

REIA #07-08 / 2017
298 páginas
ISSN: 2340-9851
www.reia.es

Alejandro Valdivieso

Universidad Politécnica de Madrid. ETSAM / avaldivieso@gsd.harvard.edu arqvaldivieso@hotmail.com

Rafael Moneo's Writings for Arquitecturas Bis (1974-1985). The figure of the architect: Gregotti & Rossi (1974)

Rafael Moneo (1937) was one founding editors of the Barcelona-based magazine *Arquitecturas Bis*. When its last issue was published in 1985, Moneo was already working as Chairman of the Department of Architecture at Harvard University Graduate School of Design. The publication proved an 'after-modern' philosophical and historical self-consciousness approach; a theoretical structure capable to distil self-reflexivity, as evidenced significantly by Moneo's writings, dedicated to Twentieth-century architects. These texts, framed between his tenure professorship at Barcelona (1972-73) and Madrid (1980-85) underline some of the issues he addressed upon his arrival to Harvard: On the one hand, they allow us to elucidate his concern on the 'figure of the architect' and embrace a humanist vision of the architect; on the other hand, to proof his role played as active translator of 'La Tendenza's' ideology into North American academia. Moneo knew well the Italian theoretical agenda after having spent two years in Italy as a scholar of the Royal Academy of Spain – a wilful period to reflect upon theory and history – and because of the cultivated Catalan-Italian connection while teaching in Barcelona. Thus it is no coincidence that his first major writing (1974) was dedicated to Vittorio Gregotti (1927) and Aldo Rossi (1931-1997).

Rafael Moneo (1937) fue uno de los miembros fundadores de la revista barcelonesa *Arquitecturas Bis*. Cuando ésta publica su último número en 1985, Moneo ya se encuentra dirigiendo el Departamento de Arquitectura de la Graduate School of Design de la Universidad de Harvard. La publicación se caracterizó por una nueva conciencia filosófica e histórica 'after-modern'; una estructura teórica capaz de destilar autorreflexión, como evidencian los artículos escritos por Moneo, principalmente dedicados a arquitectos del siglo XX. Estos textos, enmarcados en el periodo comprendido entre su cátedra de Barcelona (1972-73) y de Madrid (1980-85) subrayan muchos de los aspectos abordados desde su llegada a Harvard: de una parte, nos permiten explicar su inquietud acerca de la 'figura del arquitecto' y comprender su visión humanista del arquitecto; de otra parte, comprobar su papel como transmisor de las ideas de la 'Tendencia' italiana a la agenda pedagógica norte americana. Moneo conocía de primera mano la cultura arquitectónica de aquel país, después de los dos años pensionado en la Academia española de Bellas Artes en Roma –un deliberado periodo para reflexión sobre la Historia y el papel de la teoría–, y debido también la cultivada relación catalana-italiana durante su cátedra barcelonesa. No es por tanto casualidad que el primer gran texto esté dedicad a Vittorio Gregotti (1927) y Aldo Rossi (1931-1997).

Arquitecturas Bis; Rafael Moneo; Aldo Rossi; Vittorio Gregotti; History; Text

Fecha de envío: 17/10/16 | Fecha de aceptación: 14/12/2016



When the last issue of the Spanish magazine *Arquitecturas Bis: información gráfica de actualidad* was published in Barcelona in 1985, Rafael Moneo (Tudela, Navarra, 1937) — one of its founders, and member of its editorial board since its first issue, launched in 1974 —, was already working as Chairman of the Department of Architecture at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design. Early before, in March 9, 1985, Moneo gave his last lecture as “Kenzo Tange Visiting Professor of Architecture.”¹ The lecture, under the title “The Solitude of Buildings,”² was meant also to be his introduction as the new Chair. Consciously and deliberately, Moneo showed at the very end three of his works — the Bankinter building in Madrid (1972-76), the Logroño Town Hall (1973-81) and the Roman Museum in Mérida, the construction of which was currently finishing up (1980-1986) — in order to exemplify his argument: “Why buildings instead of projects [designs]?” he started saying. Moneo was indirectly introducing to the school’s audience the pedagogical agenda he was going to conduct for the next 5 years: An effort to bring the existing gaps between academia and professional practice; to dissolve oppositions between theoretical debates, speculative paper based design techniques, and practice; in order to leave behind the ideological dialectical theory-practice that very much described in the 1980’s North American architectural education.³

In this sense, one of the achievements that brought Moneo to Harvard was precisely his condition as both a leading scholar committed to the ongoing theoretical agenda; or in other words, his work as writer, historian and professor; and his experience as practitioner, as a builder. Moneo’s words insisted on the importance of considering theory to be

1. The “Kenzo Tange Professorship” (Officially “Kenzo Tange Visiting Chair in Architecture and Urban Design”) was established in November 7, 1983, in honor of the Japanese architect Kenzo Tange (1913-2005). Vittorio Gregotti was the first Kenzo Tange Visiting Professor (Spring 1984) and Rafael Moneo the second one (Spring 1985). See: “Kenzo Tange Professorship Established” in MOSTAFAVI, Mohsen; CHRISTENSEN, Peter (Eds.), *Instigations, engaging architecture, landscape and the city GSD075*, Zurich, Lars Müller Publishers, 2012, pp. 410.
2. MONEO, Rafael, *The Solitude of Buildings*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 1986.
3. See McLEOD, Mary, “The End of Innocence: From Political Activism to Postmodernism”, in OCKMAN, Joan (Ed.), *Architecture School. Three Centuries of Educating Architects in North America*, Cambridge, MA and London, England, MIT Press, 2012, pp. 162-201.

a consequence of the development out of practical solutions — *to build* — by confronting architecture with reality — construction and materiality, landscape and city —. This claim is highly important in order to understand his architectural philosophy and design approach: Moneo, as constructor of the city whose main intellectual vehicle is History. Whilst the Bankinter building initiated Moneo's international reputation — a major building in the capital of Spain —, Logroño represented his first public building, and Mérida the first possibility to reveal his attitude to the past, to Roman construction, and to those past architectures he had studied since his early years, which are still present in the lectures and seminars taught at Harvard University Graduate School of Design in Cambridge.⁴

Proclaiming itself as a magazine devoted to current architectural affairs, (“información gráfica de actualidad”, in Spanish), the first issue of the self-styled so-called “little magazine” *Arquitecturas Bis* lacked any kind of editorial stand but consciously pursued a strong international and cosmopolitan scope, with an emphasized reference to Louis Khan's death, and with the publication of the work of Richard Meier in the Bronx, New York.⁵ *Arquitecturas Bis* lasted for just a little more than eleven years publishing a total number of 32 single and 10 doubles issues. Although the last issue of the magazine included an organized index — by issues, subjects (history, theory & criticism, texts, architects & works, and book reviews) as well as by authors —, the publication did not organize beforehand the content among thematic or other possible categories, but it rather worked more spontaneously in the preparation of every issue, which finally could appear to be very coral or heterogeneous by itself, but also very different from each other. The seemingly lack of a specific editorial policy — going hand-in-hand to the graphic design — can be addressed as one of its most distinguishing features.

