

Conceptual Approach To Architecture



Dr. Badi al-Abed

Consultant Architect & Former Dean
Faculty Of Engineering, Al-Isra` University
Vice President Of The Jordanian Society
For The History Of Science
Amman - Jordan

badi@go.com.jo

Citation:

Badi al-Abed, Conceptual Approach To Architecture.- *Historical Kan Periodical*.- Issue (10) December 2010.
P. 96 – 118. (www.historicalkan.co.nr)

Abstract

This paper argues that architectural interpretation is experiencing from abuse use of architectural key terms. Notions like: criticism, history and theory; concepts like: beginning and approach; and labels like: style, school and movement were used indiscriminately in architectural interpretation.

For instance, Banham (1966:10) indicated that he interpreted New Brutalism as a movement before the conditions of forming a movement were existed. Jencks writings are another example for the abuse use of the former notions, concepts and labels. In his two books: *The Language Of Post-Modern Architecture* and *Late Modern Architecture*, he described Post-Modern Architecture: first as a movement, second as a style, third as a school and fourth as an approach.

Banham and Jencks were attempting to formulate verbal equivalent to the design of some architects before it was tested and proved to deserve a theoretical coverage, organized in an intellectual discipline as an approach, school or movement. This attempt perhaps, caused this abuse use of the former key terms in architectural interpretation.

Commercial architectural press was another source for the abuse use of the previous architectural key terms. As a case in point, the magazine of *Architectural Design (AD)* was a major source of the misinterpretation of those notions, concepts and labels, over the past four decades.

It seems that no considerations were made to the specific definitions of those key terms, nor to the scope of their conceptual meaning, limits and context of their theme.

Thus this paper endeavors to clear the abuse use of those notions, concepts and labels in architectural interpretation via defining them, refining their conceptual meanings. And exploring their themes, outlining their role, scope and place within architectural interpretation in order to employ them appropriately within

architectural interpretation, as they constitute basic themes of the conceptual world of architecture.

In so doing an attempt will be made to investigate the origin, structure, meaning and definitions of the said key terms as indicated in key literary, philosophical and architectural sources. Another attempt will be made to highlight the process and emphasize the conditions of forming and establishing architectural approaches, schools and movements via the concept beginning - as a moment in time and as a project underway - as interpreted in architectural sources.

It is important to indicate that investigations in this paper are limited only to the notions: criticism, history and theory; concepts: beginning and approach; and labels: style, school and movement; though investigations will include concepts like precedence, generality and creativity, but within the previous architectural key terms.

Introduction

This paper argues that architectural interpretation is experiencing from abuse use of architectural key terms. Notions like: criticism, history and theory; concepts like: beginning and approach; and labels like: style, school and movement were used indiscriminately in architectural interpretation.

For instance, Banham (1966:10) indicated that he interpreted New Brutalism as a movement before the conditions of forming a movement were existed. Jencks writings are another example for the abuse use of the former notions, concepts and labels. In his two books: *The Language Of Post-Modern Architecture* and *Late Modern Architecture*, he described Post-Modern Architecture: first as a movement, second as a style, third as a school and fourth as an approach.

Banham and Jencks were attempting to formulate verbal equivalent to the design of some architects before it was tested and proved to deserve a theoretical coverage, organized in an intellectual discipline as an

approach, school or movement. This attempt perhaps, caused this abuse use of the former key terms in architectural interpretation.

Commercial architectural press was another source for the abuse use of the previous architectural key terms. As a case in point, the magazine of *Architectural Design (AD)* was a major source of the misinterpretation of those notions, concepts and labels, over the past four decades.

It seems that no considerations were made to the specific definitions of those key terms, nor to the scope of their conceptual meaning, limits and context of their theme.

Thus this paper endeavors to clear the abuse use of those notions, concepts and labels in architectural interpretation via defining them, refining their conceptual meanings. And exploring their themes, outlining their role, scope and place within architectural interpretation in order to employ them appropriately within architectural interpretation, as they constitute basic themes of the conceptual world of architecture.

In so doing an attempt will be made to investigate the origin, structure, meaning and definitions of the said key terms as indicated in key literal, philosophical and architectural sources. Another attempt will be made to highlight the process and emphasize the conditions of forming and establishing architectural approaches, schools and movements via the concept beginning - as a moment in time and as a project underway - as interpreted in architectural sources.

It is important to indicate that investigations in this paper are limited only to the notions: criticism, history and theory; concepts: beginning and approach; and labels: style, school and movement; though investigations will include concepts like precedence, generality and creativity, but within the previous architectural key terms. Having clear the purpose of this paper and emphasized its method of investigation I shall take the time to start with the notion of criticism.

