiographical arc and in his retrospective assemblage of autonomous histories and criticisms within the theme of the avant-garde may we identify some overt attempt to classify, or at least to reflect upon, the tasks and scope of architectural history. The structure and composition of the book, though, makes this point less obviously than does its introduction: the essay 'Il "progetto" storico,' to which we will quickly return.

The book addresses the 'avant-garde' under three themes. The first of these treats Piranesi as a prefiguration of twentieth century avant-garde visuality, making a direct connection with cinematographer Sergei Eisenstein. Eisenstein, Tafuri demonstrates by including a reproduction of the film-maker's own writings on Piranesi, was clearly

---

68   Ibid., p. xi.

conscious of shifts in visual construction and the representation of space played out in Piranesi's *Carceri*.[69] By claiming the avant-garde's historicity, therefore, Tafuri makes a case for its engagement with technical debates on the issue of spatial representation that would reach an end point with avant-garde cinema and its Benjaminian 'operators.' However, he also questions, by identifying Eisenstein's 'return' to the visual strategies of the *Carceri*, the very concept of 'avant-garde.' Does an avant-garde that reinvigorates an artistic strategy over a century old defy, in the end, its own definition of being the advanced edge of cultural development? And is it then possible to speak of an 'avant-garde' with the certainty that culture, and artistic culture in particular, moves directionally?

Tafuri then turns to a series of twentieth century case studies in which he questions the concept of an architectural avant-garde. He situates a return to Piranesi's avant-gardism in the early twentieth century theorisation and theatrical experimentation of Georg Fuchs, Marinetti, Moholy-Nagy, Hugo Ball, Mayakovsky, Kurt Switters, Meyerhold and Gropius. Theatre forms a metaphor for the realisation of the avant-garde; he writes that "the stage obliges the real to compress itself into it and then to explode at the spectator."[70] If the function of the avant-garde is a new conception of space and its representation, then the theatre offers an institutional corollary for experimenting with its realisation through confrontation with an audience. Yet, to recall Benjamin, in order to fulfil a truly modern objective—the destruction of the 'aura' by the dissolution of boundaries between the stage and its audience—the experimentation of avant-garde theatre—along with its strategies of advancing and demonstrating visions of the arts and their future in manifestos and a heightened production of theoretical writing—the 'lessons' of the theatre needed to return to the source of its themes and to render itself dystopic. Tafuri thus points to a trajectory from experimental theatre to an engagement with the metropolis on programmatic terms. He identifies four models of engagement: the artistic-intellectual-political relation of Berlin to the USSR in the 1920s; the application of ideology to the realities of urban planning in the construction of new Soviet cities under the First Five-Year-Plan; the expression of a capitalist world-view in the high-rise metropolises of Chicago and New York; and the sublimation of architectural and urban production to 'Sozialpolitik' in Weimar Germany. The relation of ideology and 'utopian' avant-garde strategies of the 'stage' to the real conditions of modern cities demonstrates, across Tafuri's four examples, a thesis that he had advanced a decade earlier in 'Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica.' Therein, he argued that the programmatic insularity of the avant-garde from contemporary reality rendered it impossible to shift from theatre—in fact, and as a metaphor for staged artistic practices—to metropolis. At odds with these practices of the Left, the only clear demonstration of an ideological system at the level of 'city' is American capitalism, in which *laisser-faire* ideological strategies operate as an extrapolation of conditions inherent to the organic modern city.

69   Sergej M. Ejzenštejn (Sergei Eisenstein), 'Piranesi o la fluidità delle forme,' trans. Maria Fabris from 'Piranesi, ili teku est form' (1946-47), *La sfera e il labirinto*, by Manfredo Tafuri, pp. 89-110.

70   Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Guards and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Pellegrino d'Acierno and Robert Connolly (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987), p. 109.

If the second part of *La sfera e il labirinto* demonstrates the inevitable conclusion of the avant-garde in the city, then 'The Glass Bead Game' identifies the consequences to architectural culture of rejecting its defeat. Insofar as the avant-garde's 'realisation' through a confrontation with urban conditions—an attempt to overcome the boundary of the stage and to effect an engagement with the conditions of modern life—was marked by the irreconcilability of utopian aspirations, an internally developed artistic language—even if rejecting bourgeois artistic culture, operating as a closed system of references—and the reality in which they sought to intervene, then the final section of this book considers the works of those who "make use of 'battle remnants,' that is, to redeploy what has been discussed on the battlefield that has witnessed the defeat of the avant-garde."[71] Tafuri identifies in the work of such architect-theoreticians as the New York Five (and particularly Peter Eisenman), James Stirling, Aldo Rossi, Vittorio Gregotti among others a desire to take up those ruined elements of European avant-garde culture and reinvigorate them in contemporary architectural debates: "Thus, the new 'knights of purity' advance onto the scene of the present brandishing as banners the fragments of a utopia that they themselves cannot confront head-on."[72] He floats the notion of autonomous architecture—properly attributable to Rossi,[73] but enacted by all to varying degrees—in which architectural culture retreats back onto its stage with its 'fragments' of an avant-garde. The place of ideology and of 'action' inherent in the theatre of the 1920s considered earlier in *La sfera e il labirinto* thus shifts from one where a conception of a future free of bourgeois culture—brought about by the new (anti-Art) arts—is developed on an isolated stage and launched forth into the metropolis. Instead, Tafuri identifies in contemporary architecture's autonomous disposition a forced insularity achieved by cloaking these failed fragments in a language that protects them from the actual conditions that failed the avant-garde.

<div align="center">❧</div>

While *La sfera e il labirinto* thus appears to generate a trajectory of the avant-garde, the basis of Tafuri's analysis is not the history of the avant-garde itself but rather a history of the status of a specific technical language in the architectural avant-garde. He demonstrates that in the construction of 'technique,' institutions and relationships between protagonists and the 'real world' in a series of moments within what only *appears* as a trajectory. Rather, he demonstrates that the peak of avant-garde culture is at once its moment of greatest impotence. Conversely, the emptiness identified by Tafuri in attempts to deploy the avant-garde's 'ruins' within an insulated architectural culture is also a moment in which any idea of the avant-garde encounters its own self-

---

71 Ibid., p. 267.

72 Ibid.

73 Cf. Aldo Rossi, *L'architettura della città* (Padua: Marsilio, 1966); Mary Louise Lobsinger, 'The Obscure Object of Desire: Autobiography and Repetition in the Work of Aldo Rossi,' *Grey Room*, no. 8 (Summer 2002): 39-61.

referentiality. Tafuri addresses the idea of an avant-garde language in very specific terms; he analyses its written production, manifestos and theoretical agenda, and commentaries on contemporaneous and historical practices. He demonstrates a technical logic robust in terms of the system that produced it, but that scrutiny according to the language and technique of other disciplines and fields of artistic production risks the exposure of the entire system as ultimately indefensible. It is in allusion to the provisional nature of techniques that he refers, in the introductory essay ('Il "progetto" storico'), to the historiographical thinking of Ginzburg and Prosperi.[74] The question posed of the avant-garde in *La sfera e il labirinto* is thus equivalent to that posed by Tafuri of historical 'technique.' In the theoretical production of the avant-garde, he demonstrates the irreconcilability of its insulated discourse on modernity and manifestations of modernity itself. He writes: "Upon awakening, the world of fact takes on the responsibility of re-establishing a ruthless wall between the image of estrangement and the reality of its laws."[75] The historiographical issue at stake in in *La sfera e il labirinto* is the most complex of any in Tafuri's published works, for its takes architectural theory as a 'lesson' for historical research. "Only in appearance, then," Tafuri writes, "*will we speak of something else.*"[76] In identifying the potential for gross self-referentiality in the written discourse of the avant-garde, for arguments of action rendered defensible in their own terms, Tafuri identifies an abstract issue that demands attention in the production of architectural histories.

In his introductory essay, Tafuri invites readers to draw contrasts between the theses of 'Il "progetto" storico' and the accounts delivered in the book's chapters. This is an important invitation, for in asking his readers to compare an essay that effectively forms a methodological reflection on historical meaning against a documented historical practice, Tafuri (by implication) invites comparison with his entire historical production, if not to that point then certainly from that moment on. To cover again, in this newer setting, some of the points made in Chapter Six, Tafuri addresses the issue of language and technique: "Does not historical work possess a language that, entering perpetually into conflict with the multiple techniques of environmental formation, can function like litmus paper to verify the correctness of discourses on architecture?"[77] While this might be true of an instrumental historiography, Tafuri identifies that history itself "is determined by its own traditions, by the objects that it analyses, by the methods that it adopts; it determines its own transformations and those of the reality that it deconstructs."[78] He contrasts the positivistic search for 'origins' thus presupposing ""the discovery of a *final* point of arrival" with the absolute provisionality of analytical strategies employed by

---

74 Tafuri, ibid., p. 3. Tafuri cites Carlo Ginzburg and Antonio Prosperi from *Giochi di pazienza. Un seminario sul 'Beneficio di Cristo'* (Turin: Einaudi, 1975), p. 84.

75 Tafuri, ibid., p. 309.

76 Ibid., p. 2.

77 Ibid., pp. 1-2.

78 Ibid., p. 3.

Derrida, Foucault, Freud and so on.[79] But while Tafuri recognises that each document is implicated in any number of techniques and discourses, any number of historical disciplines, and indexes, in fact, the entire world of its own production that it would, in a sustained extrapolation, theoretically reveal, he also recognises a 'mortal risk.'[80] He writes: "What guarantee do I have that, after breaking up and dissociating stratifications that I recognise as already plural in themselves, I will not arrive at a dissemination that is an end in itself?"[81] The guarantee, he answers, lies in the historian's own willingness to pursue the Sisyphean labours of an historical analysis that constantly tests historical material and analytical tools, institutional perspectives and mentality; in fact, this labour requires that any apparently firm platform upon which historical research is conducted be systematically tested, and then that testing process itself be bought under scrutiny in turn.

> The theoretical knot that must be confronted is how to construct a history that, after having upset and shattered the apparent compactness of the real, after having shifted the ideological barriers that hide the complexity of he strategies of domination, arrives at the heart of those strategies—arrives, that is, at their modes of production. But here we note the existence of a further difficulty: modes of production, isolated in themselves, *neither explain nor determine*. They themselves are anticipated, delayed, or traverse by ideological currents. Once a system of power is isolated, its genealogy cannot be offered as a universe complete in itself. The analysis must go further; it must make the previously isolated fragments collide with each other; it must dispute the limits it has set up. Regarded as 'labour,' in fact, analysis has no end; it is, as Freud recognised, by its very nature *infinite*.[82]

Tafuri effectively describes the impossibility of 'history,' arguing for an operational distinction between historical practice and its broader intellectual goals.

❧

With this distinction we return to two earlier distinctions made by Sartre, between 'essence' and 'experience.' If Tafuri's project in historiography remains beyond our ability to reconstruct then it remains possible only to point towards a series of questions repeatedly raised in that work which comprises evidence of action within the project. Among other things, those questions address the identity of the historian with respect of the architect, the status of writing in architectural production and analysis, the place of ideology in architecture, the capacity of architecture to act in a world in which

---

79   Ibid.
80   Ibid., p. 7.
81   Ibid., p. 4.
82   Ibid., p. 10.

architecture has rendered itself irrelevant, the consequences of removing critical action from architectural production to other fields of architectural culture, and so on. If we perceive these issues as recurrent in Tafuri's *œuvre*, but acknowledge the impossibility of engaging with then at the level of his 'project,' then we can at least identify what this project is not. To repeat a passage discussed in Chapter Six:

> I could choose to descend into what we have defined as the magic circle of language, transforming it into a bottomless well. The so-called operative criticism has been doing this for some time, serving, like fast food, its arbitrary and pyrotechnic send-ups of Michelangelo, Borromini, and Wright. Yet if I choose to do this, I must realize clearly that my aim is not to forge history, but rather to give form to a neutral space, in which to float, above and beyond time, a mass of weightless metaphors. I will ask of this space nothing but to keep me fascinated and pleasantly deceived.[83]

'Il "progetto" storico' posits the impossibility of 'history' while insisting upon the necessity for historical research. This returns us to Sartre's imperative for intellectual action. To what extent does the conscious anguish of choosing for either resistance or acceptance demand a pre-condition of loneliness? To what extent may we regard Tafuri's disciplinary choices as deeply personal? And, consequently, if we subscribe to the possibility of necessarily practicing history in isolation, to what does this translate as a mode of working? In his lecture 'The Loneliness of the Project,' German art historian Boris Groys argues that the work practices of artists, philosophers, writers, scientists, and so on assume a fundamentally existentialist stance in the relation of their 'project' to the external conditions of day to day life. To see Tafuri through Groys's eyes is to understand that if history, too, may be seen as a 'project' outside of the normal run of daily life, then the isolation we observe in other parts of Tafuri's life has consequences for Tafuri's conception of historical practice and of 'history' *per se* as well as for his historiographical strategies, collaborations and models of publication.[84] Groy's notion of the project, most importantly, distinguishes between intellectual work as an isolated and individual 'project' and the manifestations of that project, which he argues as representations of the project and distinct from the project itself.

He writes that the notion of the project—from its most ordinary connotations to its modernist utopian conception—invokes a fine balance between a common scale of time shared by all and a temporal field inhabited by an artist, for example—the authors of Groys's projects are conceived as artists—as he or she pursues their own path towards a desired future. In each instance that an artist proposes a project—to an ethical panel,

---

83   Ibid., p. 15.

84   Groys does not, we should be clear, consider the case of Tafuri. In fact, he is primarily concerned with the art project, and the relationship between the utopian 'project' and the pragmatic notion of projects as proposed to funding agencies, for instance. Nonetheless, his general theory of parallel time and accountability advanced by is important to the general argument and evident also in Tafuri's work.

funding committee, gallery, etc—he or she advances a scheme (even if microcosmic) for the future. A project undertaken equates to the artist commencing with the realisation of that vision. Anchored not to the vicissitudes of the present world, their vision responds to that world with critique, hope or simply the expectation that what they do will result in something consequential for the world at large. Such a vision is fundamentally utopian, for it expresses dissatisfaction with the present through an abstract idea for a better future through direct action: "each project in fact represents a draft for a particular view of the future, and in each case can be fascinating and instructive."[85] However, it is distinct from the programmatic futures encapsulated in political and architectural manifestoes insofar as that vision remains unshared in its entirety. One simply cannot subscribe to an individual's project as a whole; the most direct level of engagement is with its 'evidence.'

Groys notes that there exists those projects that do not simply occupy the time it takes to complete a building, installation or book, but inform the entire lives of the individuals in whose minds the project is conceived. The ends of the project may be religious, scientific, or artistic; but their pursuit will result in the same phenomena: a life lived not in the present but in a parallel timeframe. For the life-long project is a demonstration of sustained expectation, in which every effort towards the project—each new convert, small discovery, art work—is not the fulfilment of the project but evidence of its existence. He argues that, if the project takes one away from the normal life led by society, then evidence of the project provides the means for society to 'sanction' the loneliness required for the project's pursuit. In this conception lies the archetypal awkward genius, the reclusive scientist, the hermit. These formulations are permissible only because they have shown that something else is on their minds, something that will eventually become evident, valuable perhaps, but the pursuit of which must be shown over time. For Sartre, this idea might demonstrate the distinction between *essence* and *existence* in human life. Sartre's essence corresponds, in conceptual terms, to Groys's project. Just as evidence of existence can never encapsulate individual essence, so too the project's shadow is not the same as the project itself. For one living in the project, documentation follows the project, 'proving' its existence. In turn, this—just as with the *essence* of life—is subject to review, for under an existentialist worldview, experience informs essence. From the moment that an individual chooses to pursue a project beyond the normal grasp of society, only through documentation does that individual re-establish contact with the day to day flow of life, and in so doing open traces of the project to interrogation, criticism, and measurement.

For the author of a life-long project, whose project extends beyond a single life-time, the prospect of justifying a life spent in loneliness within that life-time is paradoxical, to say the least. The coincidence of the project's duration with a biological life, or its extension beyond that life, means that the author cannot ever seek a broader community

---

85   Boris Groys, *The Loneliness of the Project*, trans. Matthew Partridge (Antwerp: Museum van Hegendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, 2002), p. 4.

'approval' by the work itself. Documentation, on the other hand, allows the author of such a project, the essence of which would by definition remain elusive, to reassure a broader audience by sharing insights into the process that would ultimately, though theoretically, result in the project's completion. An artist may not produce works of art, but rather the documentation through paintings, for instance, of a larger question or set of questions. A writer may produce books, but not as ends in themselves. And likewise, histories may not be the purpose of an historian's work, but the documentation of an open investigation into bigger questions. By rendering the documentation of a project as an insulating device against which the project's author retains absolute independence, the author holds at bay the capacity of society to judge the project itself. Just as Sartre's existentialist man is judged by his actions and not by his essence, so too, documentation is the public face of the project. Yet in contrast with Sartre's model, the project author's publication from the project need not aspire to the complexity or completion of the project as conceived. In one sense, the project remains immune from judgement because it is insulated from experience by a mechanism distinguishing intentionality and act to the extent that the act—the documentation of intentionality—becomes a surrogate for the project as received by a public.

Unlike the author of a project conceived in pragmatic terms, though, with a time span and objectives built into its conception, the life-project has an ambivalent relationship with the future. Groys writes that the author of a project lives in a future that the rest of the world is still awaiting: "[The] author of the project already knows what the future will look like, since his project is nothing other than a description of this future."[86] The present is either of little concern as a condition that will pass, or of pressing concern as "something that has to be overcome, abolished or at least changed."[87] But for the life lived in the project, the future is inconceivable, except in such terms as revolution, rapture, or discovery. The very essence of such terms is that they are so well beyond the perceivable present, that these things exist only in essence; they have no form, and therefore cannot be inhabited through projected experience. However, this does not stop the forward momentum of the project, or deter its documentation. It simply envelopes the author in the loneliness Groys describes, attended by moments of a shared project-in-process (in Sartre's terms, by *une action directe*). Its essence eludes communication.

The terms in which Tafuri invokes the notion of project are rather more closely shared with those of Sartre than of Groy's artist. Faced with an open field of choice, one must chose. To refuse the responsibility of choice is akin, for Tafuri's historical practice, to a retreat from the world into that space that offers nothing but lure of deception. He rather positions the question as one of the capacity of informed action within a field that is fraught with ambiguity and artificial *firmitas*. He describes the ability to regard history as an engagement both within itself and in a field of conflict beyond its normal disciplinary boundaries. In so doing, he further portrays an ethical stance in which the

---

86 Ibid., p. 11.
87 Ibid., p. 12.

intellectual constantly faces one fundamental, if abstract, quandary: to choose or not. In deciding to chose—a stance of action, which for Sartre is intrinsic to life (and which is experienced always as conflict)—Tafuri acts *for* his discipline, but on the condition that his actions are constantly provisional, subject to revision and open to critique. Yet if the past is irrecoverable, why pursue history at all? As Tafuri writes elsewhere, and as we have considered earlier in this dissertation, the publication of historical research is necessary in the battle with architectural mythology. In exposing myths—historical 'truths'—the historian reminds architectural practice and its adherent culture that it cannot perpetuate, in the present, stories that bolster specific notions of practice and its aims while lacking the support of firm historical analysis. The historian, in such terms, assumes the added mantle of clearing the field of choice for others who must decide upon a course of action. In debunking myths, one by one, by rigorous if interminable historical analysis, Tafuri's historian clears a path for historical practice to proceed unencumbered by false hope.

EPILOGUE

DEATH IN VENICE

In the preceding pages we have given sustained attention to the challenge faced by Manfredo Tafuri of formulating an historiographical practice within the specific institutional and historical contexts in which he worked. Rather than agreeing upon a clear process within which Tafuri distilled his intellectual and methodological referents, we have demonstrated the need to sever the traditional restraints separating biographical, institutional and intellectual histories and the broad *milieux* in which he is readily implicated, invoking the shadow of mentality and its historical traces, as well as the now defunct distinctions between high and low cultural artefacts and memories. The coincidence between the approach we have followed and the nature of historical practices that we identify here as proper to Tafuri is not accidental. In pointing towards Tafuri, we identify his value as a figure who problematises the practices of architectural historiography with moments of biographical and intellectual complexity matched by few others of his era. What, then, is the consequence of bringing Tafuri to bear upon Tafuri? Do we risk entering a circular, rhetorical state in which Tafuri answers himself, in which the complexities of his case either resolve or excuse themselves of the compulsion towards resolution? We sustain a stern warning in the nature of his early reception of the 1970s, which fixes upon theoretical and biographical images—politico-biographical images, to be precise—and thereby easily overcome the potential challenges laid down by a close study of his thought. More recently, the notion of 'legacy' has replaced that of 'exemplar' in the scholarship and criticism that encounters Tafuri's ideas about architecture and its history. However, the same basic problem remains that of confronting images with the means of their disturbance. Insofar as we draw this 'lesson' from Tafuri, apply it to Tafuri and undermine then (at his prompting, relative to his 'case') the very notion of legacy, we leave ourselves with the difficult task of drawing conclusions from this study.