The publisher and Editor in Chief of *Arquitecturas Bis* was the Catalan writer and intellectual Rosa Regàs (Barcelona, 1933), who directed the Barcelona-based independent publishing house La Gaya Ciencia. She, together with the architect Oriol Bohigas (Barcelona, 1925) and the graphic designer Enric Satué (Barcelona, 1983), were the prime movers of the editorial project at the beginning, and responsible of putting together a list of emerging figures within the discipline of architecture and design to work on the publication. At the time, La Gaya Ciencia's publishing catalogue was specialized in literature, poetry, politics and architecture.⁶

4. MONEO, Rafael, “Today's Architecture as Seen through Enduring Concerns”, Lecture course, Spring Term 2016, Harvard University Graduate School of Design (Teaching Assistant: Alejandro Valdivieso). Part I: “The Notion of Knowledge in Architecture”; Part II: “Form and Time: Architecture as an Inevitable Witness of Time”; Part III: “Architecture versus Necessity”; Part IV: “Architecture versus Necessity.”

5. *Arquitecturas Bis* n.1, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, May 1974.

6. Regàs had been working closely with the local branch of Architect's Association in Cataluña (COAC) in the publication of several books since the late sixties. Eg: LLORENS, Tomás (ed.), *Arquitectura, historia y teoría de los signos*, El Symposium de Castelldefels, 1974; LLORENS, T., and CANTER, D., *Hacia una Psicología de la Arquitectura*. Barcelona, 1973; SCALVINI, M. L., *Para una Teoría de la Arquitectura*, 1972.

In addition to the ‘non-official’ three founding editors, the list of editors was completed with the architects and professors Federico Correa (1924), Lluís Domènech (1940), the aforementioned Rafael Moneo, Helio Piñón (1942), Manuel de Solà-Morales (1939-2012) and the philosopher Tomás Llorens (1936). The Basque architect Luis Peña Ganchegui (1926-2009) joined the editorial board with double issue 17/18. From 1977, Fernando Villavecchia (1951), by then a young architecture student, joined as the Editorial Board secretary. The magazine arranged a very efficient internal structure that actively participated in the production and edition of all the numbers, generating around 500 writings, about 30% of the total content, stemming news, notes, theoretical writings, historical essays, criticism articles, and books reviews. The editors of the magazine created a complementary team; their similarities and differences gave the magazine its specific *aura* and shaped its contents. Thus, *Arquitecturas Bis* editorial formula was novel in the sense that allowed a group of young professionals working together were each of the editors faced the production of the publication from a different perspective. Jointly and separately, they performed the theoretical anxiety and the spirit of the time. Each editor emphasized a particular theoretical affiliation and a reactive approach to the whole domain of architecture culture, compelling the magazine to play an important role as a printed space committed to the endeavor of disseminating architectural theory. By the end of the 60’s, a new discourse was filtrated through media, resembling the avant-garde propaganda: if in the early decades of the twentieth-century the *medium* was to disseminate and shape up the avant-garde, in the late 60’s and 70’s, the aim was no other than trying to unfold the ‘modern’ ideology. *Arquitecturas Bis* practiced what could be described as an ‘after-modern’ philosophical and historical self-consciousness that contributed to consolidate a break with the traditions of modernism, characterized with a new historiographic impulse; a significant sign of an age that brought the rise of architectural theory in a context of critical reading of modernism and the consequent emergence of theories and histories of ‘resistance’ or ‘reaction’, together with the engagement and reception to the whole domain of cultural theory.⁷ [fig. 1]

7. The magazines that best exemplified this rise of History and Theory were Lotus International, Oppositions, and Arquitecturas Bis, published respectively in Milan, New York and Barcelona. These magazines were able to uniquely identify the distance and differentiation between the exercise of theory and criticism, design practice and the ‘progetto’, working as a vehicle for communication and debate; propounding to do so, the edition of a careful selection of writings, the translation ad hoc of texts coming from different reviews in different languages, as well as by publishing diverse works and projects, recovering valuable architectures overlooked by the official history. As an example, the monographic issue of Arquitecturas Bis, from 1978, with original texts by Rafael Moneo, as well as texts translated ad hoc to Spanish and originally published as editorials in Oppositions (Neo-Functionalism by Mario Gandelsonas originally in number 5 or Post-Functionalism by Peter Eisenman in number). These magazines were grouped together not only because of their common theoretical stand, but also because they were well connected somehow or other, directly and indirectly, by their editors, especially through the different meetings they held together. The first took place outside Barcelona in 1975, and included Lotus, Oppositions and Arquitecturas Bis. The second one took place in New York in 1977 and included also the French magazine A.M.C., the Italian Controspazio and “a couple of specially invited guests such as Ada Louis Huxtable, Colin Rowe or Richard Meier”.

Figure 1. Mock-up for anniversary post-card.
From left to right: Rafael Moneo, Manuel de Solà-Morales, Tomás Llorens, Oriol Bohigas, Rosa Regàs, Fernando Villavecchia, Luis Peña Ganchequi, Federico Correa, Helio Piñón, Enric Satué, Lluís Domènech. (E. Satué Archive)



Moneo, who had qualified as an architect in 1961 in Madrid's School of Architecture,⁸ was the only editor from *Arquitectura Bis* that did not come directly from Barcelona's – or the Catalan⁹ – intellectual environment.¹⁰ He had met the Catalan architects through the 'Pequeños Congresos', organized by the editor of *Arquitectura* magazine, Carlos de Miguel, and Oriol Bohigas since the mid-1960's. The Catalan group was mainly represented by the above-mentioned Bohigas, Correa and Domènech, also editors of *Arquitecturas Bis*. These encounters not only strengthened ties between architects coming from different parts of Spain – Cataluña, Valencia, Sevilla, Galicia or the Basque Country, amongst others – but enabled intense processes of intellectual exchange between a couple of Spanish generations and their foreign contemporaries. *Arquitecturas Bis* provides evidence of this, as mentioned. The other reason that explains Moneo's participation in the magazine was his arrival to Barcelona's School of Architecture to teach, beginning in the academic year 1971-2, after the professorship competition of 'Elementos de Composición' held in Spain in 1970, where a very young Professor Moneo was selected ahead of other prestigious architects from an older generation, as in the case of Federico Correa, with

8. Moneo entered the school of architecture in 1956 after two years of preliminary science courses and training in drawing. This intense curriculum allowed professional architects in Spain to have a solid education in pure sciences, humanities and a complete domain of representation and drawing techniques. Although the School of architecture (Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura) was part of a Polytechnic university (Universidad Politécnica de Madrid), academia was still organized in a "traditional manner, following the structure of the Beaux-Arts School in Paris." For a more detailed description of Moneo's education period at the university in Madrid, see: GÓNZALEZ DE CANALES, Francisco and RAY, Nicholas. "Biography" in Rafael Moneo: Building, Teaching and Writing. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 13-17.
9. The Catalan or 'Països Catalanes' context, including Valencia (Piñón or Llorens came from Valencia). To this respect see: LÓPEZ SEGURA, Manuel, Architecture for a Recovered Democracy. Public Patronage, Regional Identity and Civil Significance in 1980's Valencian Architecture, Thesis (Graduate, Master in Design Studies), Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 2013.
10. Tomás Llorens and Helio Piñón came from Valencia (although Piñón studied in Barcelona and Llorens in Valencia and Madrid), we must include them in the catalan-valencia ("Països Catalanes") context. The other case was the Basque architect Luis Peña Ganchequi (1926-2009), who joined the editorial board with double issue 17/18.