Criticism

Criticism is a major source of knowledge in every intellectual discipline, like art, literature and architecture. In the following discussion, I shall be highlighting its aspects, purposes, techniques and reviewing its types. In so doing an attempt will be made to indicate its origin. The literal⁽¹⁾ meaning of criticism is the act of making judgment, in particular, in art and literature. Criticism, according to Williams (1980), is a conscious response to the work of art associated with judgment, "as apparently general and natural process." It was developed from fault finding or "unselfconscious-ness"⁽²⁾ to a general concept of evaluation or "self consciousness." Architectural criticism appears to be proceeded in the same manner. According to Collins (1971b) architectural criticism began in its "spoken" form ever since the concern with aesthetic experience occurred. Consequently, criticism developed through the course of history to be formulated into a written language same as any other intellectual discipline. On this view, Collins together with Oakley (1970) and Bonta (1980 a), argued that architectural criticism was derived from and influenced by literary criticism. They argued that criticism is analysis of architecture; its endeavor is to project in thought and words what presents itself in other means (such as sensory and mental perception). And to direct architects and lay public to the outcome of analysis, in order to participate in its structure as a technique for architectural reform, Collins (1971 b).

As a result of this interpretation one may argue that criticism serves educational purposes through its process of inquiry into causes undertakes to formulate a verbal equivalent to design process. Thus criticism reveals consciousness and offer knowledge about architecture.

Restorative and supportive criticism

Having indicated the endeavors of criticism, one is introduced to two main aspects or tendencies that constitute

architectural criticism. Those are "restorative⁽³⁾ or teleological" and "supportive or ideological." The first is concerned with indicating architectural values and meaning; its task is not just refinement of knowledge of architecture, but constituting, at least, part of it. For instance, Collins (1971 b), argued that "architectural criticism cannot exist unless architectural values are verbalized." In a similar way, Oakley (1970) argued that the task of a critic is to evaluate the result of "the application of the ideas to outcomes, to assess the value to actual work." Therefore, the restorative tendency includes efforts of architectural approaches that are valid at one time, despite their different techniques as will be indicated later. Yet it is a general tendency and not a unitary or a complete one.

Unlike the supportive or the ideological tendency, namely, Marxist criticism. Where architecture, according to Maxwell (1977) and Tafuri (1980), is conceived as an ideological instrument, which has no values of historical continuity of the social order, but a socioeconomic context. Such a notion operates and constitutes the base, means and endeavors of Marxist ideology, which originated from Marx's interpretation of history, Scruton (1979). Therefore, it is limited, absolute and totalitarian, unlike the restorative that operate according to different aspects and concepts, like: religious, technical, functional and different historical interpretation, as will be discussed later.

Generality

The previous discussion leads to the concept of 'generality', which appears to be a point of agreement between the two tendencies. Nevertheless, generality is a vital aspect in criticism. Oakley (1970:179) indicated:

"At a high level of generality the critic has the task of drawing attention to the character of the continuity and discontinuity that exists between the work of past epochs that we have come to admire and study, and the works of our time....

Our present-day architecture is one of prototypes for an epochal architecture whose final forms and disciplines cannot yet be known. The forms cannot be known since they will in part be predicated by process and voyages of discovery in the biological sciences and in applied technology, the implications of which we are as yet unaware ... [my underlining].”

Generality, therefore, is a body of collective knowledge that generates criticism, which as a consequence contributes towards unity of architectural practice. Collins (1968), indicated that generality includes “all” forms, ideas and activities, which merged in some kind of conceptual unity. Such unity may be understood or regarded, according to Collins (1971 a), as an antithesis of design. On this view, one may argue that generality maintains and dictates a patient account as to how architectural practice might be done. Therefore, generality of criticism maintains and, perhaps, animates creative work.

On the contrary, generality of the supportive attempts to project Marxist ideology as a universal one, for instance, Tafuri (1980) argued that “operative” criticism - analysis of architecture rather than an abstract survey - as an ideological one, is “contesting towards past (history) and prophetic towards the future”. It operates to substitute the “ready-made judgments of value”. On this view, Tafuri argued that criticism is one of the dimensions of architectural activity. Therefore, it has to fulfill two basic conditions: firstly, that the model of criticism should be “journalistic extravaganza rather than a definitive essay which is complete in itself”; secondly, the field of analysis of architectural “object” should be extended to the “criticism of the global context” that constitute its form. In the first condition, Tafuri seems to present a paradoxical argument. He calls upon an elaborated journalistic criticism whilst he maintains the notion of socioeconomic with its limited aspects. In the second condition, Tafuri seems to approach a geographical

generality rather than an intellectual one. Nevertheless, Scruton (1979: 150) disputed Marxist criticism all together:

“... we are presented with a theory which claims to show a ‘meaning’ in every cultural object and which therefore ought to be as applicable to architecture as to every form of art. And once again the very generality, of these pretensions removes all critical sting : there can no more be a Marxist method in criticism than there can be a Marxist method in mathematics” [my underlining].