Our process, insofar as it finds some resonances with Tafuri's historiography—though we do not claim to be emulating him directly, in the sense of writing a Tafurian analysis of Tafuri—requires that our conclusions lie *between* image and artefacts, between legacy and life, memory and the past. In this sense, and to return to a document that we cast into doubt at the outset of this dissertation, we recall Tafuri's practice of moving constantly, between 1968 and 1994, between Rome, the city of his birth, and Venice, the city of his teaching and the proper site of his institutionalisation and memorialisation. If, as Valéry wrote, being in Paris is like thinking, then what, for Tafuri, is 'Rome'? What is 'Venice'? We return to Tafuri's oral history, his *autoritratto*.[1] At a certain moment, he observes of his transience:

---

[1] Tafuri, 'History as Project,' interview with Manfredo Tafuri, by Luisa Passerini, Rome, February-March 1992, trans. Denise L Bratton, 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' special issue, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (1999): 10-70.

> At that time, the problem was exodus. I never felt at home anywhere. It's not
> by chance that, even today, I keep vacillating between Rome and Venice. I can
> vacillate on anything, yet I need a strong sense of roots. Perhaps this explains my
> tendency towards history, which is rooted and uprooted by those who write it.[2]

Tafuri's position towards Rome is not simple. His own city, it contains a past that is
perpetually present, but essentially inert. It is full of artefacts that are 'past' in the sense
that they already exist, but beyond the memory of the present. These fragments *do* have
a bearing on the consciousness of the city because their presence is guaranteed by a sense
of necessity; archaeological fragments of a past city are preserved, but never 'used.' In
this setting, archaeology presides over urban life in a non-negotiable relationship that
continually values the remnants of past lives over the lives of the present. Preservation
is essential, but the ruin is valued as an object rendered static from the moment of its
'discovery.' In this setting, then, the past is an obstacle necessarily negotiated in order
to conduct life on a daily basis. Rome is not simply old, like a grandfather. It is ancient,
incapable of conversation; it needs nothing in the sense that an elderly man might,
exchanging assistance for a sense of tradition and belonging. Rome is rather *the past*, like
a ruinous topography overgrown and forgotten. There is no possibility of identifying a
singular artefact, like a skeleton or a preserved interior that can be studied scientifically
in order to know the city. There are rather thousands of skeletons; thousands of places
preserved across thousands of years. There is no possibility of remembering the city by
recovering and freezing its composite parts in time, as in archaeology. The remains of the
past are important for abstract reasons (heritage, for instance), but become a burden of
authority that Romans address in the simulation of a conversation, but never expecting
answers. Rome is a field of ancient artefacts that are important as *evidence* of ancient
lives—they cannot simply be dismissed; yet these fragments will never give over their
memories, existing rather as pre-texts, obstacles that the present must negotiate rather
than engage.

These obstacles are far from simply metaphoric: the Colloseum, the Pantheon,
the Forum, buried layers of the city, each take priority over the needs of the present.
And yet the paradoxical presence of the past and absence of tradition is essential to
the notion of Rome. Both history and continuity are undermined by the absence of
recollection; for Rome, the past is vital, but beyond memory. It is a place in which
things are forgotten, not intentionally, but rather as one might forget one's book on
a café table: accidentally, distracted by the confusion of everyday life. The city as an
historical entity is therefore a constellation of fragments, constituting not a whole, but
rather a perpetually disrupted context, the weight of which *bears down* on the present. As
Verschaffel writes, monumentalising the past creates "obstacles one stumbles on as one
goes about one's daily business."[3] Further, Rome lacks tradition precisely because of the

---

2   Ibid., p. 57.

3   This characterisation of Rome draws heavily on Bart Verschaffel, 'The Monumental: On the Meaning
of a Form,' *Journal of Architecture* 4, no. 4 (1999), p. 333.

relationship of its past to history. The city constantly *undoes itself*: nothing can start afresh because the past is retained forever. The city is thus an indiscriminate accumulation of its own past that cannot 'project' but rather forms a scatography of remains from inherently contradictory, moments. When, in Rome, the past can be traced archaeologically, the idea of history is itself at stake. The city can only be researched, never narrated. It is no coincidence, therefore, that Tafuri never really leaves Rome, because the city represents not simply a geography but rather a position towards the past.

"Rome," he recalls, "beckoned me to explore her roots, but not Venice, which doesn't have roots. There is only mud beneath the city."[4] If Rome is comprised of its own fragmented past, heterogeneously composed as a city of obstacles, Venice is its inverse. In Venice the past is neither heterogenous nor inert, but homogenous and present. Yet, this past is neither as the aged grandfather nor as the forgotten ruin or the thousands of skeletons, but rather as a breathing corpse, a body in a coma, whose vital signs guarantee it treatment, but for no reward. Just as the elderly grandfather requires care and attention, so does Venice, but unlike ones grandfather, Venice has nothing to pass on, no continuity from past to present to future. We speak of Venice as we speak of the clinically dead; we cannot live with them, only visit. Those whose lives are intimately bound to them, who occupy their spaces, are the technicians who perpetuate the appearance of life. In the end, life is a projection onto their body, permitted by memory and nostalgia.

For Tafuri, we suggest, historical practice is caught between these two 'places,' between 'Rome' and the fragment, the past, on one hand, 'Venice' and memory, or image, on the other. How, though, can an historian conduct an analysis of fragments without simulating their resolution? How can one travel between these two sites without rendering one as the other, or vice versa? Posed in different terms, we encounter the 'problem' of conducting historical research as an 'investigation' while resisting the tendency to construct history as closed arguments. In this, both 'Roman' and 'Venetian' positions are ultimately at stake: one can draw provisional, but artificial, conclusions from a body of evidence, just as one can structure a story that escape's the snares of homogeneity. We have seen, noting Tafuri's direct invocation of *la critica fredudiana*, which the historian must be on guard against the image, diligent with sourcing the greatest breadth of material, subjecting that material to a form of analysis in which the analysis, too, is subject to rigorous reappraisal. Where the image arises, it must be confronted with the fragment; and not simply images of fragments, themselves smoothing over the rough edges of the past. Fundamentally, we propose, Tafuri is drawn to the historical processes that formed Rome over the millennia and to Rome's invocation to recover the contradictions of the past through research *into the past*, rather than by the production *of history*. The 'Roman' position in Tafuri's research therefore sought a thorough and broad knowledge of the *evidence* comprising history; he perpetually contests the 'Venetian' tendency towards myth, calling into question the very techniques applied to the task of interpreting the past.

---

4   Ibid., p. 58.

The epigraph of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* clearly signals the nature of the open dialogue that Tafuri saw as fundamental to the practice of history. *Marat-Sade* offers no conclusions or certainties, but rather an imperative to feel *uncomfortable* with the present bases of historical, and by extension, personal, knowledge. Tafuri later acknowledged that this process is far from simple, citing from Nietzsche's *Morgenrothe* to suggest that the accumulation of histories pose just as concrete an issue as those fragments of the past referenced by history. To recall his famous words: "Today, with every new bit of knowledge, one has to stumble over words that are petrified and hard as stones, and one will sooner break a leg than a word."[5] Memory is the device through which the past is 'accessed'; language lends those memories form. The task of the analyst is the disruption, through questioning, that allows the analytical subject to reveal his or her own processes of meaning and signification: "by penetrating deeper and deeper into memory, one can open up new possibilities."[6] It is no coincidence that Sigmund Freud deployed Rome as an important metaphor for the unconscious, both personal and collective, nor that he likened its recovery with excavation.[7]

Venice, in its coma-like state, cannot investigate its foundations, remaining asleep, dreaming, and in dreaming rehearses its own narrative. To apply the lessons of 'Rome' to historical research is like waking 'Venice' from its coma. This is perhaps the motivation behind Tafuri's 'Roman' investigation of the Venetian renaissance—*Venezia e il rinascimento*—in which he denies the city its own inclinations towards its homogeneous historical image.[8]

We must distinguish here between *history* and *historical research*. Tafuri's elaboration and demonstration of 'Il "progetto" storico' replicates the past's complexity and fragmentation, modelling the resistance that the past sustains against its own representation. For Tafuri, we believe, the products of historical practice ultimately and perpetually undo themselves. The 'past' is not a smooth progression of events; nor is it a truth to be built up over time; nor is it directly accessible. The historian's practice, argues Tafuri through his own practice, involves a perpetual confrontation with these 'frustrations.' Yet it is precisely because of the manner of Tafuri's encounter with these frustrations that his work is so important today. By extracting historical research from history, practice from discipline, he exposed the functions that historical knowledge can have in the present. By extension, his understanding that the image and the fragment—played out across a vast range of

---

5   Nietzsche, in Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Pellegrino D'Acierno and Robert Connolly (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987), p. 7.

6   Passerini, 'History as Project,' p. 45.

7   Peter Gay, *Freud: A Life for Our Time* (London and New York: W W Norton and Co, 1988), pp. 132-133, 135-136, 171-172, 316, 425 (in which Freud invokes "Roman polydimensionality"). Particular instances of Rome's deployment as a metaphor by Freud occur in 'The Interpretation of Dreams' (1900) and in 'Civilisation and its Discontents' (1930), vols. IV-V and XXI in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, trans. and ed. James Strachey, et al. (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1953 (vol. IV ent., vol. V pp. 339-627) and 1964 (pp. 57-145), resp.).

8   Tafuri, *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura* (Turin: Einaudi, 1985).

scales—come from different 'places,' bearing different burdens, and ultimately heading in different disciplinary directions, equips us for addressing, at the present moment, the proper place of the historian in architectural culture.

Yet to know Rome, or to be Roman, is to understand that the present is inherently unstable, just as the past has always been. The historian, as a figure starting from the present and looking backwards, in effect provides 'permission' for the future to perpetuate neither historical myths nor an undue reverence for the seemingly unalterable past. The tangible artefacts of the past cannot be changed, but their meaning in analysis is kept open. The figures of action, who Tafuri suggests *might* be architects, take the historian's analysis as part of a complex present and proceed with plans for the future, rather in the manner of a subject of analysis who, by understanding their own 'history,' changes their life in the present and their plans for the future. They cannot alter what has taken place already, but can change the effect of this past on their present life. Through destabilisation of the past, in other words, the future can be approached with greater confidence. Thus are drawn together Tafuri's historical and ideological projects, and thus the disciplines of history and architecture may co-exist.

What then, is Tafuri's *œuvre*? Is it a constellation of heterogeneous fragments, *à la Roma*, each to be read on both their own terms and in relation with all the other fragments scattered in the Tafurian *milieu*? Or is it a homogenous body of work, *à la Venezia*, each text another of Polo's stories to the Kublai Khan, leading us to the same place (but where?) each time, or seeing those elements in terms of a different (again, where?), or perhaps the same, place? The tendency, as Groys notes, is for us to consider the evidence of a project-in-progress as a cohesive and conclusive representation of the project. Further, the mechanisms by which the project is represented to others—books, articles, encyclopaedia entries, exhibition catalogues, lectures—encourages us to consider those elements as resolved in themselves rather than as evidence of a larger 'project-in-process.' These forums traditionally require arguments and conclusions, a story, replete with evidence; such formal characteristics in themselves contain the tools by which the work becomes homogenised, or at least understood as 'completed' research. The representation of analytical fragments as concluded elements of an open-ended historical research programme may therefore be a final paradox in Tafuri's work, its fundamental 'weakness.' In 'sharing' his analyses, he is himself open to analysis as an historian with a body of published work. Searching for 'the answer' to 'Tafuri,' contemporary scholarship holds lengthy conversations with the clinically dead, while, if anything, Tafuri's life-work warns readers to be suspicious of answers, that historical analysis undoes the subjects of its study, does not draw them into focus.

Of *L'armonia e i conflitti*, Tafuri said that it "tends to demolish" Wittkower's reading of humanist architecture, "but with affection and great regard for the importance of his work." In challenging the premises of Wittkower's thinking, Tafuri understood that he was also challenging Wittkower himself: "for each book he wrote and the moment

in which he wrote it carries his biography."[9] Although, as he claims, "biography… is essentially banal" and the moment of birth and death casual, it can also be true that an intellectual life as traceable in books is shaped by the circumstances of birth and firmly concluded at the moment of death.[10] There is always a last book, even if the work is not complete. And so while these moments are indeed "casual" (rather than causal) in Tafuri's case, they are not insignificant in understanding the ideas at stake in his work. If they are *not* 'causal,' they are at least ironic, considering the pattern of loneliness and vacillation present in his life, as represented vividly in his own, end of life, recollections. For in the conclusion of Tafuri's life, and in the interment of his remains and the memorialisation of his importance, he continues to occupy a space between Rome and Venice. After his death in February, 1994, he was buried, not on the island of San Michele in Venice, but in Rome, as an outsider, in the *Cimitero acattolico e per gli stragnieri* at the Porta S. Paolo, his tombstone bearing the simple inscription, *Storico dell'architettura*. This is fitting, for just as his remains are quite literally contained in the ground in Rome, covered by a ruin-like tombstone as one more fragment under the shadow of the pyramid of Caius Cestius, his image is fixed in Venice, where the memory of Tafuri is invoked at the threshold of Tolentini, within Carlo Scarpa's entrance-way to the faculty. To the left, a stone memorial and, to the right, a fallen cast of the façade of S. Francesco della Vigna converted into a garden mark Tafuri's significance to the history and identity of *IUAV*.[11] But more that this, they ensure that significance is never taken for granted, as students and professors pay perpetual tribute to Tafuri by incorporating his memory into their daily routine. By these means, Tafuri never leaves Venice, but is subsumed by the city and transformed into a memory kept alive as a familiar presence. And so Tafuri's life concludes but is not resolved, caught, even in death, between the world of physical remains, as a skeleton in Rome, and the coma-condition, kept alive as an institution, an ideal.

This is the paradox of Tafuri's evolving philosophy of historical research: one must investigate evidence of the past and understand the profound complexity of the accumulation of lives since passed, but in his memory, this 'life-in-project' is framed precisely in terms that Tafuri himself rejected: as a story, with a message. Death in Venice is thus not an end, but a restless, if perpetual slumber, a memorial dialectic in which image presides over artefact, while the artefact taunts the image for its naïveté.

---

9   Tafuri, 'History as Project,' p. 54.

10 Ibid., p. 66.

11 The garden involving S. Francesco della Vigna, by Jacopo Sansovino (early design, c.1534) and Andrea Palladio (execution of façade, 1562-1570), is an element of Carlo Scarpa's proposal for the entranceway to *IUAV*, designed in 1977 and executed in the early 1990s, preceding Tafuri's death. However, it is clear that this façade has come to assume the memorial function argued for it here, particularly in light of Tafuri and Foscari's historical study of S. Francesco della Vigna, published as *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di S. Francesco della Vigna nella Venezia del '500* (Turin: Einaudi, 1983).

BIBLIOGRAPHIES

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Earlier versions of several chapters of this dissertation appeared, in whole or in part, over recent years, or were delivered as lectures. While we have modified, often substantially, all of the texts that reappear here from earlier publications, we nonetheless note their importance in the development of this work.

Chapter One was delivered, in part, as lectures to the Academia Belgica (December 2004) and the University of Edinburgh (February 2005); while I have since changed my ideas about several points, it first appeared as 'Death in Venice: Tafuri's Life in the Project,' *Architectural Theory Review* (*ATR*) 8, no. 1 (2003): 30-43.

Parts of Chapter Two were published as '"Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions": Manfredo Tafuri and *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985*,' *Additions: Proceedings of the 19th Annual SAHANZ Conference*, eds. John Macarthur and Antony Moulis (Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2002), 12 pp. [cd-rom]; "Choosing History: Tafuri, Criticality and the Limits of Architecture," *Journal of Architecture* 10, no. 3 (2005): 235-244; 'Inoperative Criticism: Tafuri and the Discipline of History,' *ATR* 8, no. 2 (2003): 85-93.

I initially tested the argument of Chapter Four in 'Making Progress: Tafuri, History and the Psychoanalysis of Society,' *Progress: Proceedings of the 20th Annual SAHANZ Conference*, eds. Maryam Gusheh and Naomi Stead (Sydney: SAHANZ, 2003), 178-182; refined in 'The Historical Process: Tafuri, Freud and the Methodology of Architectural History' (presented to the 7th Joint Doctoral Seminar in Architectural History and Theory, Universiteit Gent, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Université catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-neuve, 2004).

Chapter Five was first given as a lecture to the University of Greenwich (January 2005), later published as 'Tafuri and the Age of Historical Representation," *ATR* 10, no. 1 (2005): 1-18. A summary of Chapter Eight first appeared as 'Borromini, Piranesi, Tafuri: Historical Memory and Programmatic Indecision,' *Celebration, Proceedings of the 22nd Annual SAHANZ Conference*, eds. Andrew Leach and Gill Matthewson (Napier: SAHANZ, 2005): 191-196. I delivered Chapter Eight as a doctoral seminar at The Bartlett, University College, London and as a lecture at Sint Lucas, Brussels (both December 2004).

The epilogue appeared as the much longer, though rather poorly informed, essay 'Death in Venice,' as referenced above.

BIBLIOGRAPHY I
WRITING BY TAFURI

We have generally ordered this bibliography in chronological sequence. In instances where seminars and *convegni* are later published in edited collections, full details are given in the year of presentation. For multi-authored publications, we list Tafuri as first author in each case.

1959

ASEA (Associazione Studenti e Architetti, including Manfredo Tafuri, et al.). "Dichiarazione." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 45 (July 1959). Reprinted in "Gli studenti di architettura contro il Piano Regolatore," *Il tempo*, November 21, 1959: 5; also as "Dichiarazione programmatica dell'Associazione Studenti e Architetti," *Superfici* II, no. 5 (April 1962): 42-43.

Tafuri, Manfredo. "La prima strada di Roma moderna. Via Nazionale." In *Urbanistica*, no. 27 (1959): 95-109.

1960

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Il corso di composizione nella Facoltà di architettura di Roma." In *Architettura e cantiere*, no. 24 (1960): lxiv.

———. "I lavori di attuazione del P. R. di Roma." In *Italia nostra. Bollettino dell'Associazione nazionale 'Italia nostra' per la tutela del patrimonio artistico e naturale* IV, no. 18 (1960): 6-11.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Giorgio Piccinato. "Relazione introdottiva al dibattito sulla didattica di Saverio Muratori." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia* IV, no. 57 (July 1960): 148-149.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Massimo Teodori, for ASEA. "Un dibattito sull'architettura e l'urbanistica italiana" [letter to Ernesto Nathan Rogers]. In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 241 (July 1960): 58.

1961

Tafuri, Manfredo. "L'ampiamento barocco del Comune di S. Gregorio da Sassola." In *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, no. 31-48 (1959-1961): 269-380.

———. "Architettura." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. I, 122-125. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

———. "Il codice dell'urbanistica ed i piani risanamento conservation." In *Italia nostra. Bollettino dell'Associazione nazionale 'Italia nostra' per la tutela del patrimonio artistico e naturale* V, no. 21 (1961): 13-17.

———. "Gardella, Ignazio." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. I, 699. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

———. "L'informale e il 'design' contemporaneo." In *Argomenti di architettura*, no. 4 (December 1961): 89-94.

―――. "Johnson, Philip." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. I, 890. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. "Le Corbusier." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. I, 973. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. 'Mies van der Rohe, Ludwig.' In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. II, 110. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. "Un piano per Tokyo e le nuove problematiche dell'urbanistica contemporanea." In *Argomenti di architettura*, no. 4 (December 1961): 70-77.

―――. "Il problema dei parchi pubblici in Roma e l'azione di 'Italia nostra'." In *Urbanistica*, no. 34 (1961): 105-112.

―――. "Ridolfi, Mario." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. II, 610. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. "Rietveld, Gerrit Thomas." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1948-1960), Vol. II, 612-613. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. "Il riordinamento della Galleria Doria Pamphili, Villa Chigi, Villa Savoia." In *Italia nostra* V, no. 22 (March-April 1961): 26-28.

―――. "Saarinen, Eero." In *Enciclopedia della scienza, lettere e arte italiana*, App. 3, Vol. II (1949-1960), 643. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

―――. "Zevi, Bruno." In *Enciclopedia italiana di scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 3 (1949-1960), Vol. II, 1146. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1961.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Giorgio Piccinato. "Helsinki." In *Urbanistica*, no. 33 (1961): 88-104.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Vieri Quilici. "Il problema di Villa Savoia." In *Italia nostra* V, no. 23 (May-June 1961): 12-19.

1962

Architetti e Urbanisti Associati (AUA, incl. Manfredo Tafuri). "Architettura e società." In *Superfici* II, no. 5 (April 1962): 42-43.

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Aschieri, Pietro." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IV, 375-377. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962.

―――, ed. "Attività politica e critica degli architetti romani." In *Superfici* II, no. 5 (April 1962): 42-47.

―――. "Attualità del Palladio." Review of *Palladio*, by P. Rave. *Paese sera*, June 5-6, 1962.

―――. "Autore, Camillo." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IV, 608-609. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962.