whom he worked in the magazine, and to who was dedicated one of his first texts published in the magazine.¹¹ Moneo soon became a point of reference for the younger generations of architects teaching and studying at the school,¹² and his *Catalan drift* was seen with a certain irony and suspicion from Madrid's intellectual environment.¹³ During his chairmanship at the School of Barcelona, Moneo continued living and working on his practice in Madrid, travelling every week from Madrid to Barcelona; this situation can be considered to be decisive regarding some contents published in *Arquitecturas Bis*. Such was the case, for example, of the double issue entirely focused on Madrid,¹⁴ which can be compared to the one dedicated to Cataluña published some time before.¹⁵ Madrid's monographic issue, published in July 1978, and whose content is not to be ascribed directly to Moneo,¹⁶ portrayed on its cover – not coincidentally – an image by the Catalan photographer Catalá-Roca of Sáenz de Oiza's Banco de Bilbao building in construction. Even though Moneo does not made direct reference to Oiza – apart from the photograph on the cover no any other reference to the Banco de Bilbao tower is made –, his text “Madrid ‘78: 28 arquitectos no numerarios”¹⁷ frames the work of a young generation of architects and professors working in Madrid, including himself, who are indebted

11. MONEO, Rafael, “Il Giardinetto de Correa-Milà” in *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 1, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, May 1974, pp. 17-21.

12. TUSQUETS, Oscar, *Todo es Comparable*, Barcelona, Tusquets, pp. 61.

13. FULLAONDO, Juan Daniel, “Notas de Sociedad”, *Nueva Forma* 108, 1975, pp. 7.

14. *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 23/24, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, July, 1978. Includes texts by Antón Capitel (ETSAM Professor) Rafael Moneo, Oriol Bohigas, Carlos Flores (director of *Hogar y Arquitectura* magazine), Juan Daniel Fullaondo (director of *Nueva Forma* magazine) and Carlos de Miguel (director *Arquitectura* magazine).

15. *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 13/14. Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, May-July, 1976. Includes texts by Oriol Bohigas, Helio Piñón, Lluís Domènech, Víctor Pérez Escolano (Sevilla), Oriol Bohigas, Manuel de Solà-Morales and Rafael Moneo.

16. “Querido amigo: Hace pocos días recibí tu carta refiriéndote al posible número que queréis hacer en *Bis* y, de manera extraña, me recordó en algún sentido la que acabáis de publicar de Mendini: consciente o inconscientemente, ¡qué lejos estáis de nosotros! En un primer momento parecía como si, de repente, quisierais volver a las discusiones que Moneo y tú publicabais en los años 69. Volver entonces al tema de Madrid o de Barcelona, a la peculiaridad de cada una de las dos “escuelas” podría ser, por lo menos para nosotros, una trampa de la que coherentemente tenemos que escapar, centrándonos en intentar aclarar dónde estamos y cuál es nuestra situación concreta. Por ello, el que ahora queráis volver al viejo tema no sé si debería entenderlo como una deliciosa profanación del cadáver o como un voluntarismo que habría que agradecer con lágrimas en los ojos.” (Carlos Sambricio, letter to Oriol Bohigas. Dated in Madrid, November 9, 1976). In BOHIGAS, Oriol, *Epistolario 1951-1994* (Ed. Antonio Pízza and Martha Torres), Colección de *Arquitectura* n. 50, Colegio Oficial de Aparejadores y Arquitectos Técnicos de la Región de Murcia, Murcia, 2005, pp. 213).

17. MONEO, Rafael, “Madrid ‘78: 28 arquitectos no numerarios” in *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 23/24, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, July 1978, pp. 22-54.

to the older generation of masters — of which Oiza,¹⁸ with whom Moneo did his apprenticeship in Madrid while being a student, was its greatest representative —. Moneo’s active role in Barcelona implied distance from his first teaching years in Madrid (from 1966 to 1969) and consequently from the so-called ‘Escuela de Madrid’, whose ideology was mainly promoted by the magazine *Nueva Forma* (1967-75),¹⁹ directed by Juan Daniel Fullaondo, and aligned with an older generation of architects, including Oiza.²⁰ In a sense, *Arquitecturas Bis* can be seen as a counterpoint of *Nueva Forma* (1967-75),²¹ and its establishment, which replaced and succeeded Fullaondo’s publication, was taken by its editors as the beginning for a new editorial experiment — less centralized, more cosmopolitan,²² less identifiable with rigid ideologies — but overall, distinguished with a theoretical endeavor and critical outlook; characterized with a new historiographic impulse, a significant sign of an age that brought the rise of architectural theory in a context of critical reading of modernism.

As it has been stated, *Arquitecturas Bis* proved an ‘after-modern’ philosophical and historical self-consciousness approach, but unlike precedent cases, it was in itself a theoretical structure — image-idea — capable to distil self-reflexivity, as evidenced significantly by the texts Moneo published for the magazine. In this sense, almost all of the content Moneo published in *Arquitecturas Bis*, from 1974 to 1985 — framed between his tenure professorship at Barcelona (1972-73) and his arrival

18. Very soon, and during his final years as a graduate student, Moneo got in touch with professional practice and began his apprenticeship (1957-1961) in the office of the great master of modernity in Spain, Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza (1918-2000). At that time, Oiza was working in a new commission, the residential towers Torres Blancas, in Madrid, and Moneo participated in that project, amongst others. Years later, from 1971-81, and as a result of a competition where he competed with other important members of his generation, Oiza built the Banco de Bilbao tower in Madrid. Together with Torres Blancas, the Banco de Bilbao tower was “representative of the ambition of architects of Oiza’s generation to produce buildings in Spain of an authentic modernist character.” GÓNZALEZ DE CANALES, Francisco and RAY, Nicholas. “Biography” in Rafael Moneo: Building, Teaching and Writing, op. cit., pp. 13-17.

See also: MONEO, Rafael, “Perfil de Oiza Joven”, *El Croquis* n. 32-33, 1988, pp. 176.

19. See: PEREZ MORENO, Lucia C. *La Construcción de una Cultura Arquitectónica en España (1966-1975)*. Thesis (Ph.D.), Madrid, ETSAM-Universidad Politécnica, 2013.

20. “Participando de la confianza en la arquitectura y en su ejercicio, más parece que en lugar de tener precisas referencias con respecto a los maestros madrileños representan la supervivencia de algunos de sus aspectos: de sus papeles como profesionales, ante todo; de la teórica desconfianza hacia el academicismo que parece aun invadir la conciencia de todo arquitecto «moderno» de Madrid; y del horror a que cualquier teoría sistemática pueda frenar el papel artístico que para su arquitectura se reclama, o impedir el principal medio desde que ésta se configura: los ingredientes diversos que se recogen de las arquitecturas que interesan —incluidas aquellas que podemos llamar disciplinares— para ser utilizados en tal configuración” (“Notas sobre una generación”, *Arquitecturas bis* n. 23/24, September/July 1978, pp. 58).

21. Conversation between Alejandro Valdivieso and Lluís Domènech, founding editor of *Arquitecturas Bis*. Barcelona, July 2015.