However, the concept of generality gives rise to the techniques of criticism. The restorative tendency adopts a “descriptive” technique that is concerned, according to Bonta (1980 a), with cultural phenomena, like: religion, social structure, politics, way of life, thinking and belief, as well as, technology. Such phenomena incorporated into history, as will be discussed later, perhaps as much as into criticism.

On the contrary, the supportive tendency proclaims a “prescriptive” technique where criticism operates, functions and performs, according to Tafuri (1980), as a code that constitutes practice of architecture. Nevertheless Scruton (1981), once again, disputed Marxist criticism by demonstrating its technique as a depicting cultural phenomenon which is preoccupied by the notion of socioeconomic; incapable of offering solutions or guiding principles to aesthetic and architectural “problems”. Yet one may conclude that descriptive technique serves for dissemination of knowledge whilst the prescriptive one, in its limited scope, serves for the dissemination of ideology. Thus, this paper will be a contribution to the task and technique of restorative tendency.

Types of criticism

Having so far highlighted the two tendencies and techniques, indicated the conceptual criticism, it seems paradoxical, therefore, to interpret specific types of criticism. But this is not the case, because most, if not all, architectural approaches were sprung from based upon or attributed

to a specific type/s of criticism; or the other way around, so to speak that architectural approaches are instruments of criticism. And criticism is a means of interpreting and refining architecture. For instance, Scruton (1979), indicated different “doctrines” of aesthetic, such as: “functionalism,”⁽⁴⁾ the “space theory”⁽⁵⁾ and “proportion.”⁽⁶⁾ He reviewed and criticized the three doctrines only from an aesthetic point of view. Whereas the first, is an architectural approach which is concerned with the nature of architectural practice as “fitness for purpose” and aesthetic is only one aspect of the functionalism approach. The second, is a more conceptual approach rather than practical, such approach attempts to relate buildings (architecture) to their surrounding space and to achieve aesthetic values from architecture/space relationship. The third is the corpus of historical interpretation, in which historians tried, according to Scruton (1979), to transfer to architecture the “quasi-musical notion of a harmonious order by giving specific rules and principles for the proportionate combination of parts”. Consequently, one may conceive as to how architectural criticism and architectural approaches are incorporated.

On this view, spoken criticism, as indicated earlier, was the first type. It developed, according to Collins (1971b), to a poetic type as in the case of John Ruskin’s⁽⁷⁾ depiction of *The Stones of Venice*. Where Ruskin “transmute architecture into literature without contributing anything at all to the public understanding of problems of architectural design”.

Oakley (1970) recorded five types of criticism: firstly, “contextual” criticism which is concerned with cultural/architectural interrelation, such as the relation between social order and architecture. The second type is “formalistic” criticism which is concerned with image and meaning of architecture. The third is “aesthetic” criticism, which is concerned with syntax, grammar of architecture proportion and artistic

characteristics. The fourth and the fifth, are “functional and spatial” criticism, both were indicated earlier.

Another categorization based upon the assumption that criticism incorporates into architecture as a “special” activity, was indicated by Collins (1968). Where he recorded four types of criticism: the first, is “popular” criticism, which is concerned with public experience of using certain types of buildings like opera houses and theatres or via visiting certain buildings like palaces and museums. The second, is “lay” criticism, which is concerned with layman’s experience of buildings they have seen or occupied and also, the act of laymen as clients upon design. The third, is “professional” criticism, which is concerned with criticism made by architects for architects, whether they criticized drawing, as in the case of competitions or finished buildings. Here Collins indicated the futility of assessing buildings in environmental terms without the knowledge and experience of the critic with the building environment. Bonta (1980 a), emphasized this view when he recorded the evaluation of the historian Pevsner and the reaction of the English critic Broadbent to the Leicester Engineering Building⁽⁸⁾. The former as an outsider critic argued that the building is a functional one, whilst the latter as a user of the building disputed the former judgment. It is for this reason, one may argue, that critics should avoid drawing or camera criticism. The final type is “self-criticism” which is concerned with evaluation of the creative processes of the human mind and that applied to architectural methods.