―――. "Azzurri, Francesco." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IV, 782-784. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1962.

―――. "Il paesaggio industriale." In *Italia nostra. Bollettino dell'Associazione nazionale 'Italia nostra' per la tutela del patrimonio artistico e naturale* VI, no. 27 (1962): 1-5.

―――. "Il Piano Regolatore non è un disegno. Intervista sul Piano Regolatore Generale di Roma." In *Pases sera*, May 9-10, 1962. Reprinted in *Casabella-continuità*, no. 279 (September 1963): 45.

———. "Studi e ipotesi di lavoro per il sistema direzionale di Roma." In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 264 (June 1962): 27-36.

———. "La vicenda architettonica romana, 1945-1961." In *Superfici* II, no. 5 (April 1962): 20-41.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Giorgio Piccinato and Vieri Quilici ('per lo studio AUA di Roma'). "La città territorio. Verso una nuova dimensione." In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 270 (December 1962): 16-25.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Lidia Soprani. "Problemi di critica e problemi di datazione in due monumenti taorminesi: Il palazzo dei Duchi di S. Stefano e la 'Badia vecchia'." In *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, no. 51 (1962): 1-12.

1963

Architetti e Urbanisti Associati (AUA, incl. Manfredo Tafuri). "Relazione di concorso per il Centro Direzionale di Torino." In *Casabella-Continuità*, no. 278 (August 1963): 13.

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Architettura e socialismo nel pensiero di William Morris." Review of *Architettura e socialismo*, by William Morris, ed. Mario Manieri-Elia. In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 280 (October 1963): 35-39.

———. "Banfi, Gian Luigi." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. V, 754-755. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1963.

———. "Ludovico Quaroni e la cultura architettonica italiana." In *Zodiac*, no. 11 (1963): 130-145. Republished in *Ludovico Quaroni e lo sviluppo dell'architettura moderna in Italia* (Florence: Edizioni di comunità, 1964).

———. "Problemi d'urbanistica." In *Comunità. Gionale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 112 (August-September 1963): 46-53.

———. "Recente attività dello studio romano 'Architetti e Ingegneri'." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 93 (July 1963): 150-169.

———. "Vecchie e nuove ipotesi per i centri direzionale." In "Interventi collettanei con progettisti e storici, edited by Guido Canella," special issue, *Casabella-continuità*, no. 275 (May 1963): 42-56.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Antonio Cederna and Carlo Melograni. "Interviste di 'Paese sera'." See 1962.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Enrico Fattinnanzi. "Un'ipotesi per la città-territorio di Roma. Strutture produttive e direzionali nel comprensorio pontino." In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 274 (April 1963): 26-37.

1964

Tafuri, Manfredo. *L'architettura moderna in giappone*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1964.

———. "Ernst May e l'urbanistica razionalista." In *Comunità. Giornale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 123 (October 1964): 66-80.

———. "Un fuoco urbano della Roma Barocca." In *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura*, no. 61 (1964): 1-20.

———. *Ludovico Quaroni e lo sviluppo dell'architettura moderna in Italia*. See 1963.

———. "Una precisazione sui disegni del Dos Santos per il complesso dei Trinitari in via Condotti." In *Quaderni dell'istituto di storia dell'architettura* XI, nos. 62-66 (1964): 26.

———. "Il problema dei centri storici all'interno della nuova dimensione cittadina." In *La città territorio. Un esperimento didattico sul centro direzione di Centocelle in Roma*, edited by Saul Greco, 27-30. Bari: Leonardo da Vinci Editrice, 1964.

———. "Razionalismo, critico e nuovo utopismo." In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 293 (November 1964): 20-42.

———. "Simbolo e ideologia nell'architettura dell'Illuminismo." In *Comunità*, no. 124-125 (November-December 1964): 68-80. Published in Spanish as "Simbolo e ideología en la arquitectura del Illuminismo," *Arte, arquitectura y estética en el siglo XVIII*, 87-106 (Madrid: Akal, 1980).

———. "La storia dell'architettura moderna alla luce dei problemi attuali." Corso di composizione architettonica B II, Università degli studi di Roma, 1964-1965.

———. "Storicità di Louis Kahn." In *Comunità*, no. 117 (February 1964): 38-49.

———. "Teoria e critica nella cultura urbanistica italiana del dopoguerra." In *La città territori*, ibid., 39-45.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Carlo Aymonino, Francesco Tentori, et al. "Progetti degli architetti romani." In *Casabella-continuità*, no. 289 (July 1964): 3-11.

1965

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Basile, Ernesto." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. VII, 73-74. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1965.

———. "Basile, Giovanni Battista Filipo." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. VII, 81-82. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1965.

———. "Borromini e l'esperienza della storia" In *Comunità. Gionale mensile di politica e cultura*, no. 129 (1965): 42-63. Reprinted as "Borromini e il problema della storia" in "Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura II A," edited by Manfredo Tafuri, 9-30. Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, 1979.

———. *La Cattedrale di Amiens*. *Forma e colore*, no. 25. Florence: Sadea/Sansoni, 1965. Reprinted in Manfredo Tafuri, Lara Vinco Masini, Marco Dezzi Bardeschi, et al., *Le grandi cattedrali gotiche*. Florence: Sadea/Sansoni, 1968.

———. "Inchiesta sul simbolo della cultura italiana." Contribution to a debate convened by R. Giorgio. *Marcatre. Notiziario di cultura contemporanea*, no. 16-18 (July-September 1965): 214-216.

———. "La lezione di Michelangelo." In *Comunità*, no. 126 (January 1965): 52-69.

———. "Il parco della Villa Trissino a Trissino e l'opera di Francesco Muttoni." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 114 (April 1965): 833-841.

1966

Tafuri, Manfredo. *L'architettura del Manierismo nel cinquecento europeo*. Rome: Officina, 1966.

———. "La nuova dimensione urbana e la funzione dell'utopia." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 124 (February 1966): 680-683.

———. "La poetica borrominiana. Mito, simbolo e ragione." In *Palatino* X, nos. 3-4 (1966): 184-193.

1967

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Architettura, 'town-design,' città." In *D'Ars agency* VIII, nos. 36-37 (1967): 4-9.

———. "L'avventura del Barocco a Roma." Review of *Roma barocca. Storia di una civiltà architettonica*, by Paolo Portoghesi. In *Paese sera*, January 20, 1967, Libri, iii.

———. "Berlam, Arduino." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IX, 110-111. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1967.

———. "Berlam, Giovanni." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IX, 111. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1967.

———. "Berlam, Ruggero." *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. IX, 111-112. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1967.

———. "Bernini e il barocco." Review of *Bernini*, by Howard Hibbard and *Una introduzione al gran teatro del Barocco*, by Maurizio Fagiolo dell'Arco. In *Paese sera*, June 2, 1967, Libri, ii.

———. "Borromini in Palazzo Carpegna. Documenti inediti e ipotesi critiche." In *Quaderni dell'Istituto di storia dell'architettura* XIV, nos. 79-84 (1967): 85-107.

———. *Dardi. Presentazione di M. Tafuri*. Rome: Edizione Universitarie Italiane, 1967. Reprinted in *Lotus. Rivista internazione dell'architettura*, no. 6 (1969): 162-169.

———. "L'idea di architettura nella letteratura teoretica del Manierismo." In *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* IX (1967): 369-384.

———. "Inediti borromiani." In *Palatino* XI, no. 3 (1967): 255-262.

———. "Un inedito di Giovanni Antonio De Rossi. Il Palazzo Carpegna a Carpegna." In *Palatino* XI, no. 2 (1967): 133-140.

———. "Jacopo Barozzi da Vignola e la crisi del Manierismo a Roma." In *Bollettino del CISA "Andrea Palladio"* IX (1967): 385-398.

———. "Tre ville a San Felice Circeo degli architetti Alberto e Diambra Gatti." In *L'architettura. Cronache e storia*, no. 136 (February 1967): 636-645.

———. "Valadier fra comunicazione e l'Aufklärung." In *Marcatre. Notiziario di cultura contemporanea*, nos. 30-33 (1967): 210-214.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Emilio Garroni, Paolo Portoghesi, et al. "Il rapporto tra Borromini e la tradizione." Roundtable moderated by Gugliemo De Angelis d'Ossat. In *Studi sul Borromini. Atti del convegno promosso dall'Accademia nazionale di San Luca*, edited by Gugliemo De Angelis d'Ossat, Vol. II, 35-70. Rome: De Luca, 1967.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Paolo Marconi, Paolo Portoghesi, et al. "Il metodo di progettazione del Borromini." Roundtable moderated by Salvatore Caronia Roberti. *Studi sul Borromini*, ibid., Vol. II, 5-34.

1968

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Il barocco in Boemia." Review of *K. I. Dietzenhifer e il Barocco boemo*, by Christian Norberg-Shulz. In *Paese sera*, June 22, 1968, Libri, iv.

———. "Bianchi, Salvatore." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. X, 174-175. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1968.

———. "Bizzacheri (Bizzacari, Bizzocheri, Bizacarri), Carlo Francesco." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. X, 737-738. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1968.

———. *Il concorso per i nuovi uffici della camera dei deputati. Un bilancio dell'architettura italiana*. Rome: Edizioni universitarie italiane, 1968.

———. "È il momento del barocco." Review of *Le metamorfosi del barocco*, by Andreina Griseri. In *Paese sera*, July 22, 1968, Libri, iii.

———. "Una 'lettura' settecentesca del modello di Michelangelo per S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini." In *Palatino* XII, no. 3 (July-September 1968): 251-255.

———. "Michelangelo e il suo tempo." Review of *L'architettura di Michelangelo*, by James S. Ackerman. In *Paese sera*, December 22, 1968, Libri, ii.

———. "Il mito naturalistico nell'architettura del '500." In *L'arte*, no. 1 (1968): 7-36.

———. "Retorico e sperimantalismo. Guarino Guarini e la tradizione manierista." Paper presented to "Guarino Guarini e l'internazionalità del barocco," September 30 to October 5, 1968. Published in *Guarino Guarini e l'internazionalità del barocco. Atti del convegno internazionale promosso dall'Accademia delle scienze di Torino*. Introduced by Rudolf Wittkower, vol. 1, 667-704. Turin: Accademia delle scienze di Tornio, 1970.

———. "Le strutture del linguaggio nella storia dell'architettura moderna." In *Teorie della progettazione architettonica*, Architettura e città, no. 3. Introduced by Guido Canella, 11-30. Bari: Dedalo, 1968. Published in Spanish as "Las estructuras del lenguaje en la historia de la arquitectura moderna," *Teorie de la proyectacíon arquitectónica*, 17-48 (Barcelona: Gili, 1971).

———. "Teatro e città nell'architettura palladiana." In *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* X (1968): 65-78.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Bari: Laterza, 1968. 2nd ed., 1970. 3rd ed., 1973. 4th ed., 1976. 5th ed., 1980. Translated into English from the 4th ed. by Giorgio Verrecchia as *Theories and History of Architecture* (London: Granada, 1980). Translated into French by Jean-Patrick Fortin, François Laisney and Hubert Damisch as *Theories et histoire de l'architecture*. (Paris: Société des architectes diplômés par le gouvernement, 1976). Translated into Spanish by Martí Capdevila y Sebastiá Janeras as *Teorías e historia de la arquitectura. Hacia una nueva concepción del espacio arquitectónico* (Barcelona: Laia, 1977). Japanese edition published 1985. Chinese edition published 1991.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Lara Vinco Masini, Marco Dezzi Bardeschi, et al., *Le grandi cattedrali gotiche*. See 1965.

1969

Tafuri, Manfredo. "'Architectura artificialis': Claude Perrault, Sir Christopher Wren e il dibattito sul linguaggio architettonico." Paper presented to the Congresso internazionale sul Barocco, Lecce, September 21-24, 1969. Published in *Barocco europeo, barocco italiano, barocco salentino, Atti del Congresso internazionale sul Barocco, Lecce 21-24 Settembre 1969*, edited by Pier Fausto Palumbo, 375-398. Lecce: Editrice "L'Orsa Maggiore", 1970. Note participation in the "Tavola rotonda sul barocco salentino," 461-480.

———. *L'architettura dell'umanesimo*. Bari: Laterza, 1969. Translated into French by Odile Seyler and Henri Raymond as *Architecture et humanisme de la Renaissance aux Réformes* (Paris: Dunod, 1981). Translated into Spanish by Victor Pérez Escolano as *La arquitectura del Humanismo* (Madrid: Xarait, 1978).

———. "Committenza e tipologia nelle ville palladiane." *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* XI (1969): 120-136.

———. *Dardi*. See 1967.

———. *Jacopo Sansovino e l'architettura del '500 a Venezia*. Photographs by Diego Birelli. Venice: Marsilio, 1969.

———. "Manierismo." In *Dizionario Enciclopedico di Architeturra e Urbanistica*, ed. Paolo Portoghesi, Vol. III, 474. Rome: Istituto Editoriale Romano, 1969.

———. "Per una critica dell'ideologia architettonica." In *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1969, no. 1: 31-79. Translated into English by Stephen Sartorelli as "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology," *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 2-35 (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998).

———. "Rinascimento." In *Dizionario Enciclopedico di Architettura e Urbanistica*, edited by Paolo Portoghesi, Vol. V, 173-232. Rome: Istituto Editoriale Romano, 1969.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 2nd ed. See 1968.

1970

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Ambiguità del Guarini." In *Op. Cit. Selezione della critica d'arte contemporanea*, no. 17 (January 1970): 5-18.

———. "'Architectura artificialis'." See 1969.

———. "La fortuna del Palladio alla fine del Cinquecento e l'architettura di Inigo Jones." In *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* XII (1970): 47-62.

———. "Giovan Battista Piranesi. L'architettura come 'utopia negativa'." Paper presented to "Bernardo Vittone e la disputa fra classicismo e barocco nel settecento," Accademia delle scienze, Turin, 1970.

———. "Lavoro intellectuale e sviluppo capitalistico." In *Contropiano. Materiali marxisti* 1970, no. 2: 241-281.

———. "Retorica e sperimantalismo." See 1968.

1971

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Alle origini del palladianesimo. Alessandro Farnese, Jacques Androuet Du Certeau, Inigo Jones." In *Storia dell'arte*, no. 11 (1971): 141-162.

———. "Die Aussage der Architektur: Werk Umfrage über Architektur und Semiotik." In *Werk* 1971, no. 10: 689-692.

———. "Austromarxismo e città. 'Das Rote Wien'." In *Contropiano. Materiali Marxisti* 1971, no. 2: 257-311.

———. "Las estructuras del lenguaje en la historia de la arquitectura moderna." See 1968.

———. "G. B. Piranesi. L'architettura come 'utopia negativa'." In *Angelus Novus. Trimestrale di estetica e critica*, no. 20 (1971): 89-127.

———. "Socialdemocrazia e città nella Repubblica di Weimar." In *Contropiano* 1971, no. 1: 207-223.

———, ed. *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS, 1917-1937. Il contributo degli architetti europei.* Rome: Officina, 1971. Published in Spanish as *Socialismo, ciudad , arquitectura. URSS, 1917-1937. La apotación de los Arquitectos Europeos*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri (Madrid: Alberto Corazón, 1973).

———. "Il socialismo realizzato e la crisi delle avanguardie." In *Socialismo, città, architettura. URSS, 1917-1937. Il contributo degli architetti europei*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri, 41-87. Rome: Officina, 1971. Published in Spanish as "El socialismo realizado y la crisis de las vanguardias," *Socialismo, ciudad , arquitectura*, ibid., 47-92.

1972

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Breccioli (Famiglia)." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* XIV, 93-94. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1972.

———. "Buratti, Carlo." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* XV, 389-391. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1972.

———. "Design and Technological Utopia." In *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape, Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*, edited by Emilio Ambasz, 388-404. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972.

———. "Giovan Battista Piranesi. L'architettura come 'utopia negativa'." See 1970.

———. "Hans Schmidt: Ein 'Radikaler'." In *Werk* 1972, no. 10: 132.

———. "URSS-Berlin. Du populisme à l''internationale constuctiviste'." "L'architecture et l'avant-garde artistique en URSS de 1917 à 1934," special issue, *VH101. Revue trimestrielle*, nos. 7-8 (1972): 53-87. English edition published as "USSR-Berlin, 1922: From Populism to 'Constructivist International'," *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by Joan Ockman (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984).

Tafuri, Manfredo, et al. "Le questione dei grandi centri urbani nella strategia del movimento operario." In *Atti del Convegno sul centro urbano*, 11-21, 47-23, 111-113. Florence: Casa del popolo Michelangelo Buonarroti di Firenze, CLUSF, 1972.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co. *De la vanguardia a la metropolis. Crítica radical a la arquitectura.* Barcelona: Gili, 1972.

1973

Tafuri, Manfredo. "La chiesa di S. Anna o dei SS. Faustino e Giovita dei Bresciani." In *Via Giulia. Una utopia urbanistica del '500*, by Manfredo Tafuri, Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro, 328-332. Rome: Casa editrice stabilimento Aristide Staderini, 1973.

———. "Le 'Carceri nuova' e la casa di correzione per i minorenni." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 359-369

———. "La chiesa e l'oratorio di S. Maria del Suffragio." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 332-342.

———. "L'insula fra vicolo delle Palle e vocolo Sugarelli." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 279-288.

———. "L'insula fronteggianite l'antica piazza di ponti Sisto e la chiesa di S. Salvatore in Onda." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 505-510.

———. "S. Eligio degli Orefaci. Architettura." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 431-439.

———. "La montagna disincantata. Il grattacielo e la City." In *La città americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal*, by Manfredo Tafuri, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia, 415-455. Bari: Laterza, 1973. Translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as "The Disenchanted Mountain: The Skyscraper and the City," *The American City from the Civil War to the New Deal*, by Tafuri, Ciucci, Dal Co and Manieri-Elia (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1979). Translated into Spanish as "La montaña desencantada El rascacielos y la Ciudad," *La ciudad americana de al Guerra civile al New Deal*, 387-512 (Barcelona: G. Gili, 1975).

———. "L'ospedale di S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini e la case annesse." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 255-258.

———. "Il palazzo e il palazzetto Falconieri." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 445-459.

———. "Il palazzo dei Tribunali." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 314-322.

———. "Palazzo Sangallo-Medici-Clarelli." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 272-278.

———. "Les premières hypotheses de planification urbaine dans la Russie soviétique, 1918-1925." In "Sozialistische Architektur? UdSSR / Architecture socialiste? URSS 1917-1932," special issue, *Archithese* no. 7 (1973): 34-41. Republished in Italian as "Le prime ipotesi di pianificazione urbanistica nella Rusia sovietica. Mosca, 1918-1924," *Rassegna sovietica* 1974, no. 1: 80-93.

———. *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico*. Bari: Laterza, 1973. Translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976). Translated into French by Françoise Brun as *Projet et utopie de l'Avant-garde à la Métropole* (Paris: Dunod, 1979). Published in German as *Kapitalismus und Architecture: Vo Corbusiers 'Utopia' zur Trabantenstadt* (Hamburg, 1977); extract published as "Die Krise der Linearität," *Arch-Plus*, nos. 105-106 (1990): 98-106. Japanese edition published 1981.

———. "S. Biaggio della Pagnotta e l'ospizio degli armeni." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 323-327.

———. "S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini. Architettura." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 201-255.

———. "Sansovino 'versus' Palladio." In *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* XV (1973): 149-165.

———. "El socialismo realizado y la crisis de las vanguardias." See 1971.

———. *Socialismo, ciudad , arquitectura.* See 1971.

———. "S. Spirito dei Napolitani. Archietttura." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 392-404.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 3rd ed. See 1968.

———. "Via Giulia. Una storia di una struttura urbana." In *Via Giulia*, ibid., 65-153.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia. *La città americana dalla Guerra civile al New Deal*. Bari: Laterza, 1973. Translated into English by Barbara Luigia La Penta as *The American City from the Civil War to the New Deal* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1979). Translated into Spanish as *La ciudad americana de al Guerra civile al guerra civil al New Deal* (Barcelona: Gili, 1975).

Tafuri, Manfredo, Francesco Dal Co and Giuseppe Mazzariol. Preface to *Le Corbusier e Pessac*, by Brian Brace Taylor, 7-9. Rome: Officina, 1973.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Luigi Salerno and Luigi Spezzaferro. *Via Giulia. Una utopia urbanistica del '500*. Rome: Casa editrice stabilimento Aristide Staderini, 1973.

1974

Tafuri, Manfredo. "*L'architecture dans le boudoir*: The Language of Criticism and the Criticism of Language." Trans. Victor Caliandro. *Oppositions*, no. 3 (1974): 37-67. Republished in *The Oppositions Reader*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 291-316 (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998). Published in German as "Das Konzept der Architektursprache und die Sprache der Architekturkritik," *Arch-plus*, no. 37 (1978): 4-16. Published in Spanish as *L'architecture dans le boudoir. El lenguaje de la critica y la critica del lenguaje* (Seville: Colegio de Arquitectos, 1982).