22. *Arquitecturas Bis* stood out from other magazines published in Spain partly due to its connections with several North American and Italian publications, such as *Oppositions* from New York and the Milanese *Lotus*.

to Harvard in 1985²³ – was entirely dedicated to Twentieth-century contemporary architects, with the only exception of John Soane (1753-1837), albeit Soane is not a twenty-century architect, Moneo’s approach to his work allow us to understand his figure at least as a ‘contemporary builder’, in an historical sense, in comparison to some of the other figures he wrote about. Although Moneo had already published a book review in the first issue of the magazine,²⁴ as well as the aforementioned article about the interior design of a famous restaurant in Barcelona designed by Federico Correa and Alfonso Milà, it is not until the fourth edition of the magazine, published in November 1974,²⁵ where we find Moneo’s first relevant contribution. Entitled “*Gregotti & Rossi*”, it introduced a larger investigation on these contemporary Italian architects. The monographic issue included articles by Oriol Bohigas on Gregotti and Josep Quetglas on Rossi. Less than a year after, in July, 1975 (Issue n. 8) Moneo wrote about Le Corbusier – “La Olivetti de Le Corbusier” – and the projects the Swiss architect did for Olivetti in Milan in 1962. Le Corbusier’s Italian projects were a perfect excuse for Moneo to insist on how the description of a specific architecture implied already making it understandable; and understanding it meant acquainting the way in which it was thought, thus the way in which it was built. How should architecture be studied and analyzed, he claimed, from a point of view rather than the architects’? Prior to any kind of analysis, Moneo stressed what he considered to be the origin of any architecture: The logic and

23. In this regard, it is not coincidental that his last contribution to the magazine (issue n. 52, published in December, 1985) is an extensive essay about the John Hancock building in downtown Boston, designed and built by I. M. Pei & Partners, who include H.N. Cobb, lead designer of the building, and his predecessor as Chairman of the Department of Architecture at the GSD, upon which he will focus on.

24. MONEO, Rafael, “Arquitectura del Siglo XIX en Madrid, Valencia y Mallorca, Arquitecturas Bis n. 1, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, May 1974, pp. 11-15.

25. The content of the issue, not related to Gregotti or Rossi, is extended by a comment on Manuel de Solá-Morales’ text – “Los Nuevos Geómetras. La Escuela de Cambridge” (“The New Geometers. The School of Cambridge”)–; a text on the town planning of Warsaw written by Federico Correa – “Varsovia: la resurrección patriótica” (“Warsaw: the patriotic resurrection”)– in addition to the chronicle by Helio Piñón – “Los mundiales del signo. Semiótica arquitectónica en el ‘Primo Congreso’ de Milán” (“The world cup of signs. Architectural Semiotics in the ‘Primo Congreso’ of Milan”)– of one of the seminars dedicated to architecture in the First Congress of the International Association of Semiotics, held in Milan a few months earlier. The issue is completed with a brief note alluding to the renewal of the Italian magazine Lotus International – “Padre corajudo, hijo consagrado, nieto señorito” (“Brave Father, consecrated son, gentleman grandson”)–, as well as with a brief critique-like text – “Rossi y Venturi frente a Taut o Rossi y Venturi frente a Taut” (“Rossi and Venturi vs Taut or Rossi and Venturi vs Taut”)–, about the Symposium on The Pathos of Functionalism held on the 9th and 13th of September, 1974 in the Internationales Design Zentrum of Berlin. This critique briefly gathers part of the work developed in the above mentioned symposium and emphasizes (beyond the historical review of the residential Berlin colonies of the 20s) Rossi and Venturi’s view, across their writings and projects, towards functionalism and neo-functionalism theories. As the critique concludes: “the preeminence of the rational in the sense used by the Tendenza or the historical denial of the functionalism: won’t they be parallel bases for architecture that don’t really seem so formally distant to us?” The question that closes the critique will serve as an introduction for the content of the next issue of the magazine (the fifth one) where it reproduces a translated version of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown’s paper “Functionalism, yes, but”.

formal scheme that supports form.²⁶ Which idea makes this architecture possible? How can they be described and portrayed? In this respect, when Moneo insists on the fact that the ‘description’ — formal, graphic — of any architecture already implies understanding it, he is referring not only to the way in which this architecture has been thought but, above all and for that matter, on how it has been built.²⁷ These words on Le Corbusier, specifically addressed on his own works at the 1985 “Kenzo Tange Lecture” at Harvard, mask Moneo’s own design approach; when describing these projects he is venturing an approach to his own architectural Philosophy and to his own work. Theories — ideas — are to be understood as developing out of practical solutions, implying always a direct convergence amidst the way in which ideas are represented, thus finally built.

As happened with the text on Gregotti and Rossi, and barely two years after, in March 1976 (Issue n. 12), Moneo committed again an approach to another pair of architects, in this case to the modernist Catalan architect, disciple of Gaudi, Josep Maria Jujol (1879-1949), and the Portuguese Álvaro Siza Vieira (1933). In 1976, Siza Vieira was an emergent Iberian architect, and the magazine published, along with Moneo’s ‘oppositions’ writing, a review of his first works. Moneo placed Siza’s work into a historical context propounding to do so a critical — rather than a merely descriptive — reading of his work. Under the heading “Arquitecturas en los Márgenes”, Moneo deployed possible convergences to the work of both architects, who occupied symmetrical positions in relation to the historical time that had framed their work: Whilst Jujol would live together with Gaudi the last years of modernism in Cataluña, Siza was in the 1970’s strengthening his work within the fall term of the modern movement.²⁸

Moneo will publish again a text dedicated to an architect five years later (double issue number 38/39) published in July/October, 1981. The title was “4 citas, 4 notas” and it was focused on the work of John Soane, specifically on his house-museum in London. The text was articulated around four Twentieth-century architecture historian’s quotations — in order of appearance within the text: Philip Johnson (*Writings*, 1979); H. R. Hitchcock (*Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, 1952); John Summerson (*Georgian London*, 1962) and Emil Kaufman (*Architecture in the Age of Reason, Baroque and Post-Baroque in England, Italy and France*, 1955) —. Not coincidentally, Moneo had prefaced the Spanish translation of Kaufman’s book in 1974.²⁹ He will publish after

26. “Llega entonces uno a sospechar que describir un edificio como éste sea, ante todo, y en primer lugar, dar con la idea que permitió pensarlo, imaginarlo, proyectarlo. Dicho en otras palabras, ver cuál sea el esquema, aquella primera idea, que soporta la forma” *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 8, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, July 1975, pp. 18-20.

27. “Vuelvo, pues, así a la reflexión con que comenzaba estas líneas al reconocer cuánto la descripción de una arquitectura implica ya entenderla y entenderla quiere decir saber algo de cómo ha sido pensada, de cómo se ha construido.” *Ibidem*.

28. MONEO, Rafael, “Arquitecturas en los Márgenes”, *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 12, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, March 1976, pp. 2.

29. MONEO, Rafael, “Prólogo a la edición española”, in Emil Kaufmann: *La Arquitectura de la Ilustración: Barroco y pos-barroco en Inglaterra, Italia y Francia*, Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1974, pp. vii-xxv.

that a couple of writings on Louis Kahn (Issue No. 41/42) published in January/June, 1982, and Mies van der Rohe, published in July, 1983 (Issue No. 44) under the title “Un Mies menos conocido” where he described some of the residential projects Mies built in Germany from the mid 1920’s to the early 1930’s, emphasizing the importance of Mies’ European works.