———. "Due libri per Palladio." In *Arte veneta* XXVIII (1974): 309-311.

———. "Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903) e le origini del planning negli Stati uniti." In *Quaderni storici* IX-III, no. 27 (September-December 1974): 785-802. Reprinted in *Dalla città preindustriale alla città del capitalismo*, edited by Alberto Caracciolo 291-306 (Bologna: Il mulino, 1975).

———. „Le prime ipotesi di pianificazione urbanistica nella Rusia sovietica." See 1973.

———. "Sozialdemokratie und Stadt in der Weimarer Republik (1923-1933)." See 1971.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Amerigo Restucci. *Un contributo all comprensione della vicenda storia dei Sassi*. Matera: Ministerio dei lavori pubblici, 1974.

1975

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Gli anni dell''attesta': 1922-1945." In *Giuseppe Samonà 1923-1975. Cinquant'anni di architetture*, by Manfredo Tafuri, Carlo Aymonino, Giorgio Ciucci and Francesco Dal Co, 9-17. Rome: Officina, 1975. Published in Spanish as "Los 'años de la 'espera'," *Arquitecturas bis*, nos. 32-33 (January-April 1980): 40-41

———. "Architettura e storiografia. Una proposto di metodo." In *Arte veneta* XXIX (1975): 276-282.

———. "Architettura, urbanistica e design dal 1945 a oggi. I." In *Arte moderna*, Vol. XV, 1-64. Milan: Fratelli Fabbri, 1975.

———. "La dialectique de l'absurde. Europe-USA. Les avitars de l'idéologie du gratte-ciel, 1918-1974." In "Vie et mort du gratte-ciel," special issue, *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no.178 (March-April 1975): 1-16. Extract republished in Italian as "Dal World Trade Center a Battery Park City (1968-1975)," *Casabella*, nos. 457-458 (March-April 1980): 86-89.

———. "'European Graffitti': Five x Five = Twenty-five." In *Oppositions*, no. 5 (1975): 35-74.

———. "Frederick Law Olmsted (1822-1903)." See 1974.

———. "Michelangelo architetto." In *Civiltà delle macchine* 1975, no. 3: 49-60.

———. "La montaña desencantada." See 1973.

———. "Les 'muses inquiétantes' ou les destins d'une génération de Maîtres." In "Italie '75," special issue, *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 181 (September-October 1975): 14-33.

———. Review of *Andrea Palladio* and *Scrittori vicentini d'architettura del secolo XVI*, by Lionello Puppi. In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* XXXIV, no. 2 (May 1975): 152-155.

———. *Socialdemocracia y ciudad en la Republica de Weimar*. See 1971.

———. "Il teatro come 'città virtuale'. Dal Cabaret Voltaire al Totaltheater." In *Bollettino del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"* XVII (1975): 361-377. Republished in *Lotus*, no. 17 (December 1977): 30-53.

———. "Verso la 'città socialista'. Ricerche e realizzazioni nell'Unione sovietica, fra la NEP e il primo piano quinquennale." In *Lotus*, no. 9 (February 1975): 76-93.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia. *La ciudad americana de al Guerra civile al New Deal*. See 1973.

1976

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architecture and Utopia*. See 1973.

———. "Capriani, Francesco, detto Francesco da Volterra." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. XIX, 189-195. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1976.

———. "Ceci n'est pas un ville." In *Lotus*, no. 13 (December 1976): 10-13.

———. "Les cendres de Jefferson." In *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 186 (August-September 1976): 53-72.

———. "Giovan Battista Piranesi. L'utopie négative dans l'architecture." In *L'architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 184 (March-April 1976): 93-108.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Françoise Very. In *AMC. Architecture, movement, continuité*, no. 39 (June 1976): 64-68. Republished as "I mercati della cultura" / "The Culture Markets," trans. French-Italian Bruno Pedretti; French-English Kenneth Hylton in *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 36-45.

———. "Il luogo teatrale dall'umanesimo a oggi." In *Teatri e scenografie*, 24-39. Milan: Touring Club Italiano, 1976.

———. "'Neu-Babylon'. Das New York der Zwanzigerjahre und die Suche nach dem Amerikanismus." In "Metropolis 3," special issue, *Archithese*, no. 20 (1976): 12-24.

———. "Order and Disorder: The Dialectic of Modern Architecture." In *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 10 (October 1976): 97-120. Published in Italian as "Ordine e disordine," *Casabella*, no. 421 (January 1977): 36-40.

———. "Storia dell'arte e riforme di struttura." In *Paese sera*, June 26, 1976, 11.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 4th ed. See 1968.

———. *Theories et histoire de l'architecture*. See 1968.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Francesco Dal Co. *Architettura contemporanea*. Storia universale dell'architettura. Milan: Electa, 1976. Translated into French by Carlo Aslan, Pierre Joly as *Architecture contemporaine* (Paris: Berger-Levrault, 1982). Translated into German as *Architektur der Gegenwart* (Stuttgart: Belser, 1977). Translated into Spanish by Luis Escolar Bareño as *Arquitectura contemporánea*, 2 Vols. (Madrid: Aguilar, 1978). Translated into English as *Modern Architecture*, 2 Vols. (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1979). Chinese edition published in 2000. Japanese edition published 2002-2003.

1977

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architektur der Gegenwart*. See 1976.

———. "Les bijoux indiscrets." In *Five Architects NY*, edited by Camillo Gubitosi and Alberto Izzo, 7-33. Rome: Officina, 1977.

———. "The Dialectics of the Avant-Garde: Piranesi and Eisenstein." In *Oppositions*, no. 11 (Winter 1977): 72-80.

———. "Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and 'Mask'." In *Oppositions*, no. 11 (1977): 1-25. Published in Italian as "Il soggetto e la maschera. Una introduzione a Terragni" in *Lotus*, no. 20 (September 1978): 5-31. Republished in *La Casa del fascio di Como*, by Peter Eisenman (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1978); also in *Guseppe Terragni: Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques*, by Peter Eisenman, 273-293 (New York: Monacelli, 2003). Published in reduced form in *Giuseppe Terragni. La Casa del fascio*, ed. Luigi Ferrario and Daniela Pastore, 55-60 (Rome: Istituto Mides, 1982).

———. *Kapitalismus und Architecture*. See 1973.

———. "Lettura del Testo e Practiche Discorsive." In *Il Dispositivo Foucault*, edited by Franco Rella, 37-45. Venice: CLUVA, 1977.

———. "Le 'macchine imperfette'. Città e territorio nell'ottocento." Paper presented to "Città e territorio nel XIXe secolo," Venice, October 1977. Published in *Le macchine imperfette. Architettura, programma, istituzioni nel XIX secolo. Atti del convegno internazionale 'Città e territorio nel XIXe secolo, Venezia, IUAV, ottobre 1977*, edited by Paolo Morachiello and Georges Teyssot, 15-24. Rome: Officina, 1980.

———. "Nota introduttiva." In *Casabella*, no. 422 (February 1977): 62.

———. "Ordine e disordine." See 1977.

———. "Il 'progetto' storico." In *Casabella*, no. 429 (October 1977): 11-18. French translation in *La nouvelle critique*, no. 103 (April 1977) and in *AMC. Architecture mouvement continuité*, nos.

54-55 (June-September 1981): 138-143. Translated into English as "The Historical 'Project',"
Oppositions, no. 17 (Summer 1979): 54-75.

———. *Teorías e historia de la arquitectura.* See 1968.

———. "Il teatro come 'città virtuale'." See 1975.

———. "L'unità della storia." In *Casabella*, no. 423 (March 1977): 34-35.

1978

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Architettura, urbanistica e design dal 1945 ad oggi." In *Vivere e comunicare.
Funzione e strumenti dell'arte oggi*, by Manfredo Tafuri, Gillo Dorfles, Guido Ballo, et al., 1-64.
Milan: Fratelli Fabri, 1978.

———. *Arquitectura contemporánea.* See 1976.

———. *La arquitectura del Humanismo*. See 1969.

"De Bekoring van de Natuur." In "Alvar Aalto." Special issue. *Plan* 1978, no. 11: 26-32.

———. "Borromini e Piranesi. La città come 'ordine infranto'." Conference paper presented at
the Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice, October 13, 1978. Published in "Materiali per il corso
di Storia dell'architettura IIA," edited by Manfredo Tafuri, 143-147. Venice: Dipartimento
di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia,
1979. Reprinted in *Piranesi tra Venezia e l'Europa. Atti del convegno internazionale di studio promosso
dall'Istituto di storia dell'arte della fondazione Giorgio Cini per il secondo centenario della morte di
Giovan Battista Piranesi, Venezia, 13-15 ottobre 1978*, edited by Alessandro Bettagno, 89-101.
Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1983. Published in German as "Borromini und Piranesi: Die Stadt
als 'zersprengte Ordnung'," *Werk* 1979, nos. 33-34: 6-12.

———. "Cesare Cesariano e gli studi vitruviani nel quattrocento." In *Scritti rinascimentali di
architettura*, ed. Manfredo Tafuri, Arnaldo Bruschi, Corrado Mantese and Renato Bonelli, 387-
433. Milan: Il polifilo, 1978.

———. "Il complesso di S. Maria del Priorato sull'Aventino 'Furor analiticus'." In *Piranesi.
Incisioni, rami, legature, architetture*, 78-87. Vicenza: Neri pozza, 1978.

———. "Corso di storia dell'architettura 2°. Trascrizione delle lezione, tenute dal Prof. Manfredo
Tafuri nel corso dell'anno accademicao 1977-78." Manuscript edited by students of Storia
dell'architettura 2A. Venice: Dipartimento di analisi critica e storia dell'architettura, 1978.

———. "Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and 'Mask'." See 1977.

———. "Das Konzept der Architektursprache und die Sprache der Architekturkritik." See
1974.

———. "Das Konzept der Typologischen Kritik." In *Arch-plus*, no. 37 (1978): 48-49, 62.

———. "New Trends in Contemporary Architecture: Formalism, Realism, Contextualism." In
Space Design (March 1978).

———. *Retorica y experimentalismo. Ensayos sobre la arquitectura de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Trans.
Victor Pérez Escolano and Vicente Lleó Cañal. Seville: Universidad de Sevilla, 1978.

———. "Das Konzept der Architektursprache und die Sprache der Architekturkritik." See
1974.

———. "Un teatro per Forlì." In *Paese sera*, February 5, 1978, Arte, 20.

———. "Vienna, capitale della 'finis Austriae'." In *Le città capitale nel XX secolo*, ed. Mario Manieri-Elia, 24-27. Milan: F. Fabri, 1978.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Arnaldo Bruschi, Corrado Mantese and Renato Bonelli, eds. *Scritti rinascimentali di architettura*. Milan: Il polifilo, 1978.

1979

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Avant-garde et formalisme entre la Nep et la premier plan quinquennal." In *URSS, 1917-1978. La città, l'architettura / La ville, l'archtecture*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri, Jean-Louis Cohen and Marco De Michelis, 16-92. Rome: Officina; Paris: L'esquerre, 1979. Published in Spanish as "Formalismo y vanguardia entre la NEP y el primer plan quinquenal," *Constructivismo ruso. Sobre la arquitectura de las vanguardias ruso-soviéticas hacia 1917*, 9-45 (Barcelona: Ediciones del Selbal, 1994).

———. "Borromini e il problema della storia." See 1965.

———. "Borromini e Piranesi." See 1978.

———. "Discordant Harmony from Alberti to Zuccari." In "Leon Battista Alberti," AD Profile 21, edited by Joseph Rykwert, *Architectural Design* 49, nos. 5-6 (1979): 36-44.

———. "The Disenchanted Mountain." See 1973.

———. "The Historical 'Project'." See 1977.

———. "Introduzione al corso. Francesco Borromini e la crisi dell'universo umanistico." In "Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA," ed. Manfredo Tafuri, 3-5. Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, 1979.

———. "Main Lines of the Great Theoretical Debate over Architecture and Urban Planning 1960-1977." In *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 100 (January 1979): 133-154. Reprinted in *A+U*, no. 365 (January 2001).

———, ed. "Materiali per il corso di Storia dell'architettura IIA." Venice: Dipartimento di analisi, critica e storia dell'architettura, Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, 1979.

———. *Modern Architecture*. See 1976.

———. "Olanda, Weimar, Vienna." In *Architettura socialdemocrazia. Olanda, 1900-1940*, by Manfredo Tafuri, Giorgio Cuicci, Giorgio Muratore and Pieter Singelenberg, 11-18 (Venice: Arsenale, 1979).

———. *Projet et utopie de l'Avant-garde à la Métropole*. See 1973.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co. "Il mito di Venezia." In "Venezia città del moderno" / "Venice: City of the Modern," special issue, *Rassegna* no. 22 (1979): 7-9.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co and Mario Manieri-Elia, *The American City from the Civil War to the New Deal*. See 1973.

Manfredo Tafuri, Giorgio Cuicci, Giorgio Muratore and Pieter Singelenberg. *Architettura socialdemocrazia. Olanda, 1900-1940*. Venice: Arsenale, 1979.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Jean-Louis Cohen and Marco De Michelis, eds. *URSS, 1917-1978. La città, l'architettura / La ville, l'archtecture*. Rome: Officina; Paris: L'esquerre, 1979.

1980

Tafuri, Manfredo. "*Am Steinhof*. Centralità e 'superficie' nell'opera di Otto Wagner." In *Lotus*, no. 29 (1980): 72-91. Republished in *Die Kunst des Otto Wagner*, edited by Gustav Peichl, 61-75 (Vienna: Akademie der Bildenden Künste, 1984). Translated into Spanish as "*Am Steinhof*. Centralidad y 'superficie' en la obra de Otto Wagner" in *La escuela de Madrid*, no. 6-7 (1984): 75-04.

———. "Andrea Palladio, utopista della sintesi." In *Rinascita*, no. 39 (1980): 23-24.

———. "Los 'años de la 'espera'." See 1975.

———. "La cattedrale sommersa. L'ultima opera di Johnson e Burgee." In *Domus*, no. 608 (July-August 1980): 8-15.

———. "*L'ephemère est eternal*. Aldo Rossi a Venezia." In *Domus*, no. 605 (April 1980): 7-11. Republished in *Aldo Rossi. Teatro del mondo*, edited by Manlio Brusatin and Iberto Prandi, 145-149 (Venice: CLUVA, 1982).

———. "Le 'machine imperfette'. Città e territorio nell'ottocento." See 1977.

———. "Il mestiere dello storico." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. In *Domus*, no. 605 (April 1980): 31.

———. "Natural-Artificial: The Architecture of Franco Purini." In *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 119 (August 1980): 35-40.

———. "'Das Rote Wien'. Politica e forma della residenza nella Viena socialista, 1919-1933." In *Vienna rossa. La politica residenziale nella Vienna socialista*, by Manfredo Tafuri, A. Passeri and P. Piva, 7-148. Milan: Electa, 1980. Translated into French by Catherine Chatin as *Vienne la rouge. La politique immobilière de la Vienne socialiste, 1919-1933* (Brussels and Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1981). Published in Spanish (with English digest) as "'Das Rote Wien'. Politica y arquitectura residencial en la Viena socialista," *Arquitectura*, no. 278-279 (May-August 1989): 16-41.

———. "'Sapienza di stato' e 'atti mancati'. Architettura e tecnica urbana nella Venezia del '500." In *Architettura e utopia nella Venezia del cinquecento*, 16-39. Milan: Electa 1980.

———. *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e architettura da Piranesi agli '70*. Turin: Einaudi, 1980. Translated into English by Pellegrino d'Acierno and Robert Connolly as *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Guards and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987). Translated into Spanish as *La esfera y el laberinto. Vanguardias y architectura de Piranesi a los años setenta* (Barcelona: Gili, 1984). Extract published as 'Introduzione' in *I musei di James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates*, by Francesco Dal Co and Tom Muirhead, 11-15. Milan: Electa, 1990. Japanese edition published 1992.

———. "Simbolo e ideología en la arquitectura del Illuminismo." See 1964.

———. "La tecnica delle avanguardie." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Omar Calabrese. *Casabella*, nos. 463-464 (November-December 1980): 98-101.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, 5th ed. See 1968.

———. *Theories and History of Architecture*. See 1968.

———. "The Watercolours of Massimo Scolari." In *Massimo Scolari. Architecture Between Memory and Hope*, 2-15. New York: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980.

———. "Dal World Trade Center a Battery Park City (1968-1975)." See 1975.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Georges Teyssot. "Impressions classiques." *Monuments historiques*, no. 108 (April 1980): 71-78. Translated into English as "Classical Melancholies," *Architectural Design*, no. 52 (1982): 6-17.

1981

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Alvise Cornaro, Palladio and the Grand Canal." In *A+U Architecture and Urbanism*, no. 130 (July 1981): 3-30.

———. "L'analista di frammenti." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Benedetto Gravagnuolo. In *Modo*, no. 41 (July-August 1981): 14-17.

———. *Architecture et humanisme de la Renaissance aux Réformes*. See 1969.

———. "L'ascesi e il gioco." In *Gran bazaar*, no. 15 (July-August 1981): 92-99.

———. "Le avventure dell'oggetto. Architetture e progetti di Vittorio Gregotti." In *Il progetto per l'Università delle Calabrie e altre architetture / The Project for Calabria University and other architectural works*, by Vittorio Gregotti, iv-xviii. Milan: Electa, 1981.

———. *Borromini*. Las Palma de Gran Canaria: Universidad Politécnica, 1981.

———. "Diga insicura" / "Sub tegmine fagi . . .." In *Domus*, no. 617 (May 1981): 22-26.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Sue Dance. In *Transition* 2, nos. 3-4 (September-December 1981): 7-12.

———. "Lettera a Renato De Fusco." In *Op. Cit. Selezione della critica d'arte contemporanea*, no. 51 (1981): 83.

———. "Manfredo Tafuri en Buenos Aires. La racionalidad irracional." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Marco Pasinato and Hugo Iturbe. In *Dos puntos* 2 (October-November 1981): 72-73.

———. "Politica, scienza e architettura nella Venezia del Cinquecento." Paper presented to XXIII Corso internazionale di alta cultura, Fonazione Cini, Venezia, August 29 to September 16, 1981. Published in *Cultura e società nel rinascimento tra riforme e manierismi. Atti del XXIII Corso internazionale di alta cultura, Fonazione Cini, Venezia, 29 agosto-16 settembre 1981*, edited by Vittore Branca and Carlo Ossola, 97-133 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1984).

———. *Progetto e utopia.* Japanese ed. See 1973.

———. "Le projet historique." See 1977.

———. "The Uncertainties of Formalism: Victor Šklovskij and the Denuding of Art." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 73-77.

———. *Vienne la rouge.* See 1980.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Antonio Foscari. "Un progetto irrealizzato di Jacopo Sansovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani sul Canal Grande." In *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* XXVI, nos. 1-4 (1981): 71-87. Republished as "Un progetto irreaslizzato di Jacopo Sansovino. Il palazzo di Vettor Grimani a S. Samuele," "Natura e cultura. Viaggi, paesaggi, giardini e panorami fra '700 e '800," special issue, *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, no. 15 (1981): 69-82.

1982

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Alcuni temi e problemi tra progetto e storia." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Antonio Terranova. In *Rassegna di architettura e urbanistica* XVIII, no. 54 (December 1982): 35-51.

———. "Alvise Cornaro, Palladio e Leonardo Donà. Un dibattito sul bacino Marciano." In *Palladio e Venezia*, edited by Lionello Puppi, 9-27. Florence: Sansoni, 1982.

———. "Architecture and 'Poverty'." Review of *Modern Architecture. A Critical History*, by Kenneth Frampton. In "Modern Architecture and the Critical Present." Special issue. *Architectural Design* 81, nos. 7-8 (1982): 57-58.

———. *L'architecture dans le boudoir.* See 1974.

———. *Architecture contemporaine*. See 1976.

———. "Architettura italiana, 1944-1981." In *Storia dell'arte italiana*, Vol. VII, "Il novecento," edited by Federico Zeri, 425-550. Turin: Einaudi, 1982.

———. "Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and 'Mask'." See 1977.

———. "Una lettera a *Casabella*." In *Casabella*, no. 486 (December 1982): 32-33.

———. "'Machine et mémoire.' La città nell'opera di Le Corbusier." In *Nuovo corrente*, no. 87 (1982): 3-32. Republished (in two parts) in *Casabella*, no. 502 (May 1984): 44-51; *Casabella*, no. 503 (June 1984): 44-51. Translated into Italian from the French edition in *Le Corbusier enciclopedie*, 126-138 (Milan: Electa, 1988). Reprinted in *Le Corbusier 1887-1965*, edited by H. Allen Brooks, 234-259 (Milan: Electa, 1993). Translation into English by Stephen Sartorelli as "'*Machine et mémoire*': The City in the Work of Le Corbusier," *The Le Corbusier Archives*, vol. X, xxxi-xlvi. (New York and London: Garland, 1983). English edition republished in *Le Corbusier: The Garland Essays*, edited by H. Allen Brooks, 203-218 (New York and London: Garland, 1987). French translation republished in *Le Corbusier. Une encyclopédie*, 460-469 (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou, 1987).

———. "La 'nuova Constantinopoli'. La rappresentazione della Renovatio nella Venezia dell'Umanesimo (1450-1509)." In *Rassegna. Problemi di architettura dell'ambienti*, no. 9 (1982): 25-38.

———. "Sklovskij, Benjamin e la Teorie dello 'spostamento'." In *Figure*, no. 1 (1982): 38-51.

———. *Vittorio Gregotti. Progetti e architetture*. Milan: Electa, 1982. Translated into French by Pierre-Alain Croset as *Vittorio Gregotti. Projets et architectures* (Paris: Le moniteur, 1982). Published in English as *Vittorio Gregotti: Buildings and Projects* (New York: Rizzoli, 1982).

———. "Vorm en verzadiging. Tange's werken in de jaren viftig" / "Form and Saturation. Tange's Works in the Fifties." In *Plan*, no. 2 (1982): 24-33, 45.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Antonio Foscari. "Evangelismo e architettura. Jacopo Sansovino e la chiesa di S Maria a Venezia." In *Bollettino dei Civici musei veneziani* 82, nos. 1-4 (1982): 34-54.

———. "Sebastiano da Lugano, i Grimani e Jacopo Sansovino. Artisti e committenti nella chiesa di Sant'Antonio di Castello." In *Arte veneta* XXXVI (1982): 100-123.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Georges Teyssot. "Classical Melancholies." See 1980.

1983

Tafuri, Manfredo. "L'archeologia del presente." In *Il disegno dell'architettura*, Quaderni 57, edited by Gloria Bianchino. Parma: Università di Parma, Centro Studi e Archivio delle Comunicazione, Dipartimento Progetto, 1983.

———. "Borromini e Piranesi." See 1978.

———. "'Epistula ad Lucianum architectum'." In *Semerani + Tamaro. La città e i progetti*, edited by Giancarlo Rosa, 5-7. Rome: Kappa, 1983.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. In *Materiales*, no. 3 (August 1983): 7-22.

———. "'*Machine et mémoire*': The City in the Work of Le Corbusier." See 1982.

———. "'Pietas' republicana, neobizantinismo e umanesimo. Giorgio Spavento e Tullio Lombardo nella chiesa di San Salvador." In *Ricerche di storia dell'arte*, no. 19 (1983): 5-36.

———. "Il problema storiografico." Paper presented to "'Renovatio urbis.' Venezia nell'età di Andrea Gritti (1523-1538)." Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura, Venice, June 1983. Published in *'Renovatio urbis.' Venezia nell'età di Andrea Gritti (1523-1538)*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri, 9-55. Rome: Officina, 1984.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Antonio Foscari. *L'armonia e i conflitti. La chiesa di San Francesco della vigna nella Venezia del '500*. Turin: Einaudi, 1983.

1984

Tafuri, Manfredo. "*Am Steinhof*." See 1980.

———. "'Cives esse non licere.' La Roma di Nicolò V e Leon Battista Alberti. Elementi per una revisione storiografica." In *L'invenzione della città. La strategia urbana di Nicolò V e Alberti nella Roma del '400*, by Caroll William Westfall, 13-39. Rome: La nuova italia scientifica, 1984. Translated into Spanish as "'Cives esse non licere.' La Roma de Nicolás V y Leon Battista Alberti. Elementos para una revisión historiográfica," *Leon Battista Alberti*, 101-122 (Barcelona: Stylos, 1988).

———. "El concepte de Renaixement." In *L'avenç*, no. 73 (July-August 1984): 52-60.

———. "Il corpus disciplinare." In *Il potere degli impotenti (Architettura e istituzioni)*, 25-30. Bari: Dedalo, 1984.

———. *La esfera y el laberinto*. See 1980.

———. "Il frammento, la 'figura', il giocco. Carlo Scarpa e la cultura architettonica italiana." In *Carlo Scarpa. Opera completa*, by Francesco Dal Co and Giuseppe Mazzariol, 73-95. Milan: Electa, 1984. Translated into English as "Carlo Scarpa and Italian Architecture," *Carlo Scarpa: The Complete Works*, by Francesco Dal Co and Giuseppe Mazzariol (London: Architectural Press; New York: Rizzoli, 1984).

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Fulvio Irace. In *Domus*, no. 653 (September 1984): 26-28.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Enrico Valeriani. In *Controspazio*, no. 4 (October-December 1984): 90-92.

———. "'Machine et mémoire.' La città nell'opera di Le Corbusier." See 1982.

———. "L'obelisco di piazza del Popolo, c. 1519." In *Raffaello architetto*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri, Christoph Frommel and Stefano Ray, 165-169 (Milan: Electa, 1984).

———. "Politica, scienze e architettura nella Venezia del Cinquecento." See 1981.

———. "Premessa." In *L'arsenale della Repubblica di Venezia*, by Ennio Concina, 7-8. Milan: Electa, 1984.

———. "Il problema storiografico." See 1983.

———. "Progetto di casa in via Giulia, Roma, 1519-1520." In *Raffaello architetto*, ibid., 235.

———. "Il progetto di Raffaello per la chiesa di S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini." Paper presented to the Congresso internazionale di studi, Urbino-Florence, April 6-14, 1984. Published in *Studi su Raffaello*, edited by Micaela Sambucco Hamoud and Maria Letizia Strocchi, Vol. 1, 177-195 (Urbino: Quattro venti, 1987).

———. "Progetto per la facciata della chiesa di S. Lorenzo, Firenze, 1515-1516." In *Raffaello architetto*, ibid., 165-169.

———. "Realismus und Architektur. Zur Konstruktion Volksbezogener Sprachen." In *Das Abenteuer der Ideen*, edited by V. Magnago Lampugnani, 131-147. Berlin: Internationale Bauausstellung, 1984. Published in Italian as "Architettura e realismo," *L'avventura delle idee nell'architettura, 1750-1980*, edited by V. Magnago Lampugnani, 123-145 (Milan: Triennale di Milano, 1985). Translated into French as "Réalisme et architecture," *Critique. Revue générale des publications françaises et étrangères* XLIII, nos. 476-477 (January-February 1987): 23-42.

———, ed. *'Renovatio urbis'. Venezia nell'età di Andrea Gritti (1523-1538)*. Rome: Officina, 1984.

———. "Roma insaturata. Strategie urbane e politiche pontiche pontificie nella Roma del primo '500." In *Raffaello architetto*, ibid., 59-105.

———. "Un teatro, una 'fontana del Sil' e un 'vago monticello'. La riconfigurazione del bacino si San Marco di Alvise Cornaro." In *Lotus*, no. 42 (1984): 41-51.

———. "USSR-Berlin, 1922: From Populism to 'Constructivist International'." See 1972.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Christoph L. Frommel and Stefano Ray, eds. *Raffaello architetto*. Milan: Electa, 1984.

Tafuri, Manfredo, José Quetglas, Pep Bonet and Josep Muntañola. "Arquitectura de los años 80." Roundtable discussion. In *Annales*, Escuela Técnica superior de arquitectura, Barcelona (1984): 67-82.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Bernhard Shutz. "Progetti per S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini, Roma, 1518." In *Raffaello architetto*, ibid., 217-224.

1985

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Architettura e realismo." See 1984.

———. "Documenti sulla Fondamenta nuova." In *Architettura, storia e documenti* 85, no. 1 (1985): 79-95.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Mercedes Daguerre and Giulio Lupo. In *Materiales. Programa de estudios historicos de la construccion del habitar*, no. 5 (1985): 17-27.

———. "Un 'progetto' raffaellesco per la chiesa S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini a Roma." In *Prospettiva*, no. 42 (1985): 38-47.

———. "Architettura e realismo." See 1984.

———. "Il Sacco di Roma, 1527. Fratture e contunuità." In *Roma nel rinascimento* 1985: 21-25.

———. "Tempo veneziano e tempo del 'progetto'. Continuà e crisi nella Venezia del Cinquecento." In *Le Venezie possibili. Da Palladio a Le Corbusier*, edited by Lionello Puppi and Giandomenico D. Romanelli, 23-33. Milan: Electa, 1985.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Japanese ed. See 1968.

———. *Venezia e il rinascimento. Religione, scienza, architettura*. Turin: Einaudi, 1985. Translated into English by Jessica Levine as *Venice and the Renaissance* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989).

Tafuri, Manfredo, Francesco Dal Co and Massimo Cacciari. "Il mito di Venezia." In *Rassegna*, no. 22 (1985): 4-9.

1986

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane e Jacopo Sansovino. Un conflitto professionale nella Roma medicea." Paper presented to *Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane*, XXII Ccongresso di storia dell'architettura, Rome, February 19-21, 1986. Published in *Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane. La vita e l'opera*, edited by Gianfranco Spagnesi, 76-99. Rome: Centro studi per la storia dell'architettura, 1986.

———. "La chiesa di S. Maria Maggiore a Venezia. Un'ipotesi per Tullio Lombardo." In *Arte veneta* XL (1986): 38-53.

———. "Histoire d'histoires." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Nicola Soldini. In *Faces. Journal d'architectures*, no. 3 (1986): 28-31.

———. *Humanism, Technical Knowledge and Rhetoric: The Debate in Renaissance Venice*. Walter Gropius Lecture, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, April 30, 1986. Cambridge: Harvard Graduate School of Design, 1986.

———. "Le lingue di Venezia." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Nicola Soldini. In *Corriere del Ticino*, July 19, 1986, 20.

———. "Osservazioni sulla chiesa di S. Benedetto in Polirone." In *Quaderni di Palazzo Te*, no. 5 (1986): 11-24.

———. *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*. Turin: Einaudi, 1986. Translated into English by Jessica Levine as *A History of Italian Architecture, 1944-1985* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1990). Final chapter published as "La soglia e il problema," *Casabella*, no. 523 (1986): 42-43. Published also in Greek as "To orio kai to problema" / "The Threshold and the Problem," *Architecture in Greece*, no. 22 (1988): 48-50.

———. "Storia parallele. La serenissima nel''automno del Mediterraneo'." In *Casabella*, no. 525 (1986): 30-31. Republished in *Venezia e la difesa del Levante. Da Lepanto a Candia, 1570-1670*, 30-31. Exhibition catalogue. Venice: Arsenale, 1986.

———. "There is No Criticism, Only History." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Richard Ingersoll. In *Design Book Review*, no. 9 (Spring 1986): 8-11. Reprinted as "Non c'è critica, solo storia" / "There is No Criticism, Only History," *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 96-99.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Bruno Adorni. "Il chiostro di S. Abbondio a Cremona. Un'interpretazione eccentrica del modello bramantesco del Belvedere." In *Arte lombarda*, no. 79 (1986): 85-98.

1987

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Aggiunte al progetto sansoviniano per il palazzo di Vettor Grimani." In *Arte veneta* XLI (1987): 41-50.

———. "Daniele Barbaro e la cultura scientifica veneziana del '500." In *Giovan Battista Benedetti e il suo tempo. Atti del convegno internazionale di studio*, 55-81. Venice: Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti, 1987.

———. "Due progetti di Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane per la chiesa dei fiorentini a Roma." In *Architettura, storia e documenti* 1987, nos. 1-2: 35-52.

———. "Ipotesi sulla religiosità di Sebastiano Serlio." Paper presented to the VI Seminario internazionale di storia dell'architettura, Vicenza, Centro internazionale di storia dell'architettura "Andrea Palladio", August 31 to September 4, 1987. Published in *Sebastiano Serlio*, edited by Christoph Thoenes, 57-66 (Milan: Electa, 1989).

———. "'Machine et mémoire'." See 1982.

———. "La norma e il programma. Il 'Vitruvio' di Daniele Barbaro." In *I dieci libri dell'architettura tradotti e commentati da Daniele Barbaro*, by Vitruvio (Vitruvius), XI-XL (1567, Milan: Il polifilo, 1987).

———. "Il palazzo di Carlo V a Granada. Architettura 'a lo romano' e inconografia imperiale." In *Ricerca di storia dell'arte*, no. 22 (1987): 4-26. Translated into Spanish as "El palacio de Carlos V en Granada. Arquitectura 'a lo romano' e iconografía imperial," *Cuadernos de la Alhambra*, no. 24 (1988): 77-108.

———. "Il progetto di Raffaello per la chiesa di S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini." See 1984.

———. "Réalisme et architecture." See 1984.

———. "Venezia e la Roma della Rinascita. Palazzo Dolfin a San Salvador. Un'opera ibrida di Jacopo Sansovino." In *Venezia e la Roma dei Papi*, 143-170. Milan: Electa, 1987.

———. "Peter Eisenman: The Meditations of Icarus." In *Houses of Cards*, by Peter Eisenman, 167-187. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

———. "Il progetto di Raffaello per la chiesa di S. Giovanni dei Fiorentini." See 1984.

———. "Réalisme et architecture." See 1984.

———. *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*. See 1980.

1988

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Antonio Del Grande." In *Dizionario biografico degli italiani*, Vol. XXXVI, 617-623. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1988.

———. "'Cives esse non licere.' La Roma de Nicolás V y Leon Battista Alberti." See 1984.

———. "Il disegno di Chatsworth (per il palazzo Ducale di Venezia?) e un progetto perdutodi Jacopo Sansovino." Paper presented to *Andrea Palladio. Nuovi contributi*, VII Seminario internazionale di storia dell'architettura, Vicenza, Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio", September 1-7, 1988. Published in *Andrea Palladio. Nuovi contributi*, edited by André Chastel and Renato Cevese, 100-111 (Milan: Electa, 1990).

———. "'Machine et mémoire'." See 1982.

———. "To orio kai to problema" / "The Threshold and the Problem." See 1986.

1 9 8 9

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Il campanile della basilica di San Prospero a Reggio Emilia." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri, Ernst Gombrich, et al., 536-537. Milan: Electa, 1989. Translated into English by Fabio Barry as "The Bell Tower of the Basilica of San Prospero at Reggio," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, 264-265 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

———. "La chiesa abbaziale di San Benedetto in Polirone." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 538-547. Engl. trans., "The Abbey Church of San Benedetto al Polirone," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 266-275.

———. "Il duomo di Mantova." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 550-557. Engl. trans. "The Cathedral of Mantua, 1545," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 278-286.

———. "L'edilizia religiosa." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 531. Engl. trans. "Religious Buildings," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, 258.

———. "Giulio Romano. Architetto e pittore a Mantova" / "Architect and Painter in Mantua." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Ermanno Ranzini. In *Domus*, no. 710 (November 1989): 21-32.

———. "Giulio Romano. Linguaggio, mentalità, committenti." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 15-63. Engl. trans. "Giulio Romano: Language, Mentality, Patrons," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 11-55. Published also as "Eros e spiritualismo," *Casabella*, no. 559 (July-August 1989): 35-37.

———. "Giulio Romano e Jacopo Sansovino." Paper presented to "Giulio Romano e l'espansione europea del rinascimento," Teatro scientifico del Bibiena, Palazzo Ducale, Mantua, October 1-5, 1989. Published in *Giulio Romano. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi su 'Giulio Romano e l'espansione europea del rinascimento,' Mantova, Palazzo Ducale, Teatro scientifico del Bibiena, 1-5 ottobre 1989*, 75-108 (Mantua: Accademia nazionale virgiliana, 1991).

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Giaconto Di Pietrantonio. In *Flash Art*, no. 149 (March-April 1989): 67-71.

———. "Ipoteso sulla religiosità di Sebastiano Serlio." See 1987.

———. "I lavori nel palazzao Vescovile a Mantova." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 490. Engl. trans., "The Works in the Palazzo Vescovile of Mantua, 1540," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 214.

———. "El palacio de Carlos V en Granada." See 1987.

———. "La porta del Te." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 380-383. Engl. trans. "The Porta del Te," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 185-188.

———. "Porta Giulia o della Cittadella." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 491-495. English trans., "The Porta Giulia (or the Porta della Cittadella)," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 215-219.

———. "Il ritratto di Giulio Romano di Tiziano." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 535. Engl. trans., "Titian's Portrait of Giulio Romano," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 263.

———. "'Das Rote Wien'." See 1980.

———. "Strategie di sviluppo urbano nell'Italia del Rinascimento / Urban Development Strategies in Renaissance Italy." In *Zodiac. Rivista internazionale d'architettura / International Review of Architecture* 1 (February 1989): 12-43.

———. "Studi bramanteschi." In *Roma nel rinascimento* (1989): 85-101.

———. *Venice and the Renaissance*. See 1985.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Ernst Gombrich, et al., eds. *Giulio Romano. Architetto*. Milan: Electa, 1989. Translated into English by Fabio Barry as *Giulio Romano: Architect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Tafuri, Manfredo, Fosco Maraini and Jean-Marie Arnault. *Problemi di conservazione*. Rome: SEMAR, 1989.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Howard Burns. "Da Serlio all'Escorial." In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 575-581. Engl. trans. "From Serlio to the Escorial," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 307-314.

———. "Disegni architettonici" ("Giulio a Mantova").' In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 496-497. Engl. trans. "Architectural Drawings," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 220-221.

———. "Disegni architettonici" ("Giulio a Roma"). In *Giulio Romano. Architetto*, ibid., 302-304. Engl. trans. "Architectural Drawings," *Giulio Romano: Architect*, ibid., 159-162.

1990

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Die Krise der Linearität." See 1973.

———. "Il disegno di Chatsworth (per il palazzo Ducale di Venezia?) e un progetto perdutodi Jacopo Sansovino." See 1988.

———. Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Massimo Zancan. In *Casabella*, no. 569 (June 1990): 54.

———. "Introduzione." In *I musei di James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates*. See 1980.

———. "Raffaello, Jacopo Sansovino e la facciata di S Lorenzo a Firenze." In *Annali di architettura. Rivista del Centro internazionale di studi di architettura "Andrea Palladio"*, no. 2 (1990): 24-44.

———. "Sei disegni di Antonio da Sangallo il Giovane." In *Eidos. Rivista di arti, letteratura e musica* IV, no. 7 (1990): 28-39.

1991

Tafuri, Manfredo. "La basilica di Palladio." In *Quaderni della fondazione Istituto Gramsci Veneto* (*Città venete a confronto. Venezia, Padova, Vicenza*, edited by U. Curi and L. Romano), 11 (1991): 117-124.

———. "E Michelangelo rifutò di parlare." Review of *Michelelangelo architetto*, Giulio Carlo Argan and Bruno Contardi. In *L'indice dei libri del mese* 91, no. 4 (April 1991): 28-29.

———. "Giulio Romano e Jacopo Sansovino." See 1989.

———. "Passato irrisolto, inquieto presente." In *Casabella*, no. 585 (December 1991): 39-40.

———, ed. and intro. *La piazza, la chiesa, il parco. Saggi di storia dell'architettura, XV-XIX secolo*. Milan: Electa, 1991.

———. "Storia, conservazione, restauro." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Chiara Baglione and Bruno Pedretti. In *Casabella*, no. 580 (July 1991): 23-26. Republished in *Il progetto del passato. Memoria, conservazione, restauro, architettura*, edited by Bruno Pedretti, 85-100 (Milan: Bruno Mondadori, 1997). Spanish translation by Alberto Humanes as "Historia, conservación, restauración," *Arquitectura*, no. 307 (1996): 14-18.

———. *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*. Chinese ed. See 1968.

1992

Tafuri, Manfredo. "History as Project." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Luisa Passerini. Rome, February-March 1992. Trans. Denise L Bratton. In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (1999): 10-70.

———. Introduction to *I musei di James Stirling, Michael Wilford and Associates*. See 1980.

———. *Ricerca del rinascimento: Principi, città, architettura*. Turin: Einaudi, 1992. Preface and Chapter One translated into English by Daniel Sherer as "A Search for Paradigms: Project, Truth, Artiface," *Assemblage*, no. 28 (1995): 46-69. Full translation into English by Daniel Sherer forthcoming as *Interpreting the Renaissance: Princes, Cities, Architecture*, introduced by K. Michael Hays (New Haven: Yale University Press, forthcoming 2006). Translated into Spanish by Mónica Poole Bald as *Sombre el renacimiento. Pricipios, ciudades, arquetectos* (Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1995).

———. *La sfera e il labirinto*. Japanese ed. See 1980.

———. "Storici ma col regolo." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Gian Paolo Consoli. In *L'indice dei libri del mese* 92, no. 8 (September 1992): 39-40. Published partially in *Il manifesto*, April 21, 1992; and *d'A*, no. 11 (1994): 78-80.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Carlo Aymonino. "Per / To James Stirling (1926-1992)." In *Zodiac. Rivista internazionale d'architettura / International Review of Architecture*, no. 8 (1992): 4-5.

1993

Tafuri, Manfredo. "La città rovesciata." Review of *La villa. Forma e ideologia*, by James Ackerman. In *L'indice dei libri del mese* 93, no. 3 (March 1993): 12-13.

———. "La chiesa di S. Sebastiano in Vallepiatta a Siena." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, edited by Manfredo Tafuri and Francesco Paolo Fiore, 302-317. Milan: Electa, 1993.