What may have in common Rossi, Gregotti, Le Corbusier, Jujol, Siza, Soane, Kahn and Mies van der Rohe? Moneo’s writings for *Arquitecturas Bis*, especially those ones focused on the work of several architects, underlined some of the issues he addressed in 1985 at Harvard, as well as the ones he had been developing while teaching in Barcelona (1971-1977)³⁰ and Madrid (1980-85),³¹ focusing on contemporary architects — insisting on architects, and on built works —. On the one hand, Moneo’s texts allow us to elucidate his concern on the “figure of the architect” and embrace his humanist vision of the architect as cultured intellectual.³² How contemporary architects establish its relation with History? On the other hand, and embracing the aforementioned concern, his texts addressed the boundaries or ‘margins’ (using his own words) between *progetto* and building, and the question on how the construction of buildings is definitely capable of shaping theory.³³ It is precisely here where Moneo deals with construction — technique — itself and with representation — drawing and modelling —.³⁴

This vision of the architect is exactly the one implied when he described the work of Gregotti and Rossi for *Arquitecturas Bis*. Even though the magazine — and Moneo’s writing — confronts (right from the cover’s chart) both Italian architects, and the way in which contents are structured compels their comparison in opposition, a series of common

30. MONEO, Rafael, Ejercicios del curso de elementos de composición 1972-1973, Barcelona, Cátedra de Elementos de Composición, ediciones de la ETSAB, 1973; 1973-1974; 1974; 1971-1972, 1975; 1975; 1974-1975, 1975; 1975-1976, 1976; 1976-1977, 1977.

31. The courses taught at ETSAM in Madrid and in Harvard were published later in his book *Theoretical Anxiety and Design Strategies in the Work of Eight Contemporary Architects*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2004.

32. “Lección 2. La idea del proyecto: la figura del arquitecto”. MONEO, Rafael, op. cit., Ejercicios del curso de elementos de composición 1972-1973, pp. 5. In relation to this topic Moneo includes two bibliographical sources: Briggs M.S., *The Architect in the History*, Oxford, 1927 and Giovanni G., *La Figura artistica e professionale dell’architetto*, Firenze, 1929.

33. “But without the connection that existed in the past between project and production, builders become mere instruments, and technique becomes subjugated — a slave— The intimacy between architecture and construction has been broken. The intimacy was once the very nature of architectural work and somehow was always manifested in its appearance. We know that a deterministic discourse doesn’t explain architecture, but we admit that architects should accept techniques and use building systems for starting the process of the formal invention that ends in architecture.” MONEO, Rafael, *The Solitude of Buildings*, op. cit., pp. 9.

34. In this respect, Moneo published in 1976 (with Juan Antonio Cortés) the book *Comentarios sobre dibujos de 20 arquitectos actuales*, Barcelona, Cátedra de Elementos de Composición, Monografía 14, Ediciones de la ETSAB, October 1976. See also MANGADA, Eduardo, “Dibujar después de construir: reflexión personal sobre la arquitectura, a propósito de la obra de Rafael Moneo”, *Arquitectura* No. 252, February 1985, p. 16.

determinants underlined his approach to the work of both. Moneo seems to place himself in between both of them. Besides beginning to value or study their works (books, buildings or pedagogical experiences) — granting this as well —, these serve as working materials for the editors of the magazine in order to emphasize the importance of a theoretical structure where practice is rooted. Moneo's text, which opens the issue, and in which Rossi and Gregotti are presented jointly, offers an introduction to Rossi's work on the one hand (together with a text by Josep Quetglas) and to Gregotti's on the other (together with a text by Bohigas).

It is not a coincidence the fact that one of the first contents authored by Moneo was dedicated to Rossi and Gregotti. Moneo knew well the Italian scenario after having spent two years in Italy as a scholar of the Royal Academy of Spain, a wilful period to reflect upon theory and history and the place where he would establish his first linkages with the Italian scenario.³⁵ In Rome he met Manfredo Tafuri, Paolo Portoghesi or Bruno Zevi and assisted to some lectures of Rudolf Wittkower, amongst other architects and historians. It was not until 1967, back in Spain, where he met Aldo Rossi for the first time in one of the aforementioned "Pequeños Congresos".³⁶ Years later, in 1985, coinciding with the publication of *Arquitecturas Bis* last issue, Moneo's role as active translator of Rossi's ideas into North American academia was, by then, firmly established. More specifically, the publication in *Oppositions* of "Aldo Rossi: The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery"³⁷ — originally published in Spanish in Barcelona two years before — translated

35. "In fact, Moneo used his period in the Royal Academy of Spain in Rome to establish a certain distance from the immediacy of office work, as he had experienced it with Oiza and Utzon, and to reflect on architectural history and theory, and his personal position. For this reason, he spent much of his time on the detailed study of Western architecture, and not only by visiting buildings. On Monday evenings he regularly attended Bruno Zevi's lectures at the Palazzo Taverna, where he met Paolo Portoghesi and Manfredo Tafuri for the first time." GÓNZALEZ DE CANALES, Francisco and RAY, Nicholas. "Biography" in Rafael Moneo: Building, Teaching and Writing, op. cit.

36. Rossi's *L'Architettura della città* was immediately translated into Spanish and published by Barcelona based publishing house Gustavo Gili in 1971. Architect and professor Salvador Tarragó translated the book and promoted at once the 'Rossian' magazine *2C Arquitectura de la Ciudad*, publishing three issues on Rossi.

37. "These notes, written in 1973 before the Triennale of 1974, do not deal with the complex notions which provoked that exhibition; with the grouping under the banner of the 'Tendenza' — a heterogeneous, yet consciously selected, group of architects from different countries. Thus these notes are limited to the discussion of Rossi's principles made explicit in his book *L'Architettura della Città*, and in this light, to see how Rossi designed the Modena Cemetery without considering the propositions inherent in the Triennale even though Rossi was undoubtedly the inspirations for these ideas." MONEO, Rafael. "Aldo Rossi: The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery". *Oppositions* n. 5. A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture, Summer 1976. New York, Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies. [Original: MONEO, Rafael, "La idea de Arquitectura en Rossi y el Cementerio de Modena", Barcelona, Ediciones de la ETSAB, 1974.



Figure 2. The front page of *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4 (November 1974), outlined by the use of graphical metaphor (the logo of the Italian brand of drinks Martini&Rossi) the almost monographic content of the edition based on the work of both Gregotti and Rossi.