———. "Le chiese di Francesco di Giorgio." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, ibid., 21-73.

———. "Le copie di Giorgio Vasari il Giovane." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, ibid., 380-381.

———. "Disasterous dissemination." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. 1993. In *Tefchos*, nos. 14-15 (1995).

———. "Il duomo di Urbino." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, ibid., 186-207.

———. "Edifici residenziali con cortili circolari." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, ibid., 384-389.

———. "Francesco di Giorgio Martini. Una gran mostra." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Maurizio Gargano. In *Domus*, no. 750 (June 1993): 76-80, xxii.

———. "'Machine et mémoire'." See 1982.

Tafuri, Manfredo and Francesco Paolo Fiore, eds. *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*. Milan: Electa, 1993.

———. "Francesco di Giorgio di Martini e l'assoluto imperfetto." In *Casabella*, no. 599 (March 1993): 30-36, 68-69.

———. "Il monasterio e la chiesa di Santa Chiara a Urbino." In *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*, ibid., 260-273.

1994

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Formalismo y vanguardia entre la NEP y el primer plan quinquenal." See 1979.

———. "Per una storia storica." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Pietro Corsi. In *La rivista dei libri* (April 1994): 10-12. Reprinted in Italian with English translation by Sebastiano Brandolini ("For a Historical History") in *Casabella*, "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," nos. 619-620 (1995): 144-151.

———. "Progettare la metropoli." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. By Valeriani Enrico. In *Controspazio*, no. 2 (1994): 76.

———. "Storia e restauro. Il caso di Palazzo Te a Mantova" [September 1992]. In *Bolletino d'arte*, Monographic Issue, "L'Istituto centrale del restauro per Palazzo Te," edited by Elisabetta Guiducci, Loredana Francescone and Elisabetta Diana Valente, 1-15. Rome: Ministerio per i beni culturali e ambientali; Ufficio centrale per i beni ambientali, architettonici, archaeologici, artisti e storici, 1994.

———. "Il testamento di Manfredo Tafuri" / "Manfredo Tafuri's Testament." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. In *L'architettura*, no. 40, nos. 465-466 (1994): 482-483.

1995

Tafuri, Manfredo. "I mercati della cultura" / "The Culture Markets." See 1976.

———. "Non c'è critica, solo storia" / "There is No Criticism, Only History." See 1986.

———. "Per una storia storica." See 1992.

———. "Sanmicheli. Problemi aperti." In *Michele Sanmichele. Architettura, linguaggio e cultura artistica nel Cinquecento*, edited by Silvia Foschi, 228-234. Milan: Electa, 1996.

———. *Sombre el renacimiento.* See 1992.

1996

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Historia, conservación, restauración." See 1991.

1997

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Storia, conservazione, restauro." See 1991.

1998

Tafuri, Manfredo. "*L'architecture dans le boudoir*." See 1974.

———. "Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology." See 1969.

Tafuri, Manfredo, Ernst Gombrich, et al., eds. *Giulio Romano.* See 1989.

1999

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Attualità di Borromini nel quattrocentesimo della nascita, 1599" / "Borromini Today in the 400th Anniversary of his Birth." In *L'architettura Venezia*, no. 45 (1999): 471-482.

———. "History as Project." See 1992.

2000

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architettura contemporanea*. Chinese ed. See 1976.

2001

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Main Lines of the Great Theoretical Debate Over Architecture and Urban Planning 1960-1977." See 1979.

2002

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architettura contemporanea*. Japanese ed. See 1976.

2003

Tafuri, Manfredo. "Giuseppe Terragni: Subject and 'Mask'." See 1977.

2006

Tafuri, Manfredo. *Interpreting the Renaissance*. See 1992.

Bibliography II
General Bibliography

A

Ackerman, James. "In Memoriam: Manfredo Tafuri, 1935-1994." In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 2 (June 1994): 137-138.

———. "La lezione di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Lesson of Manfredo Tafuri." In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 164-167.

Adams, Laurie Schneider. *The Methodologies of Art: An Introduction*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1996.

Adams, R. M., ed. "Roma interrotta." Special issue, *Architectural Design*, no. 49, Profile no. 20 (1979).

Adorni, Bruno. See Bib. I, 1986.

Adorno, Theodor. *Aesthetiche Theorie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970. Translated into Italian by Enrico De Angelis as *Teoria estetica*, edited by Greta Adorno and Rolf Tiedemann (Turin: Einaudi, 1975).

Akcan, Esra. "Manfredo Tafuri's Theory of the Architectural Avant-Garde." In *Journal of Architecture* 7, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 135-170.

Alberti, Leon Battista. *De picture*. Florence: 1435. Translated by John R. Spencer as *Treatise on Painting* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966).

———. *De re aedificatoria*. Florence: 1452. Translated by Robert Tavernor, Joseph Rykwert and Neil Leach as *On the Art of Building* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1991).

Allen, Judith. "Evidence and Silence: Feminism and the Limits of History." In *Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory*, edited by Carole Bateman and Elizabeth Gross, 173-189. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin, 1986.

Ambasz, Emilio, ed. *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape, Achievements and Problems of Italian Design*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1972.

Anderson, Stanford. "Architectural History in Schools of Architecture." In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 282-290.

Argan, Giulio Carlo. "Architettura." In *Enciclopedia italiana delle scienze, lettere ed arti*, App. 2 (1938-1948), Vol. 1, 229-232. Rome: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1948.

———. *Europe of the Capitals 1600-1700*. Translated by Anthony Rhodes. Geneva: Editions d'Art Albert Skira, 1964.

———. *The Renaissance City*. Trans. by Susan Edna Bassnett. New York: George Brazillier, 1969.

———. *Walter Gropius e la Bauhaus*. Turin: Einaudi, 1951. Arnault, Jean-Marie. See Bib. I, 1989.

Arnault, Jean-Marie. See Bib. I, 1989.

ASEA (Associazione Architetti e Studenti). See Bib. I, 1959.

AUA (Architetti e Urbanisti Associati). See Bib. I, 1962, 1963.

Aymonino, Carlo. See Bib. I, 1964, 1992.

B

Baird, George. "'Criticality' and Its Discontents." In *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 21 (Fall 2004-Winter 2005), 6pp, http://www.gsd.harvard.edu/research/publications/hdm/back/21_baird.pdf (accessed July 21, 2005).

Bardeschi, Mario Dezzi. See Bib. I, 1968.

Barthes, Roland. *Critique et verité*. Paris : Seuil, 1965.

———. *Le plaisir du texte*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

Bedon, Anna, Guido Beltramini and Howard Burns, eds. *Questo. Disegni e studi di Manfredo Tafuri per la ricostruzione di edifice e contesti urbani rinascimentali / Cecui-ci. Dessins et études de Manfredo Tafuri pour la restitution d'édifices et de contextes urbains de la Renaissance.* Vicenza: Centro Internazionale di Studi di Architettura "Andrea Palladio", 1995.

Bedon, Anna, Guido Beltramini and Pierre-Alain Croset. "Una prima bibliografia" / "An initial bibliography." In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 170-175.

Bellori, Giovanni Pietro. *The Lives of Annibale and Agostino Carracci*. Trans. Catherine Enggass. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1968.

———. *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti moderni*. 1672. Bologna: Forni, 1977.

Benevolo, Leonardo. *Storia dell'architettura moderna*. Bari: Laterza, 1960.

Benjamin, Walter. *Angelus Novus. Saggi e frammenti*. Intro. and trans. Renato Solmi. Turin: Einaudi, 1962.

———. *The Arcades Project*. Translated by Howard Eiland and Kevin McLaughlan from the German edition by Rolf Tiedemann. Cambridge and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999.

———. *Ausgewählte. Schriften*, Vol. 2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1966.

———. "Der Autor als Produzent." In *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 2, edited by Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1977. Translated into English by Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland and Gary Smith as "The Author as Producer" in *Selected Writings*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).

———. *Berliner Kindheit um Neunzehnhunhundert*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1950.

———. *Einbahnstrasse*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1961.

———. *Illuminationen. Schriften*, Vol. 1. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1955. Translated into English by Harry Zohn as *Illuminations*, edited and introduced by Hannah Arendt (1968. London: Pimlico, 1999).

———. "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit." In *Zeitschrift für Sozialfursochung* V, no. 1 (1936). Translated into Italian by Enrico Fillipini as *L'opera d'arte nell'epoca della sua riproducibilità tecnica* (Turin: Einaudi, 1966). Translated into English by Harry Zohn as "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," *Illuminations*, edited and introduced by Hannah Arendt (1968. London: Pimlico, 1999).

———. "Paris, Capital of the Nineteenth Century." In *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writing*, edited by Peter Demetz. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1978.

———. "Rigorous Study of Art: On the First Volume of the *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen*." Translated by Thomas Y. Levin. In *October*, no. 47 (Winter 1988): 77-90.

———. *Städtebilder*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1963.

———. "Theses on the Philosophy of History." Trans. Harry Zorn. In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt. (1968, New York: Pimlico, 1999). Originally published in *Neue Rundschau* 61, no. 3 (1950).

———. *Der Ursprung des Deutschen Trauerspiels*. 1928. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1963. Translated into English by John Osborne as *The Origin of German Tragic Drama*, introduced by George Steiner (London: NLB, 1977).

Bianchino, Gloria, ed. *Il disegna dell'architettura*, Quaderni 57. Parma: Università di Parma, Centro Studi e Archivio delle Comunicazione, Dipartimento Progetto, 1983.

Biraghi, Marco. *Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea*. Milan: Marinotti, 2005.

Bloch, Marc. *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien*. Paris: Colin 1949.

———. *Les caractères originaux de l'histoire rurale française*, 6th ed. Paris: Colin, 1976.

———. *Mélanges historiques*, 2 Vols. Paris: Sevpen, 1963.

———. *La société féodale*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1968.

Bois, Yve Alain. "Francastel's Interdisciplinary History of Art." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," edited by Demetri Porphyrios. Special issue. *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 59-60. Republished in extended and revised form as the 'Introduction' to *Art and Technology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, by Pierre Francastel, trans. Randall Cherry (New York: Zone Books, 2000).

———. "Tafuri nel labirinto" / "Tafuri in the Labyrinth." Trans. French-Italian Bruno Pedretti. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 154-159. French essay originally published in *Macula*, nos. 3-4 (1978): 202-206; English essay originally published in *Oppositions*, no. 11 (Winter 1977).

Bonelli, Renato. See Bib. I, 1978.

Bonet, Pep. See Bib. I, 1984.

Bonnifazio, Patrizia. "Fra etica e critica: *Ludovico Quaroni e lo svillupo dell'architettura moderna in Italia* di Manfredo Tafuri." In *Architettura spazio scritto. Forme e tecniche delle teorie dell'architettura in Italia dal 1945 ad oggi*, edited by Patrizia Bonnifazio and Riccardo Palma, 123-133. Turin: UTET, 2001.

Bonnifazio, Patrizia and Riccardo Palma, eds. *Architettura spazio scritto. Forme e tecniche delle teorie dell'architettura in Italia dal 1945 ad oggi.* Turin: UTET Libreria, 2001.

Borromini, Francesco. *Opus architectonicum*. Edited by Paolo Portoghesi. 1725. Rome: Elefante, 1964.

Bösel, Richard and Christoph L. Frommel, eds. *Borromini e l'universo barocco*. Milan: Electa, 2000.

Brilli, Attilo, et al. *Ricercare interdisciplinare sulle practiche significanti.* Verona: Bertani, 1977.

Bruschi, Arnaldo. See Bib. I, 1978.

Burbaum, Sabine. *Die Rivalität zwischen Francesco Borromini und Gianlorenzo Bernini*. Oberhausen: Athena, 1999.

Burckhardt, Jacob. *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*. Leipzig: Seemann, 1860.

Burke, Peter. *The French Historical Revolution: The* Annales *School, 1929-89*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Burns, Howard. "Tafuri e il Rinascimento" / "Tafuri and the Renaissance." In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 114-121.

———. See Bib. I, 1989.

Byatt, A. S. *Portraits in Fiction*. London: Chatto and Windus, 2001.

C

Cacciari, Massimo. *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*. Trans. Stephen Sartorelli. Intro. Patrizia Lombardo. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

———. "Quid Tum." In *Domus*, no. 762 (July-August 1994): 35-38. Republished in Italian and English, trans. Paul Blanchard in "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 168-169.

———. "Eupalinos or Architecture." Trans. Stephen Sartorelli. *Oppositions*, no. 21 (Summer 1980): 106-116. Reprinted *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 394-406. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999.

———. "Il problema del politico in Deleuze e Foucault (sul pensiero di 'Autonomia' e di 'Gioco'." In *Il dispositivo Foucault*, edited by Franco Rella, 57-66. Venice: CLUVA, 1977.

———. See Bib. I, 1972, 1979, 1985.

Calabi, Donatella. Review of *Venice and the Renaissance*, by Manfredo Tafuri. In *European History Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (July 1993): 469-474.

Calvi, Evelina. "Oublier Tafuri?" In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales. Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 21-28.

Camus, Albert. *L'étranger*. Paris: Gallimard, 1942. Translated into Italian by Alberto Zevi as *Lo straniero* (Milan: Bompiani, 1948).

———. *La malentendu: pièce en trois actes; Caligula: pièce en quatre actes*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. Translated into Italian by Vito Pandolfi as *Il malintesto* (Milan: Bompiani, 1947).

———. *Le mythe de Sisyphe. Essai sur l'absurde*. Paris: Gallimard, 1942. Translated into Italian by Federico Federici as *Il mito di sisifo* (Milan: Bompiani 1947).

———. *La peste*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. Translated into Italian by Beniamino Dal Fabbro as *La Peste* (Milan: Bompiani, 1948).

Canella, Guido, ed. *Teorie della progettazione architettonica*, Architettura e città 3. Bari: Edizione Dedalo, 1968.

Carr, Edward Hallett. *What is History? The George Macaulay Trevelyan Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge, January-March 1961*. London: Macmillan, 1961.

Casciato, Maristella. "A propos of Bruno Zevi." In *Archis*, no. 73 (September 2000): 72-76.

———. "The 'Casa all'Italiana' and the Idea of Modern Dwelling in Fascist Italy." In *Journal of Architecture*, no. 5 (Winter 2000): 335-353.

———. "The Italian Mosaic: The Architect as Historian." Translated by Barry Fifield. In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 62, no. 1 (March 2003): 92-101.

———. "Neorealism in Italian Architecture." In *Anxious Modernisms: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture*, edited by Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault. Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture; Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2000.

Catilda, Giancarlo, ed. *Saverio Muratori, architetto (1910-1973). Il pensioro e l'opere*. Florence: Alinea, 1984.

Cederna, Antonio. See Bib. I, 1963.

Ciucci, Giorgio. "Gli anni della formazione" / "The Formative Years." English translation by Steve Piccolo. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 12-25.

———. *Gli architetti e il fascismo. Architettura e città, 1922-1944*. Turin: Einaudi, 1983.

———. See Bib. I, 1973, 1979.

Cohen, Jean-Louis. "L'architettura intellettualizzata, 1970-1990." In *Casabella*, nos. 586-587 (1992).

———. "Ceci n'est pas une histiore." Translated French-Italian by Bruno Pedretti; French-English by Kenneth Hylton. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 48-53.

———. "Il construttivismo russo: due anni di mostre." In *Casabella*, no. 585 (1991): 41-42.

———. "Exhibitionist Revisionism: Exposing Architectural History." In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 316-325.

———. "'Experimental' Architecture and Radical History." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 42-47.

———. "The Italophiles at Work." Translated by Brian Holmes. In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 508-520. 1984. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998.

———. "The Modern Movement and Urban History." Paper presented at the 6th International DOCOMOMO Conference, Brasilia, September 20, 2000. Published in *The Modern City Facing the Future: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Docomomo Conference, Brasília, Brazil, September 19-22, 2000*, edited by Anna Beatriz Galvão, Alejandra H Muñoz, et al. (Brasília: Universidade Federal da Bahia and Universidade de Brasília, 2004).

———. See Bib. I, 1979.

Colquhoun, Alan. "Gombrich and Cultural History." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," edited by Demetri Porphyrios. Special issue, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 35-39.

Connors, Joseph. "Cultura del fittizio" / "The Culture of the Fictitious." Review *Ricerca del rinascimento. Principi, città, architettura*, by Manfredo Tafuri. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 160-163. Italian text originally published in *L'Indice dei*

libri del mese, no. 8 (September 1992): 37-38. English text at http://www.columbia.edu/~jc65/reviews/tafuri.rev.htm (accessed March 3, 2005).

———. Review of *Francesco di Giorgio*, Palazzo Pubblico, Sienna, 1993. In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* LII (1993): 487-490, http://www.columbia.edu/~jc65/main.html (accessed March 3, 2005).

Culot, Maurice and Philippe Lefebvre. "The State of Defiance." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," edited by Demetri Porphyrios. Special issue, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 79-81.

Cunningham, David. "Architecture, Utopia and the Futures of the Avant-Garde." In *Journal of Architecture* 6, no. 2 (2001): 169-182.

———. "The Concept of Metropolis: Philosophy and Urban Form." In *Radical Philosophy*, no. 133 (September-October 2005): 13-25.

D

Dal Co, Francesco. *Abitare nel moderno*. Bari: Laterza, 1982.

———. "Criticism and Design." In *The Oppositions Reader: Selected Readings from a Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture, 1973-1984*, edited by K. Michael Hays, 155-170. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1998.

———. "Note per la critica dell'architettura moderna. Da Weimar a Dessau." *Contropiano* 1968, no. 1: 153-171.

———. "On History and Architecture: An Interview with Francesco Dal Co." Interviewed by Frederick R. Groen. In *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal*, no. 23 (1987): 6-23.

———. "Riscoperta del marxismo e problematica di classe nel movimento studentesco europeo. Rudi Dutschke." *Contropiano* 1968, no. 2: 423-443.

———, ed. "Il novecento." *Storia dell'architettura italiana*. Vol. VIII. Milan: Electa, 1997.

———. *Teorie del moderno. Architettura, Germania 1880-1920.* Bari: Laterza, 1982.

———. See Bib. I, 1972, 1973, 1976, 1979.

Dal Co, Francesco and Giuseppe Mazzariol, eds. *Carlo Scarpa. Opera completa.* Milan: Electa, 1984.

Danto, Arthur C. "Commentary." *New Literary Theory* XVII, no. 2 (Winter 1986): 275-279.

Day, Gail. "Strategies in the Metropolitan Merz: Manfredo Tafuri and Italian Workerism." In *Radical Philosophy*, no. 133 (September-October 2005): 26-38.

De Angelis d'Ossat, Gugliemo. *Studi sul Borromini. Atti del convegno promosso dall'Accademia Nazionale di San Luca*, 2 Vols. Rome: De Luca editore, 1967.

De Bosis, Lauro. *Storia della mia morte.* Rome: Bardi, 1945.

De Michelis, Marco. "Aldo Rossi and Autonomous Architecture." In *The Changing of the Avant-Garde: Visionary Drawings from the Howard Gilman Collection*, edited by Terence Riley, 89-98. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002.

———. *Heinrich Tessenow 1896-1950*. Milan: Electa, 1991.

———. "The Last Dream and the Total Work of Art: Art and Architecture in Weimar Germany." In *Architecture and Arts 1900-2004: A Century of Creative Products in Building, Design, Cinema, Painting, Photography, Sculpture*, edited by Germano Celant, 53-58. Milan: Skira, 2004.

———. See Bib. I, 1979.

De Seta, Cesare. "Benevolo's *Storia*." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 41-43.

de Solà-Morales, Ignasi, ed. "Being Manfredo Tafuri." Special Issue, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000).

———. "Beyond the Radical Critique: Manfredo Tafuri and Contemporary Architecture." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 56-60.

Delbeke, Maarten. "Antonio Gherardi e la questione dello stile." In *Antonio Gherardi artista aretino (1638-1702). Un genio bizzarro nella Roma del Seicento*, edited by Lydia Saraca Colonnelli, 79-83. Rome: Artemide Edizioni, 2003.

———. *La fenice degl'ingegni: Een alternatief perspectief op Gianlorenzo Bernini en zijn werk in de geschriften van Sforza Pallavicino*. Ghent: Ghent University Engineering and Architectural Press, 2002.

Devlieger, Lionel. "Benedetto Varchi on the Birth of Artefacts: Architecture, Alchemy and Power in Late-Renaissance Florence." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Ghent University, 2005.

di Lampedusa, Giuseppe Tomasi. *Il gattopardo*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1958.

Dickstein, Morris. "Literary Theory and Historical Understanding." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 23 May 2003, http://chronicle.com/free/v49/i37/37b00701.htm (accessed May 21, 2003).

Dixon, Susan M. "The Sources and Fortunes of Piranesi's Archaeological Illustrations." In *Art History* 25, no. 4 (September 2002): 469-487.

Doubrovsky, Serge. *Pourquoi la nouvelle critique. Critique et objectivité*. Paris: Mercure de France, 1967.

Duncan, David. "Corporeal Histories: The Autobiographical Bodies of Luisa Passerini." In *Modern Language Review* 93, no. 2 (April 1998): 370-378.

Dunster, David. "Critique: Tafuri's *Architecture and Utopia*." *Architectural Design* 47, no. 3 (1977): 204-212.

E

Eco, Umberto. *Opera aperta*. Milan: Bompiani, 1962.

Eisenman, Peter. *Guseppe Terragni: Transformations, Decompositions, Critiques*. New York: The Monacelli Press: 2003.

———. *Houses of Cards*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.

———. "The Wicked Critic." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 66-70.

Ely, John Wilton. *Giovan Battista Piranesi: The Complete Etchings*. 2 vols. San Francisco: Alan Wofsey Fine Arts, 2000.

Engelmann, Edmund. *Bergasse 19*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Escolano, Víctor Pérez. "Manfredo Tafuri (1935-1994). Un ensayo de bibliographía." In *Arquitectura*, no. 300 (1994): 90-94.

———. "Me-moraie Economium." In *Arquitectura*, no. 300 (1994): 85-89.

F

Fattinanzi, Enrico. See Bib. I, 1963.

Febvre, Lucien. *L'apparition du livre*, with Henri-Jean Matin. Paris: Albin Michel, 1958.

———. *Un destin. Martin Luther*, 4th ed. Paris : PUF, 1968.

———. *Le problème de l'incroyance au XVIe siècle. La religion de Rabelais*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1949.

———. *La terre et l'évolution humaine. Introduction géographique à l'histoire* Paris: Albin Michel, 1970.

Fernie, Eric, ed. *Art History and its Methods: A Critical Anthology*. London: Phaidon, 1995.

Fink, Carole. *Marc Bloch: A Life in History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Fiore, Francesco Paolo. "Autonomia della storia" / "The Autonomy of History." Translated by Steve Piccolo. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 102-111.

Focillon, Henri. *Giovanni-Battista Piranesi*. Gollion: Folio, 2001.

Forster, Kurt. "Critical History of Art, or Transfiguration of Values?" *New Literary History* III, no. 3 (Spring 1972): 459-470.

———. "No Escape from History, No Reprieve from Utopia, No Nothing: An Addio to the Anxious Historian Manfredo Tafuri." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 61-65.

———. "Residues of a Dream World." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 69-71.

Foscari, Antonio. See Bib. I, 1981, 1982, 1983.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. 1969. London: Tavistock Publications, 1972.

———. *L'ordre du discourse*. Paris: Gallimard, 1970.

Freud, Sigmund. "Die Endliche und Die Unendliche Analyse." In *Almanach der Psychoanalyse 1938* (Autumn 1937). Translated into English by Joan Riviere as "Analysis Terminable and Interminable," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, translated and edited by James Strachey with Anna Freud, vol. XXIII, 209-253 (London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1964).

———. *Casi clinici*. Translated by Mauro Lucentini. Turin: Edizione scienfiche Einaudi, 1952.

———. *Civilisation and its Discontents*, The International Psycho-Analytical Library, 17. Translated by Joan Riviere and edited by James Strachey. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1973.

———. "The Claims of Psycho-Analysis to Scientific Interest." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated and edited by James Strachey with

Anna Freud, Vol. XIII, Totem and Taboo and Other Works. 1913. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1955.

———. *Delirio e sogni nella Gradiva di W Jensen*. Translated by Gustavo de Benedicty. Naples: Casa Editrice Vittorio Idelson, 1929.

———. *Il disagio nella civiltà*. Translated by Lorenzo Giuso. Rome: Scienza moderna, 1949.

———. "A Disturbance of Memory on the Acropolis." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated and edited by James Strachey with Anna Freud, vol. XXII, New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis and Other Works. 1936. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1964.

———. *Dottrina generale delle neurosi.* Translated by M. Levi Bianchini. Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazionale, 1922.

———. *Inibizione, sintomo e angoscia*. Translated by Emilio Servadio (Turin: 1925, 1951, 1954).

———. *Introduzione allo studio della psicoanalisi*. Translated by Edoardo Weiss. Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazioneale, 1922.

———. *Mia vita ed opera*. Translated by Joachim Flescher. Rome: Scienza moderna, 1948.

———. "Moses and Monotheism: Three Essays." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated and edited by James Strachey with Anna Freud, vol. XXIII. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1964. Italian edition translated by Arrigo Ballardini as *Mose e il monoteismo* (Milan: Pepe Diaz, 1952).

———. "The Moses of Michelangelo." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated and edited by James Strachey with Anna Freud, vol. XIII, Totem and Taboo and Other Works. 1914. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1955.

———. *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life*, The Penguin Freud Library, 5. Trans. Alan Tyson. Edited by James Strachey. 1901. London: Penguin, 1991. Italian edition translated by Maria Novella Pierini as *Psicopatologia della vita quotidiana* (Roma: Astrolabio, 1948).

———. *Il sogno*. Translated by Irene Bernardini and Enza Maccarone. Naples: Il Manicomio, 1919.

———. *Il sogno e la sua interpretazione*. Translated by G. L. Douglas Scotti. Milan: Dall'Oglio, 1951.

———. *Sommario di psicoanalisi*. Translated by Sante David. Florence: Edizione universitaria, 1951, 1953.

———. *Sulla psicoanalisi*. Translated by Edoardo Weiss. Naples: Libreria Psicoanalitica Internazionale, 1915.

———. *Totem e tabu*. Translated by Edoardo Weiss. Bari: Laterza, 1930.

Frommel, Christoph. See Bib. I, 1984.

G

Gargani, Aldo ed. *Crisi della ragione. Nuovi modelli nel rapporto tra sapere e attivita umane*. Turin: Einaudi, 1979.

Garroni, Emilio. See Bib. I, 1967.

Gasche, Rodolphe, ed. *La critica freudiana*. Milan: Feltrinelli economica, 1977

Gay, Peter. *Freud: A Life for Our Time.* New York and London: W. W. Norton and Company, 1988.

———. *Freud for Historians*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Ghirardo, Diane Y. "Manfredo Tafuri and Architectural Theory in the U. S., 1970-2000." Special issue, 'Mining Autonomy,' eds. Michael Osman, Adam Ruedig, Matthew Seidel and Lisa Tilney. *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal*, no. 33 (2002): 38-47.

Gianotte, Ezio, ed. *Strutture ambientali, dagli atti del 17° convegno internazionale Artisti, Critici e Stuiosi d'arte*. Bologna: Capelli editore, 1969.

Giedion, Siegfried. *The Eternal Present*. 2 Vols. New York: Pantheon, 1964.

———. *Space, Time and Architecture: The Growth of a New Tradition.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Ginsborg, Paul. *A History of Contemporary Italy: Society and Politics 1943-1980*. London: Penguin, 1990.

Ginzburg, Carlo. *Il formaggio e i vermi. Un cosmo di un mugnaio del '500.* Turin: Einaudi, 1976.

———. *Indagini su Piero. Il battesimo, il Ciclo di Arezzo, il Flagellazione di Urbino*. Turin: Einaudi, 1981.

———. *Miti, emblemi, spie. Morfolgia e storia*. Turin: Einaudi, 1986.

———. "Spie. Radici di un paradigma indiziario." In *Crisi della ragione. Nuovi modelli nel rapporto tra sapere e attivita umane*, ed. Aldo Gargani, 57-106. Turin: Einaudi, 1979.

———. *Storia notturna. Una decifrazzione del sabba*. Turin: Einaudi, 1989.

Ginzburg, Carlo and Adriano Prosperi. *Giochi di paziena. Un seminario sul 'Beneficio del Cristo'.* Turin: Einaudi, 1975.

Giovannoni, Gustavo. *L'urbanisme face aux villes anciennes*. Introduced by Françoise Choay. Translated from Italian to French by Jean-Marc Mandosio, Amélie Petita and Claire Tandille. Paris: Editions du seuil, 1998.

Gombrich, Ernst. "Psychoanalysis and the History of Art." In *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and other Essays on the Theory of Art*, 4th ed., 30-44. 1963. London: Phaidon, 1985.

———. See Bib. I, 1989.

Goodbun, Jon. "Brand New Tafuri: Some Timely Notes on the Imaging of Spatial Demands." *Journal of Architecture* 6 (Summer 2001): 155-168.

Grassi, Giorgio, 'Avant-Garde and Continuity,' trans. Stephen Sartorelli in K Michael Hays, ed., *Oppositions Reader: Selected Readings from a Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture 1973-1984*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998.

———. *La costruzione logica dell'architettura*. Padua: Marsilio, 1967.

Greco, Saul, ed. *La città territorio. Un esperimento didattico sul centro direzione di Centocelle in Roma.* Bari: Leonardo da Vinci Editrice, 1964.

Gregotti, Vittorio. "L'architettura del compimento" / "The Architecture of Completion." Translated into English by Steve Piccolo. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 2-9.

———. *Il progetto per l'Università delle Calabrie e alter architettura / The Project for Calabria University and Other Architectural Works*. Introduced by Manfredo Tafuri. Milan: Electa, 1981.

———, ed. "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri." Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995).

———. *Il territorio dell'architettura*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1966.

———. "Tafuri, architetto del moderno." Review of *Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea*, by Marco Biraghi. In *La repubblica*, June 10, 2005. Also available online at http://eddyburg.it/article/articleview/2897/0/46/ (accessed December 9, 2005).

———. "Territory and Architecture." In *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965-1995*, edited by Kate Nesbit. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996. Republished from *Architecture Design* 59, nos. 5-6 (1985): 28-34.

———. "Ultimo incontro." *Casabella*, no. 610 (1994): 45.

Grendler, Paul F. Review of *Venice and the Renaissance*, by Manfredo Tafuri. *Historian* 53, no. 2 (Winter 1991): 347-348.

Groys, Boris. *The Loneliness of the Project*. Trans. Matthew Partridge. Antwerp: Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, 2002.

Guerra, Andrea and Cristiano Tessari. "L'insegnamento" / "The Teaching." Trans. Steve Piccolo. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 124-129.

H

Hartoonian, Gevork. "Beyond Historicism: Manfredo Tafuri's Flight." In *Art Criticism* 17, no. 2 (2002): 28-40. Revised from the version published in *In the Making: Architecture's Past, Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, edited by Kevin Green (Darwin: SAHANZ, 2001).

———. "The Project of Modernity: Can Architecture Make It?" In *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the University of Sydney Faculty of Architecture* 8, no. 2 (June 2003): 44-56.

———. "Reading Manfredo Tafuri Today." In *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the University of Sydney Faculty of Architecture* 8, no. 2 (June 2003): 15.

Hauser, Arnold. *Social History of Art*. 4 Vols. London: Routledge Keegan Paul, 1951-1978.

Hays, K. Michael, ed. *Architecture Theory since 1968*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998.

———. "Prolegomenon for a Study Linking the Advanced Architecture of the Present to that of the 1970s through Ideologies of Media, the Experience of Cities in Transition, and the Ongoing Effects of Reification." In "Reflecting Modernism," special issue, ed. Ann Marie Brennan, Nahum Goodenow and Brendan D. Moran, *Perspecta*, no. 32 (2001): 101-108.

———. "On Turning Thirty." In *Assemblage*, no. 30 (August 1996): 6-10.

———, ed. *Oppositions Reader: Selected Essays, 1973-1984*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.

———. "Tafuri's Ghost." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 36-42.

Hays, K. Michael and Carol Burns, eds. *Thinking the Present: Recent American Architecture*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1990.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Aesthetik*. Berlin: Aufbau-Verlag, 1965. Translated into English by M. Knox as *Aesthetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975).

Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1927. Translated into Italian by Pietro Chiodi as *Essere e tempo* (Milan and Rome: Longanesi, 1953).

———. *Vom Wesen des Grundes*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1929. Translated into Italian by Pietro Chiodi as *Dell'essenza del fondamento* (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952).

———. *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit.* Frankfurt am Main: Kostermann, 1943. Translated into Italian by Armando Carlini as *Dell'essenza della verita*, translated (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952).

———. *Was ist Metaphysik?* Bonn: F Cohen, 1929. Translated into Italian by Enzo Paci as *Che cosa e la metafisica?* (Milan: F.lli Bocca, 1952).

Heynen, Hilde. *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999.

———. "Architecture between Modernity and Dwelling: Reflections on Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory*." In *Assemblage*, no. 17 (April 1992): 78-91.

———. "The Venice School, or the Diagnosis of Negative Thought." In *Design Book Review*, nos. 41-42 (Winter-Spring 2000): 22-39.

Hoekstra, Rixt. "Building versus *Bildung*: Manfredo Tafuri and the Construction of a Historical Discipline." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Groningen University, 2005, available online at http://irs.ub.rug.nl/ppn/283596589 (accessed September 19, 2005).

Huet, Bernard. "Manfredo Tafuri: il avait désenchanté le mouvement moderne." In *Architecture d'aujourd'hui*, no. 292 (April 1994): 20.

Humanes, Alberto. "Arquitecto conservador o Arquitecto restaurador." In *Architectura*, no. 307 (1996):12-13.

I

Ingersoll, Richard. "Non c'è critica, solo storia" / "There is No Criticism, Only History." Interview with Manfredo Tafuri. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 96-99.

Ingraham, Catherine. "On Turning Ten." In *Assemblage*, no. 30 (August 1996): 10-11

Insolera, Italo. *Roma moderna. Un secolo di storia urbanistica 1870-1970*. Rev. ed. 1962. Turin: Einaudi, 1993.

J

Jameson, Frederic. "Architecture and the Critique of Ideology." In *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by Joan Ockman, 51-87. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

Jameson, Frederic and Michael Speaks. "Envelopes and Enclaves: The Space of Post-Civil Society, An Architectural Conversation." In *Assemblage*, no. 17 (1992): 30-37.

Jarzombek, Mark. "Critical or Post-Critical?" In *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the University of Sydney Faculty of Architecture* 7, no. 1 (2002): 149-151.

Jaspers, Karl. *Ragione ed esistenza*. Translated and introduced by Enzo Paci. Milan: Bocca, 1942.

Jay, Martin. Review of *Architecture and Nihilism*, by Massimo Cacciari. In *Design Book Review*, no. 41-42 (Winter-Spring 2000): 96-99.

Jenner, Ross. Review of *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Guards and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, by Manfredo Tafuri. *Fabrications: Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand* 2-3 (December 1991): 73-79.

———. "Tafuri, Manfredo." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Italian Culture*, ed. Gino Moliterno. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Junghann, Kurt. *Bruno Taut, 1880-1938*. Leipzig: E. A. Seeman, 1998.

K

Kennedy, Ken. "Manfredo Tafuri: Criticism and the Australian Myth." In *Transition: Discourse on Architecture* 2, no. 3-4 (September-December 1981): 5-6.

Keyvanian, Carla. "Manfredo Tafuri: From the Critique of History to Microhistories." In *Design Issues* 16, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 3-15.

———. "Manfredo Tafuri's Notion of History and Its Methodological Sources: From Walter Benjamin to Roland Barthes." Unpublished MSc thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1992.

Kieven, Elizabeth. *Von Bernini bis Piranesi: Römische Architekturzeichnungen des Barock*. Stuttgart: Hatje, 1993.

Kimball, Richard. "Art in Crisis." In *The New Criterion*, no. 24 (December 2005): 3.

Koenig, Giovanni Klaus. *Architettura tedesca del secondo dopoguerra*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1965.

Kruft, Hanno Walter. *A History of Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*. Translated by Ronald Taylor, Elsie Callander and Antony Wood. 1985. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1994.

L

Le Goff, Jacques and Pierre Nora, eds. *Faire de l'histoire*, 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard, 1974. Translated, in a reduced edition, to Italian by Isolina Mariana as *Fare storia. Temi e metodi della nuova storiografia* (Turin: Einaudi, 1981).

Lipstadt, Hélène and Harvey Mendelsohn. "Philosophy, History, and Autobiography: Manfredo Tafuri and the 'Unsurpassed' Lesson of Le Corbusier." In *Assemblage*, no. 22 (December 1993): 58-103.

———. "Tafuri e Le Corbusier" / "Tafuri and Le Corbusier." In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 86-93.

Llorens, Tomas. "Manfredo Tafuri: Neo-Avant-Garde and History." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51,

nos. 6-7 (1981): 82-95. Translated into Spanish by Javier Pérez Igualada as *Manfredo Tafuri. Neovanguardia e historia* (Valencia: Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, 1983).

Lo Bianco, Anna, ed. *Piranesi e la cultura antiquarian gli antecedenti e il contesto, atti del convegno 14-17 novembre 1979*. Rome: Multigrafica Editrice, 1985.

Lombardo, Patrizia. "The Philosophy of the City." Introduction to *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*, by Massimo Cacciari. Translated by Stephen Sartorelli, ix-lviii. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993.

Luca, Monica, ed. *La critica operativa e l'architettura*. Milan: Unicopli, 2002.

Lukács, Georg. *Die Zerstorung der Vernunft: Der Weg des Irrationalismus von Schelling zu Hitler*. Berlin: Aufbau Verlag, 1954. Ital. trans. Eraldo Arnaud as *La distruzione della ragion* (Turin: Einaudi, 1959). Engl. trans. Peter Palmer as *The Destruction of Reason* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press; London: Merlin, 1980).

M

Macarthur, John. "The Butcher's Shop: Disgust in Picturesque Architecture and Aesthetics." In *Assemblage*, no. 30 (1996): 32-43.

———. *The Picturesque*. London: UCL Press, forthcoming 2006.

———. "Technique and the Clash of Language: Some Thoughts on Tafuri's *The Sphere and the Labyrinth*." In *Transition: Discourse on Architecture*, no. 32 (Autumn 1990): 6-21.

Mackenney, Richard. Review of *Venice and the Renaissance*, by Manfredo Tafuri. *History* 77, no. 251 (October 1992): 495-496.

Manieri-Elia, Mario. See Bib. I, 1973.

Mantese, Corrato. See Bib. I, 1978.

Maraini, F. See Bib. I, 1989.

Marcel, Gabriel. *Journal metaphysique*. Paris: Gallimard, 1927.

Marconi, Paolo. See Bib. I, 1967.

Marder, T A. Review of *Ricerca del rinascimanto. Principi, città, architettura*, by Manfredo Tafuri. In *Art Bulletin* 77, no. 1 (March 1995): 137-139.

Marino, Giuseppe Carlo. *Biografia del sessantotto. Utopie, conquiste, sbandamenti*. Introduced by Nicola Tranfaglia. Milan: Tascabili Bompiani, 2004.

Masini, Lara Vinco. See Bib. I, 1968.

Maxwell, Robert. "Tafuri / Culot / Krier: The Role of Ideology." In *Architectural Design* 47, no. 3 (1977): 187-188. Republished in *Sweet Disorder and the Carefully Careless: Theory and Criticism in Architecture*, Princeton Papers on Architecture, Vol. 2, 131-136 (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1993).

Mazzariol, Giuseppe. See Bib. I, 1973.

McLellan, David. *Marxism after Marx*, 2nd ed. London: Macmillan Press, 1979.

McLeod, Mary. Introduction *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by Joan Ockman. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

Melograni, Carlo. See Bib. I, 1963.

Memmo, Andrea. *Elementi dell'architettura lodoliana, ossia l'arte del fabbricare con solidita scientifica e con eleganza non capricciosa*. 1786. Milan: Gabriele Mazzotta, 1973.

Michelet, Jules. *Histoire de France*. Paris: A. Lacroix, 1855.

Milizia, Francesco. *Principi di architettura civile*, edited and illustrated by Giovanni Antonini, 1847 ed. 1804. Milan: Gabriele Mazzotta, 1972.

Minor, Vernon Hyde. *Art History's History*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1994.

Moneo, José Rafael. "Architettura, critica, storia" / "Architecture, Critics, History." Lecture presented at the Third Lezione Manfredo Tafuri, Dipartimento di storia dell'architettura, Istituto universitario di architettura di Venezia, February 23, 1997. Published in *Casabella*, no. 653 (1998): 42-51.

———. Introduction to *Thinking the Present: Recent American Architecture*, edited by K. Michael Hays and Carol Burns. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1990.

———. "La 'Ricerca' come lascito" / "The 'Ricerca' as Legacy." Translated Spanish-Italian by S D'Amico; Italian-English by Steve Piccolo. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 132-141.

Monica, Luca, ed. *La critica operativa e l'architettura*. Milan: Unicopli, 2002.

Morawski, Stefan. "Marxist Historicism and the Philosophy of Art." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 61-67.

Morresi, Manuela. *Jacopo Sansovino*. Milan: Electa, 2000.

Morrone, Francis. "Do Architecture Critics Matter?" In *The New Criterion*, April 2002, http://www.newcriterion.com/archive/20/apr02/kamin.htm (accessed April 26, 2002).

Morton, P. A. "Pragmatism and Provinciality: Italian Criticism of the American Plan." In *Precis*, no. 4 (1983): 26-27.

Muratore, Giorgio. See Bib. I, 1979.

Muschamp, Hubert. "Nocturne for the Marxist of Venice." In *New York Times*, May 8, 1994, p. 37.