Rossi's ideology, and what was known as '*architettura autonomia*',³⁸ to the North American intellectual environment. In 1978, another of his writings for *Oppositions*, "On Typology",³⁹ discussed some of the concepts Rossi and 'La Tendenza' had promulgated since the early 1960's, establishing his own vision on the dialectical between building typology and urban morphology.⁴⁰ Moneo's first approach to Zevi – Moneo translated into Spanish Bruno Zevi's 1964 edition of *Architecture in Nuce* [*Architettura in nuce*]⁴¹, before and during his time in Rome, influenced as expected by the 'School of Madrid' where he taught in his early years, was soon abandoned in favor of a younger generations of architects engaged with Tafuri's critique to "Operative Criticism." [fig. 2]

The front page of *Arquitecturas Bis*' fourth issue, outlined by the use of graphical metaphor (the logo of the Italian brand of drinks Martini&Rossi) the almost monographic content of the edition based on the work of both Gregotti and Rossi. The fact that the content of this fourth edition was almost entirely dedicated to these Italian architects is not coincidental: as it has been discussed earlier, the prompted Italian scenario in the seventies – due to the contradictory connections between the different theoretical discourses and the design strategies in the immediate context of the Italian architecture, the well-known *italophilia*—.⁴²

38. [...] "Moneo makes the connection between the two aspects inherent in Rossi's work by breaking the article into two dialectic halves: each with its own theme and its own rhythm and cadence. The first part, which dissects Rossi's thinking in his book *L'Architettura della Città*, is more intense; the second part, which examines Rossi's project for the Modena cemetery, is more lyrical. For me, this is architecture writing at its best – dense and informative, analytic and questioning. There is no question that Rossi's metaphysics demand this kind of dissection. Equally important for the European context is the fact that such an article by Moneo, who was part of the Barcelona group of writers of the magazine *Arquitecturas Bis*, signals a possible change in the Milan/Barcelona axis: from the influence in the early sixties of Vittorio Gregotti and post-war functionalism to the new ideology present in Rossi's work" [...]. EISENMAN, Peter (1976) Prologue to Moneo's text "The Idea of Architecture and the Modena Cemetery". *Oppositions* n. 5, op. cit.

39. MONEO, Rafael, "On Typology", *Oppositions* n. 13, A Journal for Ideas and Criticism in Architecture, 1978, pp. 23-44.

40. Other articles on Rossi were published in Spain for the aforementioned magazine *2C Construcción de la Ciudad*. See: MONEO, Rafael. "La obra reciente de Aldo Rossi: dos reflexiones". *2C Construcción de la Ciudad* n. 14. December 1979. Barcelona: Coop. Ind. De trabajo Asociado "Grupo 2C" S.C.I., pp. 38-39.

41. ZEVI, Bruno (1969) *Arquitectura in Nuce. Una definición de arquitectura*. Madrid: Aguilar

42. "There is no doubt, nonetheless, that today's Italy states a strong contradiction that puts into crisis all its architectural culture system: if in the fifties and sixties the attempt of overcoming the immediate aged schemes had a quite literal connection with theory, didactics and realizations, now the new attempts of improvement achieve interesting affirmations in the theoretical field, but they are seldom formalized in palpable, real, suitable and lasting architecture." (Author's translation). BOHIGAS, Oriol, "Gregotti o una estrategia teórica desde una práctica proyectual", *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, November 1974, pp. 15.



Figure 3. Back cover of *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4 (November 1974) including the contents index.

Quetglas' essay "*Rossi: dos 'construcciones' (Casa Bay, Gallaratese 2)*"⁴³ was preceded by a brief biographical review and a selection of writings⁴⁴ and works.⁴⁵ The detached house of Casa Bay and the building of the Monte Amiata in Milan's Gallaratese district is object of study, focusing on the housing architecture of Rossi, exemplified in both projects. Below the study of these projects lies the need to understand Rossi's design approach as an exercise of rupture — and not of continuity as in Gregotti — both in relation to the values of the historical avant-gardes and to the values of the Modern Movement. The recovery of Architecture's genuine condition, its autonomy, and its innate condition with the city, as well as the relation that establishes with History, are very present in both examples. With respect to Casa Bay, Quetglas underlined the project to be conceived as a new form of political mediation between architecture and domestic space, in clear allusion to the domestic architecture of the modern *Machine à Habiter* and the effects of mechanized production — the references to the Modern Movement (Loos, Behrens, Gropius, *L'Esprit Nouveau* and Le Corbusier) — and to the production of the mechanized object as opposed to the handmade object.⁴⁶ The text eventually enunciates Rossi's position regarding the dichotomy between the mechanized object and its models of reference — for instance, the domestic architecture of Neutra as hyper-realistic stage — as opposed to the architecture as illustration — Heinrich Tessenow and the disappearance of architecture in the domestic and personal space —. Concerning the intervention in the Gallaratese district of Milan, the reference is given by the radical Siedlungen,⁴⁷ Rossi's block in Milan, raised on props which separate, rather than connect, the building from the floor — as is the case of the Casa Bay and its laying in the area —, seems to aim at conveying a disapproval of the apparent lawlessness of the modern city. [fig. 3]

43. QUETGLAS, Josep, "Rossi: dos 'construcciones' (Casa Bay, Gallaratese 2)", *Arquitecturas Bis* n.4, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, November 1974: pp. 5-8.

44. Selection of writings by Aldo Rossi. Among others: "Adolf Loos" Casabella-Continuità number 233, or his book *L'architettura della città* (Marsilio Editores, Padua, 1966). *Arquitecturas Bis* n.4, op. cit., pp. 5.

45. Selection of works mentioned in the magazine. Among others: Concurso Internacional para el rascacielos Peugeot en Buenos Aires (1961, con V. Magistrelli y G. Polesello); Concurso para el Monumento a la Resistencia Antifascista en Cuneo (1962, con L. Meda y G. Polesello); Concurso para una Escuela en Monza (1962, con V. Gavazzeni, G. Grassi y L. Meda); Proyecto de puente sobre Via Alemania y zona de exposición en el Parque para la XIII Triennale de Milán (1962, con L. Meda); la Plaza Mayor y Fuente Monumental en Segrate (1965); Concurso para el Ayuntamiento de Scandicci (1968, con M. Fortis y M. Scolari); Proyecto para la Unidad residencial en el Barrio Gallaratese 2º de Milán (1969-1970), Concurso para el Cementerio de Modena (1971) o la Escuela de Fagnano Olona (1972). *Arquitecturas Bis* n.4, op. cit., pp. 10-12.

46. "Now we encounter the mastery of the interior, of architecture over the dweller. The material is no longer arranged according to domestic needs, it is not formalization anymore; it is alien to them, it has and fulfils its own logic, its type" (translation by the author). QUETGLAS, Josep, "Rossi: dos 'construcciones' (Casa Bay, Gallaratese 2)", op. cit., pp. 6.

47. "The contrast between the irrationality of the tertiary metropolis of capital and the rationality of the 'city of work' represented by the 'rationalistic' Siedlungen", op. cit., pp. 9.

On the other hand, Bohigas' text on Gregotti: "*Gregotti, o una estructura teórica desde una práctica proyectual*"⁴⁸ was mainly focused on the Project of the University of Calabria in Cosenza, which offers Bohigas a propitious example on which to base his argumentations: Being able to reach a theoretical structure from the creative experience⁴⁹ of the project, unlike Rossi's experience.⁵⁰ Gregotti's designs state his definite attitude of continuity in relation to History, in search of a new modern tradition — modernity as a project still to be completed — that tries to establish its way of understanding the exercise of architecture, through the positive reinterpretation of the postulates from the Historical Avant-gardes and the Modern Movement.