N

Negri, Antonio. *La constituzione del tempo*. Rome: Manifesto libri, 1997. English translation by Matteo Mandarini as *Time for Revolution* (London and New York: Continuum, 2003).

———. *Kairòs, Alma Venus Multitudo*. Rome: Manifesto libri, 2000. English translation by Matteo Mandarini as *Time for Revolution* (London and New York: Continuum, 2003).

———. "*N* for Negri: Antonio Negri in Conversation with Carles Guerra." Edited and translated by Jorge Mestre, Ivan Bercedo, Raimon Vilatovà et al. In *Grey Room*, no. 11 (Spring 2003): 86-109.

———. *Working Class Autonomy and the Crisis*. Trans. 'by committee'. London: Red Notes, 1979.

Nerdinger, Winfried. "Manfredo Tafuri 1935-1994." In *Baumeister* 91, no. 4 (April 1994): 5.

Nicolin, Pierluigi. "Tafuri and the Analogous City." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 16-20.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "Aurora." In *Opere*, Vol. V, edited by Giorgio Colli and Mazzino Montinari. Italian trans. Sossio Giametta. Milan: Adelphi, 1965.

Nillson, Edward O. Review of *Theories and History of Architecture*, by Manfredo Tafuri. In *Library Journal,* July 1980: 1504.

O

Ockman, Joan, ed. *Architecture Criticism Ideology*. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

———. "Postscript: Critical History and the Labors of Sisyphus." In *Architecture Criticism Ideology*, edited by JoanOckmand. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1984.

———. "Venezia e New York" / "Venice and New York." Translated by Cioni Carpi. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 56-71.

Olmo, Carlo. "Una storia, molti racconti" / "One History, Many Stories." Translated by Sebastiano Brandolini. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 74-83.

Onians, John. *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Oshima, Ken Tadashi. "Manfredo Tafuri and Japan: An Incomplete Project." In *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the University of Sydney Faculty of Architecture* 8, no. 2 (June 2003): 16-29.

P

Paci, Enzo. *Ancora sull'esistenzialismo.* Turin: Edizione radio italiana, 1956.

———. "Continuità e coerenza dei BBPR." In *Zodiac*, no. 4 (1959): 82-115.

———. *L'esistenzialismo.* Padua: Cedam, 1943.

———. *Esistenzialismo e storicismo*. Milan and Verona: Mondadori, 1950.

———. *Esistenza ed immagine*. Milan: Antonio Tarantola, 1947.

———, ed. *Federico Nietzsche*. Milan: Grazanti, 1940.

———. *Fondamenti di una sintesi filosofica*. Milan: aut aut, 1951.

———. *Ingens Sylva. Saggi sulla filosofia di G. B. Vico*. Milan: Mondadori, 1949.

———. Introduction to *Etica. Passi scelti*, by Benedetto de Spinoza. Messina and Milan: Principato, 1938.

———. Introduction to *Eupalinos. L'anima e la danza*, by Paul Valéry. Translated by Vittorio Sereni. Milan and Verona: Mondadori, 1947.

———. Introduction to *Scienza, liberta e pace*, by Aldous Huxley. Milan: IEI, 1948.

———. Introduction to *Teeteto*, by Plato. Translated by Enzo Paci. Milan: Mondadori, 1940.

———. *Il nulla e il problema dell'uomo*. Turin: Taylor, 1950.

————. *Pensiero, esistenza e valore*. Milan and Messina: Principato, 1940.

————. *Il pensiero scientifico contemporaneo*. Florence: G. C. Sansoni, 1950.

————. "Presentation at the 10ᵗʰ Triennal." In *Design Issues* 18, no. 4 (Autumn 2002): 48-53.

————. *Principi di una filosofia dell'essere*. Modena: Guanda, 1939.

————. "Problematica dell'architettura contemporanea." *Casabella-continuità*, no. 209 (January-February 1956): 41-46.

————. *Il significato del Parmenide nella filosofia di Platone*. Milan: Messina,1930.

————. *Socialita della nuova scuola*. Introduced by Giuseppe Botai. Florence: F Le Monnier, 1943.

————. *Studi di filosofia antica e moderna*. Turin: Paravia, 1949.

Paci, Enzo and Luigi Rognoni. *L'espressionismo / L'esistenzialismo*. Turin: Edizione radio italiana, 1953.

Pareyson, Luigi. *Studi sull'esistenzialismo*. Milan: Mursia, 1943.

Passerini, Luisa. *Autoritratto di gruppo*. Florence: Giunti-Astrea, 1988. Translated into English by Lisa Erdberg as *Autobiography of a Generation: Italy, 1968* (Hanover and London: Wesleyan University Press published by University Press of New England, 1996).

————. "Becoming a Subject in the Time of the Death of the Subject." Paper presented to "Body, Gender, Subjectivity: Crossing Borders of Disciplines and Institutions," Fourth European Feminist Research Conference, Bologna, 2000, http://www.women.it/4thfemconf/lunapark/passerini.htm (accessed September 23, 2004).

————. *Mussolini immaginario. Storia di una biofgrafia*. Bari: Laterza, 1991.

Payne, Alina A. "Architectural History and Art History: A Suspended Dialogue." In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 292-299.

Pedretti, Bruno, ed. *Il progetto del passato. Memoria, conservazione, restauro, architettura*. Milan: Bruno Mondadori, 1997.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. "Modern Architecture and the Historian, or the Return of Historicism." In *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects* LXVIII (April 1936): 230-240.

Piccinato, Giorgio. *L'architettura contemporanea in Francia*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1965.

————. See Bib. I, 1960, 1961, 1962.

Piggafetta, Giorgio. *Saverio Muratori. Teorie e progetti*. Venice: Marsilio, 1990.

Piranesi, Giovan Battista. *Parere su l'architettura*. Rome: 1765. English translation and edition by Caroline Beamish and David Britt, *Observations on the Letter of Monsieur Marriette: With Opinions on Architecture, and a Preface to a New Treatise on the Introduction and Progress of the Fine Arts in Europe in Ancient Times* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2002).

Plant, Margaret. "The Nostalgia of Manfredo Tafuri." In *Transition*, nos. 27-28 (Summer-Autumn 1989): 105-111.

Podro, Michael. *The Critical Historians of Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.

Porphyrios, Demetri. "Notes on a Method." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demetri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981): 96-105.

————, ed. "On the Methodology of Architectural History." Special issue, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7 (1981).

Portoghesi, Paolo. *Borromini nella cultura europea*. Rome: Officina, 1964.

———. See Bib. I, 1967.

———. See Bib. II, Z.

Preziosi, Donald, ed. *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, Oxford History of Art. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Q

Quaroni, Ludivico. "Una città eterna. Quattro lezioni da 27 secoli." In *Urbanistica*, no. 27 (June 1959).

Quatremère de Quincy, Antoine Chrysostôme. *Enciclopédie methodologique*. 3 vols. Paris: 1788-1825.

Quetglas, José. "Un Cadàver: Paraules per a Manfredo Tafuri" / "A Corpse: Words for Manfredo Tafuri." In *Quaderns d'arquitectura i urbanisme*, no. 210 (1995): 191-197.

———. See Bib. I, 1984.

Quilici, Vieri. *Architettura sovietica contemporanea*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1965.

———. See Bib. I, 1961, 1962.

R

Rajchman, John. "The Lightness of Theory (Meaning of Theory)." In *Artforum* 32, no. 1 (September 1993): 165-168.

Ray, Stefano. *L'architettura moderna nel paesi scandinavi*. Bologna: Cappelli, 1965.

———. See Bib. I, 1984.

Reichlin, Bruno. "Figures of Neorealism in Italian Architecture (Part 1)." Translated by Anthony Shugaar and revised by Branden W. Joseph. In *Grey Room*, no. 5 (Fall 2002): 78-101.

Reichlin, Bruno. "Figures of Neorealism in Italian Architecture (Part 2)." Translated by Anthony Shugaar and revised by Branden W. Joseph. In *Grey Room*, no. 6 (Winter 2002): 111-133.

Rella, Franco. "Il discredito della ragione." In *Crisi della ragione. Nuovi modelli nel rapporto tra sapere e attivita umane*, ed. Aldo Gargani, 147-178. Turin: Einaudi, 1979.

———. ed., *Il dispositivo Foucault*. Venice: CLUVA, 1977.

———. "Introduzione." In *La critica freudiana*, edited by Rodolphe Gasche. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1977.

———. "Il paradosso della ragione." In *aut aut*, no. 60 (1977): 107-111.

———. *Il silenzio e le parole. Il pensiero nel tempo della crisi*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1981.

Rendell, Jane and Iain Borden, eds. *Intersections: Architectural Histories and Critical Theories*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Rendell, Jane and Jonathan Hill, eds. "Critical Architecture." Special issue, *Journal of Architecture* 10, no. 3 (2005).

Restucci, Amerigo See Bib. I, 1974.

Ricœur, Paul. *The Contribution of French Historiography to the Theory of History*, The Zaharoff Lecture for 1978-1979. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1980.

Rifkin, Benjamin. "Benjamin's Paris, Freud's Rome: Whose London?" In *Art History* 22, no. 4 (November 1999): 619-632.

Rogers, Ernesto Nathan. *Editoriali di architettura*. Turin: Einaudi, 1966.

Romano, Dennis. Review of *Venice and the Renaissance*, by Manfredo Tafuri. *Journal of Modern History* 63, no. 4 (December 1991): 795-796.

Rosa, Alberto Asor. "Critica dell'ideologica ed esercizio storico" / "Critique of Ideology and Critical Practice." English translation by Sebastiano Brandolini. In "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri" / "The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Vittorio Gregotti. Special issue. *Casabella*, nos. 619-620 (1995): 28-33.

Rosa, Federico. "Progetto e critica dell'urbanistica moderna. I primi anni di attivita di Manfredo Tafuri, 1959-1968." Unpublished *tesi di laurea*, Università Iuav di Venezia, 2003.

Rosi, Francesco, dir. *Le mani sulla città*, dir. Warner, 1963.

Roskill, Mark. *What is Art History?* 2nd ed. 1976. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1989.

Rossi, Aldo. "An Analogical Architecture." In *Theorizing a New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965-1995*, edited by Kate Nesbitt. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

———. *L'architettura della città*. Padua: Marsilio, 1966. Engl. trans. by Diane Ghirardo and Joan Ockman as *The Architecture of the City* (Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1982).

———. *Selected Writings and Projects*. London: Architectural Design and Dublin: Gandon Editions, 1983.

Rothgeb, Carrie Lee, ed. *Abstracts of the Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. New York: International Universities Press, 1973.

Rykwert, Joseph. *The Dancing Column: On Order in Architecture*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998.

S

Sabatino, Michelangelo. Review of *Theories and History of Architecture*, by Manfredo Tafuri. *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 19 (Fall 2003-Winter 2004): 104-109.

Saggio, Antonio. "Il pendolo di Tafuri." *Coffee Break*, http://architettura.supereva.it/coffeebreak/20001223 (accessed March 5, 2002).

———. Review of "Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, *Casabella* 619-620 (1995), edited by Vittorio Gregotti. In *Domus*, no. 773 (July-August 1995): 103-104.

Salerno, Luigi. See Bib. I, 1973.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *L'age de raison*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945. Translated into Italian by Orio Vergani as *L'eta della ragione* (Milan: Bompiani, 1946).

———. *Basic Writings*. Edited by Stephen Priest. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

———. *L'être et le néant. Essai d'ontologie phénoménologique.* Paris: Gallimard, 1943.

———. *L'existentialisme est un humanisme.* Paris: Gallimard, 1946. Translated into Italian by Giancarla Mursia Re as *L'esistenzialismo è un umanesimo* (Milan: Mursia, 1946).

———. *L'imaginaire. Psychologie phenomenologique de l'imagination*. Paris: Gallimard, 1940. Translated into Italian by Enzo Bottasso as *Immagine e coscienza. Psicologia fenomenologica dell'immaginazione* (Turin: Einaudi, 1948).

———. *Le mur*. Paris: Gallimard, 1939. Translated into Italian by Paolo Mieli as *Il muro* (Turin: Einaudi, 1947).

———. *Morti senza tomba. Dramma in due atti e quattro quadri*; *Le mani sporche: dramma in sette quadri*. Ital. trans. Giorgio Monicelli. Milan: Mondadori, 1949. Originally published as *Morts sans sépulcre* (Lausanne: Marguerat, 1946) and *Le mains sales* (Paris: Gallimard, 1948).

———. *Les mouches*. Paris: Gallimard, 1947. Translated into Italian by Giusepe Lanza as *Le mosche* (Milan: Bompiani, 1947).

———. *La nausée*. Paris: Gallimard, 1938. Translated into Italian by Bruno Fonzi as *La nausea* (Turin: Einaudi, 1948).

———. *La putain respectueuse*. Paris: Gallimard, 1946. Translated into Italian by Giorgio Monicelli and Roberto Cantini as *La squaldrina timorata. Dramma in un atto e due quadri* (Milan: Mondadori, 1947).

———. *Reflexions sur la question juive*. Paris: Paul Morihien, 1947. Translated into Italian by Ignazio Weiss as *Ebrei* (Milan: Edizione di comunità,1948).

———. *Le sursis*. Paris: Gallimard, 1945. Translated into Italian by Giorgio Monicelli as *Il rinvio* (Milan: Mondadori, 1948).

Sasso, Gennaro. *Delio Cantimori. Filosofia e storiografia*. Pisa: Scuola normale superiore di Pisa, 2005.

Schwarzer, Mitchell. "History and Theory in Architectural Periodicals: Assembling Oppositions." In *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 342-348.

Scolari, Massimo. *Architecture between Memory and Hope*. New York: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980.

Scott, Felicity D. "Architecture or Techno-Utopia." In *Grey Room*, no. 3 (Spring 2001): 112-126.

Semerani, Luciano, ed. "The Venice School." Special issue, *Architectural Design*, no. 59 (1985).

Sherer, Daniel. "Un colloquio 'inquietante'. Manfredo Tafuri e la critica operativa, 1968-1980." In *La critica operativa e l'architettura*, edited by Luca Monica, 108-120. Milan: Unicopli, 2002.

———. "*Progetto* e *Ricerca*. Manfredo Tafuri come storico e come critico" / "*Progetto* and *Ricerca*: Manfredo Tafuri as Critic and Historian." In *Zodiac*, no. 15 (March-August 1996): 32-51.

———. "Tafuri's Renaissance: Architecture, Representation, Transgression." In *Assemblage*, no. 28 (1995): 34-45.

———. "Typology and its Vicissitudes: Observations on a Critical Category." In *Precis*, no. 13 (n.d.), http://www.arch.columbia.edu/Pub/Precis/site/13/dsherer.html (accessed January 14, 2005).

Shutz, Bernhard. See Bib. I, 1984.

Singelenberg, Pieter. See Bib. I, 1979.

Soprani, Lidia. See Bib. I, 1962.

Spezzaferro, Luigi. See Bib. I, 1973.

Stam, Mart, Hans Schmidt, El Lissitzky, et al., eds. *ABC: Contributions on Building, 1924-1928*. Comp. Claude Lichtenstein, Okatar Macel, Jorg Stuzebecker, et al. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

Sykes, A. Krista. "A Portrait of the Scholar as a Truffle Dog: A Re-evaluation of Vincent Scully." In *Additions to Architectural History: Proceedings of the XIXth Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, edited by John Macarthur and Antony Moulis. Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2002 (cd rom).

———. "The Vicissitudes of Realism: Realism in Architecture in the 1970s." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 2004.

T

Tentori, Francesco. See Bib. I, 1964.

Teodori, Massimo. See Bib. I, 1960.

Teyssot, Georges. "Emil Kaufmann and the Architecture of Reason: Klassizismus and 'Revolutionary Architecture'." Translated by Christian Hubert. *Oppositions*, no. 13 (Summer 1978): 46-74.

———. "Heterotopias and the History of Spaces." In *Architecture Theory since 1968*, edited by K. Michael Hays. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998. Translated by David Stewart from Massimo Cacciari, Georges Teyssot, Manfredo Tafuri and Franco Rella, *Il dispositivo Foucault* (Venice: CLUVA, 1977); revised in *A+U*, no. 121 (October 1980).

———. "Neoclassic and 'Autonomous' Architecture: the Formalism of Emil Kaufmann." In "On the Methodology of Architectural History," special issue, edited by Demitri Porphyrios, *Architectural Design* 51, nos. 6-7: 25-29.

———. "One Portrait of Tafuri." Interview with Georges Teyssot. By Paul Henneger. In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," special issue, ed. Ignasi de Solà-Morales, *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 10-16.

———. See Bib. I, 1980.

Thoenes, Christof. "Bramante-Giovannoni. Il Rinascimento interpretato dall'architettura fascista, Manfredo Tafuri su Giovannoni." *Casabella* 634 (May 1996): 64-73.

Tournikiotis, Panayotis. *The Historiography of Modern Architecture*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1999.

Tronti, Mario. *Operai e capitale*. Turin: Einaudi, 1966.

V

Vattimo, Gianni and Pier Aldo Rovatti. *Il pensiero debole*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1984.

Verschaffel, Bart. *Architecture (is) as a Gesture*. Translated by Jeroen Olyslaegers and Gert Morreel. Lucerne: Quart, 2001.

———. "Kleine theorie van het portret." In *De Witte Raaf*, no. 81 (1999): 1-5. Translated into French by Daniel Cunin in reduced form as "Théorie du portrait" in *Moi ou un autre. Autoportraits d'artistes belges* (Tournai: La Renaissance du Livre, 2002). Full translation in *Nature*

morte, portrait, paysage. Essais sur les genres en peinture (Brussels: le lettre volée, forthcoming 2006).

———. "The Monumental: On the Meaning of a Form." In *Journal of Architecture*, no. 4 (Winter 1999): 333-336.

Vidler, Anthony. "Disenchanted Histories: The Legacies of Manfredo Tafuri." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 29-36.

———. "Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism, 1930-1975." Unpublished PhD dissertation, Technische Universiteit Delft, 2005, http://www.library. tudelft.nl/delftdiss/pdf/2005/arc_vidler-20051024.pdf (accessed November 15, 2005).

Vignola, Giacomo Barozzi [Da]. *Regole delle cinque ordini d'architettura*. Trans. Branko Mitrovic as *Canon of the Five Orders of Architecture*. 1562. New York: Acanthus Press, 1999.

Vitruvius. *On Architecture*. Trans. Frank Granger. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931, 1934.

W

Walker, Paul. "Semiotics and the Discourse of Architecture." Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Auckland, 1986.

Weiss, Peter. *Die Verfolgung und Ermordung Jean Paul Marats Dargestellt Durch die Schauspielgruppe des Hospizes zu Charenton Unter Anleitung des Herrn de Sade*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1964. English translation by Geoffrey Skelton as *The Persecution and Assassination of Marat as Performed by the Inmates of the Asylum of Charenton Under the Direction of the Marquis de Sade* (London: Calder and Boyars, 1965). Adapted to film as *Marat/Sade*, directed by Peter Brook (MGM, 1966) [dvd].

Whiffen, Marcus, ed. *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture: Papers from the 1964 AIA-ACSA Teaching Seminar*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1970.

Wigley, Mark. "Manfredo Tafuri (1935-1994)." In *Archis*, no. 4 (April 1994): 6-7.

———. "Post-Operative History." In "Being Manfredo Tafuri," edited by Ignasi de Solà-Morales. Special issue. *Architecture New York*, nos. 25-26 (2000): 47-53.

Williams, William Carlos. "El hombre." In *Al Que Quiere!* by William Carlos Williams. Boston: The Four Seas Company, 1917.

Wittkower, Rudolf. *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*. London: The Warburg Institute, 1949.

———. *Gothic vs. Classic: Architectural Projects in Seventeenth Century Italy*. New York: George Braziller, 1974.

Wood, Christopher S. ed. *Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 2003.

Wölfflin, Heinrich. *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art*. Trans. by M. D. Hottinger. 1915. New York: Dover Publications: 1950.

Z

Zevi, Bruno. *Architettura e storiografia*. Milan: Tamburini, 1951.

———. *Cronache di architettura*, 24 vols. Bari: Laterza, 1978.

———. "History as a Method of Teaching Architecture." In *The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture: Papers from the 1964 AIA-ACSA Teaching Seminar*, edited by Marcus Whiffen. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1970.

———. *Il linguaggio moderno dell'architettura. Guida al codice anticlassico*. Turin: Einaudi, 1973.

———. "Michelangelo e non-finito architettonica." In *Pretesti di critica architettonica*, 51-95. Turin: Einaudi, 1983.

———. *Poetica nell'architettura neoplastica*. Milan: Tamburini, 1953.

———. *Saper vedere l'architettura. Saggio sull'interpretazione spaziale dell'architettura.* Turin: Einaudi, 1948.

———. *Storia dell'architettura moderna*. Turin: Einaudi, 1950.

Zevi, Bruno and Paolo Portoghesi, eds. *Michelangelo architetto*. Turin: Einaudi, 1964.