What is the object, then, of putting together the works of Rossi and Gregotti in this fourth issue? The utility of publishing certain designs and works, as well as re-editing again certain texts — or shining a spotlight on them once more — thereby placing them at the same level of relevance, will be a constant in the editorial production of *Arquitecturas Bis*. In this issue — the first (and significant) case study along its 52 issues — the magazine raises a critical review of Rossi's and Gregotti's production, aiming to unfold their theoretical strategies so to be compared by opposition and not isolatedly; the title of Quetglas' text on Rossi, for example, alludes precisely to that —. The debate about the theoretical construction that lays on the work of both architects might as well be summed up in this case⁵¹ by turning into a question one of the claims which Bohigas puts forward in his text on Gregotti, as aforementioned. The fourth issue of *Arquitecturas Bis* is ultimately and hence our justification of having halted to look at it, a significant example, perhaps the first one, of a constant and tangible convergence between text and project, which will be repeated throughout the 52 issues of *Arquitecturas Bis*. In this case, the episode takes place in Italy, which accurately exemplifies the importance of the critical architect in the context of a critical reading of modernity, by means of the irruption of criticism or the recovery of History as a material for design.

Assuming the anecdotal and thus leaving the possible coincidences in the first trajectories of the two Italian architects out (their similar training; the fact that they both worked with Ernesto N. Rogers in the magazine

48. BOHIGAS, Oriol, "Gregotti o una estrategia teórica desde una práctica proyectual", op. cit., pp. 15-22.

49. *Ibidem*.

50. "Gregotti's interest in the achievements and the intentions of the beginning of the Modern Movement is, therefore, a consequence of its projectual problem, a historical and theoretical support that arises from the very architectural practice" (author's translation), *ibidem*.

51. "To develop an architecture based on a theorization that is previously structured in historical, geometric, social or philosophical terms? Or to construct a theory on the same real experiences of the process of design and architectural achievement?; theory as a significant element of its form?", *ibidem*.



Figure 4. "Gregotti & Rossi", *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4, November 1974, pp.2.

*Casabella*⁵² and their later dedication to the university education) — Moneo emphasizes the fact that both Rossi and Gregotti believe in architecture as a form of knowledge: “a common starting point: to consider architecture as a conscious and deliberate fact of culture whose meaning is sought”.⁵³ This definition of architecture and this way of approaching its practice will be the thesis on which the contents of this issue will find their basis, similar also to the way Moneo will approach the work of other contemporary architects. An approach to the theoretical framework (writings, teaching experiences...), together with their buildings — having already completed a part of their *oeuvre* and having another significant amount yet to be completed —, brings up the importance of architecture as cultural event, this is to say: The theoretical commitment and the obligation to understand the *raison d'être* of architecture previous to the professional activity.⁵⁴ [fig. 4]

For the magazine, the truly remarkable aspects of both architects' work are the confronted positions in which their works were in 1974, so different from their initial proximities. *Arquitecturas Bis* tries to emphasize this situation. Moneo's statement is clear in this sense and calls attention on the importance of the theoretical framework that contributes to understand Gregotti's and Rossi's work. Both architects — and here is where we find the common starting point for Moneo's text and for the later texts by Quetglas and Bohigas — face the construction of their work questioning the ancient frames of reference, undertaking a deep critical exercise in which the theoretical commitment intervenes in the design process.⁵⁵

For Gregotti, History is another material for the project insofar as it contributes to it, and this is proved on his projects, as he had already stated in *Il territorio dell'architettura* (1966). Moneo describes Gregotti's book rather than a previous 'ideological program' a reflection of Gregotti's own experience of design and construction as well as the own pedagogical

52. Casabella magazine (both Gregotti and Rossi come to work in their early years for the magazine, and Gregotti will be later, between 1981 and 1996, the Editor of the magazine) is published in Milan since 1928 having experienced several changes on its format and name since then. The first edition dates from 1928 under the name of Casa Bella (directed by its founder Guido Marangoni). In 1933 the name changes to Casabella under the leadership of Giuseppe Pagano and the co-direction of Edoardo Persico from 1935. In 1938 and 1940 the name of the magazine two modifications (it will be renamed as Casabella-Construzioni in 1938 and Construzioni-Casabella in 1940) before stop editing because of the Italian Ministry of Popular Culture censorship. In 1945 Gianni Mazzocchi restructures the magazine that will edit several number until a new closure in 1947 (under the direction of Franco Albini and Giancarlo Piretti). The magazine will remain closed until 1954, when the magazine starts a new stage under the direction of Ernesto N. Rogers under the name of Casabella-Continuità. In 1965 the magazine will change again its name, since Casabella again since then, and also modifying slightly its format. The editors of this last stage have been: A. Bernasconi (1965-70), A. Mendini (1970-76), T. Maldonado (1977-81), V. Gregotti (1981-96) and since 1997 F. Dal Co.

53. MONEO, Rafael, “Gregotti & Rossi”, *Arquitecturas Bis* n.4, Barcelona, La Gaya Ciencia, November 1974, pp.1.

54. Ibidem.

55. “His [Gregotti's and Rossi's] works are above all a manipulation and transformation of the 'materials' which history provides, thus helping to define a new historical horizon and providing, therefore, continuity to the process”, *ibidem*.



Figure 5. "Gregotti & Rossi", *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4, November 1974, pp.3.

experience within the university, just as he said years later in the Kenzo Tange lecture at the GSD.⁵⁶ Gregotti's *territorio* was very much concerned with the ongoing late-1960's early-1970's theoretical agenda: The search for a design method in order to address the authentic condition of the design process — *progetto* —. Back to the way in which Gregotti addresses History as a material for the design process, Moneo points out Heidegger's influence, stating that anthropology and metaphysics will have the capacity to envision a new understanding of architecture. Moneo embraces the discussion approached by Gregotti in relation to the historical condition that delimits the exercise of architecture, and the way in which architects become conscious of this condition: how to work with the fragments of history within the city and the territory?⁵⁷

Regarding the use of History, and referencing both Gregotti and Rossi, Moneo raises again the question of the Modern Movement, focusing his argument on the linkage between the *modern program* and the immediate future, as Gregotti had stated in *Il Territorio*, taking advantage of Gregotti's position to this respect in order to address the importance of History as *materiale di progetto*. Although both Gregotti and Rossi influenced him; Moneo suggests that Gregotti understands History as the object of architecture, capable of endowing form to it. This fact implies that architecture must work with the fragments of that other continuous shipwreck that is the time passing by and disappearing, together with those other fragments that are precisely the "materials of architecture" to which Gregotti reports. To this respect, Moneo insists (quoting Scolari) that History, for Gregotti, is finally the history of the modern movement, the formal tradition of 'modernity' capable of constituting his "materials".

For Gregotti, as for Moneo, architecture is anything else than a mental exercise: they understand architecture as it becomes. While we must say that Moneo took from Gregotti's the idea of 'place' — the site understood as a reflection of the context —, the way in which architecture history is employed in the design processes, as well as precept of the autonomy of the discipline of architecture, is due to the influence of Aldo Rossi. How much of Moneo's approach to History can we find in Rossi's and Gregotti's books? How must architectural History be addressed at the school? As he addresses in his "first" lecture at Harvard, architectural initiation should include a strong familiarity with History."⁵⁸ [fig. 5]

56. "I firmly believe that architecture needs the support of matter; that the former is inseparable from the latter. Architecture arrives when our thoughts about it acquire the real condition that only materials can provide. By accepting and bargaining with limitations and restrictions, with the act of construction, architecture becomes what it really is". MONEO, Rafael, *The Solitude of Buildings*, op. cit.

57. In this sense, Moneo took most of his ideas in the uses of architectural history and the autonomy of the discipline of architecture from Rossi's *L'architettura della città*, but he also absorbed the notion of 'place' from Gregotti's *Il Territorio della Architettura*, with its distinct 'Heideggerian' ethos, as he puts it in *Arquitecturas Bis*.

58. "An architectural initiation includes today, in my opinion, a strong familiarity with history — a history that is no longer a storehouse of forms or a workshop of styles, but one that simply offers the material for thinking about the evolution of architecture, as well as the way in which architects worked in the past." MONEO, Rafael, *The Solitude of Buildings*, op. cit., pp. 16.



Figure 6. "Gregotti & Rossi", *Arquitecturas Bis* n. 4, November 1974, pp. 4. Including at the bottoms of the page Rossi's brief biographical note and the plan of Palladio's Villa Repeta a Campiglia dei Berici.

While describing Rossi's *L'architettura della città* (1966), Moneo presents architecture as a discipline with its own laws, specific, a discipline that claims its autonomy and its independence from the materials it may use, as technology, for example; but that in any way may be considered its cause or a constituent part of it.⁵⁹ The notion of type *versus* typology was used by Rossi in order to find an alternative path for a theory for design ("una teoría del proyecto", as he put it), in contrast to the methodological approach — scientific and technical optimism developed in the sixties, for example —. As Moneo argued, Rossi understood that the aim of architecture will be not so much the creation of a built object, or the expression of the formal will within a determined historical period, rather than the definition of the principles that govern the relation amongst its elements. While Gregotti still maintained continuity with the Modern Movement and its assumptions entailing the idea of the *modern program* as an unfinished project; Rossi, on the other side, claimed that it was precisely the 'modern' tradition responsible of dismissing the genuine condition of architecture by neglecting the way in which it was consubstantial to the city, fallen to the temptation of building an object conditioned from a sensorial language.⁶⁰ This is the reason why Rossi felt closer to the architectural production of the late Eighteenth-century —Boullée, Durand...—,⁶¹ rather than to the Nineteenth-century or the Twentieth-century, which where, as Moneo puts it, much concerned on technology or figurative experience, respectively. This is where; again, the relation with History enters the scene: the correspondence with history is not produces in continuity, yet as the "scenario wherein the object is perceived on the merits of other objects and in relation to them."⁶² [fig. 6]

Moneo addressed the importance of drawings, and in the end, the value of architectural representation within Rossi's theory, as well as in other architects of the 'Tendenza', as the aforementioned Scolari or Grassi, among others. Once again, this emphasis on Rossi's drawings — Moneo described Rossi's drawings as architecture in itself— makes us think on the way in which Moneo understands the architectural drawing.⁶³ In

59. "La arquitectura se presenta así como una disciplina con leyes propias, específicas, que afirman su autonomía, su independencia frente a los materiales que utiliza (así la tecnología, por ejemplo), pero que en modo alguno la constituyen." MONEO, Rafael, "Gregott & Rossi", op. cit., pp.3.

60. "Para Rossi la tradición moderna ha olvidado la genuina condición de la arquitectura, al olvidar cuanto ésta sea consustancial con la ciudad, al sucumbir ante la tentación de construir un objeto condicionado desde un lenguaje sensorial, fruíble." *Ibidem*.

61. "Moneo's recuperation of Durand, or Quatremère de Quincy, in the mid-1960's was part of his aim of establishing a specific territory for architecture as a discipline that could be seen through the lens of reason, an attitude that was prevalent in the Italian architects of 'La Tendenza'. As Moneo stated, if Wittkower's *Architecture in the Age of Humanism* was mandatory reading for architects in the Smithson's circle in the 1950's, Kaufmann's *Architecture in the Age of Reason* would be fundamental to the architects around Aldo Rossi in the 1960's". GONZÁLEZ DE CANALES, Francisco and RAY, Nicholas, *Rafael Moneo: Building Teaching Writing*, op. cit., pp. 205.

62. Moneo is quoting here Massimo Scolari, member together with Rossi of the so-called group 'La Tendenza'

63. "...But a truly architectural drawing should imply above all the knowledge of construction." MONEO, Rafael, *The Solitude of Buildings*, op. cit., pp. 34.

this sense, it is not coincidental that one of the last books published by on his work, displays consciously his work just by means of drawings in order to address the way in which these documents can work as memories of his own architectural and theoretical agenda, the evolution of his thinking.⁶⁴ Unlike Moneo's understanding of the drawing, in the case of Rossi, it is no more a tool for description; it has lost its meaning as a descriptive instrument of a fact or a precise construction technique, it is rather the canvas where the elements of architecture are displayed within the spatial territory of a hypothetically and everlasting city.⁶⁵ Moneo points out that — exemplifying his argument on Rossi's drawings — nevertheless drawings had to be understood as the expression of principles and that they are used as diffuser vehicles of these principles. But Rossi's drawings are not pictorial or even picturesque, as they may seem, they are rendered in that way in order to show for example contempt to the technological myth, but in any case, alleging construction as the specific endeavor of the architect, just as Moneo has claimed in his lectures. In the case of Rossi, his drawings can be perceived and understood as logical constructions. By all means, they are architecture, construction, and not arbitrariness or formal experimentation.

Finally, by the end of the text on Rossi, Moneo will return to one of the arguments he first stated while introducing the work of these Italian architects, an assumption that furthermore has been present in his entire career as builder, writer and professor, and that is present in the writings he produced for *Arquitecturas Bis*, especially those ones dedicated to other architects. Using the same words he used in one of his aforementioned books, *theoretical anxiety*: how to translate it into design principles? Was capable Rossi of doing so without being misunderstood? Can this translation change over time? In the case of Rossi, was the Milanese able to formalize his theory into specific architecture — built or drawn —. Buildings are capable of establishing a body of knowledge for architecture, or it is the other way round, is knowledge, History, the one responsible of shaping our cities, our goals and desires? As Moneo says that is the risk of all architects that 'make theory': his work becomes flagrant 'ad hominem' argument in front of their theory.⁶⁶

64. "Todos juntos me parece que ofrecen una buena muestra que el papel del dibujo ha tenido en la práctica profesional de los arquitectos en los últimos 50 años. Además, el conjunto de los dibujos documentan lo que ha sido la evolución del pensamiento arquitectónico durante los años en que he desarrollado mi carrera, en la que el ejercicio profesional ha estado siempre acompañado por la dedicación a la crítica y a la enseñanza". MONEO, Rafael, *Rafael Moneo: una reflexión teórica desde la profesión. Materiales de archivo (1961-2013)*, A Coruña, Fundación Barrié, 2013, Introduction.

65. "El dibujo pierde pues su valor como descripción, como comprobación de un hecho, como transmisión de una determinada técnica constructiva para convertirse en 'despliegue' de los elementos de arquitectura en el campo de una, hipotética, eterna, ciudad..." MONEO, Rafael, Gregotti & Rossi, op. cit., pp. 3.

66. "Nada más lejos de los propósitos de Rossi quien, sin embargo, al formalizar su teoría en una arquitectura concreta (construida o dibujada) da pie a tales equívocos; es un riesgo que corre todo arquitectos que teoriza: su obra se convierte en flagrante argumento 'ad hominem' frente a su teoría." MONEO, Rafael, Gregotti & Rossi, op. cit., pp. 4.