Finally, one also may introduce a third categorization, which includes three abstract types. Firstly, camera criticism, which introduced by Frampton (1975) and Tafuri (1980), where critic operates through drawings, pictures and models, as indicated earlier by Collins. Secondly, “authorative” criticism, in which the term applies, according to Collins (1971 a), to the principles of criticism that operates as guidance assumptions and means of

judgment to architectural work. Thirdly and lastly, “educational” criticism which is exercised by architectural tutors in schools of architecture. It combines all types of criticism and knowledge of architecture at the tutors’ disposal through the course of teaching.

Having gone so far as to highlight the notion of criticism and emphasize its role in architecture as a means of interpretation and refinement of knowledge about architecture, the following discussion will be devoted to the notion of history.

History

Ever since awareness of history began, among architects, in the middle of the eighteenth century (in the Western world), according to Allsopp (1970), Collins (1971b) and Watkins (1978), a dispute started about its interpretation, task and purpose. In the following discussion an attempt will be made to highlight the notion of history, its disputed aspects and its role in architectural interpretation.

History, according to Collingwood (1976), “is a special form of thought”, a kind of research, quest or inquiry about events or things which we do not know and attempt to discover them; via adopting a scientific technique of asking questions and attempting to answer them in order to find, extract or establish evidence for interpretation from the actions of human beings that have been done in the past. This in turn offers us self-knowledge and may constitute our experience. Therefore, the value of history, according to Collingwood, is an educational one, in the sense of inducing knowledge from man’s past experience and self-consciousness through understanding the said knowledge. Yet Collingwood’s interpretation is a general one and seems to offer general understanding to the nature, object and value of history, which may help and ease the cause of this paper. But the following discussion will be devoted to architectural history.

Architectural history and its interpretation

Architectural history began in the Western world, as indicated earlier in the middle of the eighteenth century, where Stuart⁽⁹⁾ and Revett recorded the ruins of Athens and Soufflot⁽¹⁰⁾ categorized the classical revival in French architecture. All historical writings at that stage, according to Collins (1971b), were concerned with description of architectural form depiction of its features and surveying of its technical achievements.

This sequence of description and discoveries together with the notion of “historical periodicity”⁽¹¹⁾ led to the categorization and interpretation of architecture into styles (the label of style will be highlighted later in this paper), like the Baroque⁽¹²⁾ and Rococo⁽¹³⁾ styles. Such discoveries and interpretations, in their turn, tempted architectural historians, according to Collins (1971b), to become theorists, which was, in my view a turn event in architectural interpretation, where I shall be demonstrating later in the concept theory.

A third interpretation, according to Collins (1971b), was the revival of architectural styles which implied two tendencies: one sought the ideals of particular styles (Greek or Roman), whilst the other considered all styles of equal value. It was from the latter tendency that a fourth interpretation namely eclecticism, partly influenced. However, the French philosopher Victor Cousin introduced the label of eclecticism, according to Collins (1971b), to philosophy. Where Cousin argued that eclecticism was a composite system of thought consisting of various selected views from different intellectual disciplines. Yet Collins argued that eclecticism was a consequence of both Cousin’s philosophy and equality of styles’ value, which gave way to a new trend in architectural practice that based upon the amalgamation of selected “tectonic” elements from different styles. It was an endeavor, according to Collins, “to find a

way out of the impasse of stylistic copying". Eclecticism in its turn gave way to modern architecture as will be discussed in a moment.

The point at issue, therefore, is that two "conflicting schools": "Revivalist" and "anti-Revivalists", were constituting the interpretation of history of architecture and paradoxically both sprang from the same attitude towards history, Collins (1971b:133):

"The Revivalists were dominated by their awareness of the legacy of history. [Whilst] the anti-Revivalists were dominated by their awareness of the evolutionary nature of history."

The former were concerned with reinterpreting styles' idioms in modern terms whilst the latter were concerned with "language" rather than themes. Thus far, discussion highlighted four different architectural interpretations of history, each of which initiated its own interpretation within the knowledge, awareness and consciousness valid at the time. Unlike modern architecture that exceeds those limits and endeavors towards new limits. In so doing the following discussion will be devoted to review Watkins' historical interpretation.

Watkins (1978), viewed three "persistent" interpretations to architectural history: firstly, one of a "religious sociological and political tendency"; secondly, the "spirit of the age" or "*Zeitgeist*"; thirdly, the "rational or technological" tendency.

The first one was obsessed by the belief that architecture should express the social order, moral and philosophy of societies and viewed architecture as an instrument for achievements of social policy. Whilst the spirit of the age (*Zeitgeist*) - which was introduced by Hegel conveyed and applied to architecture, according to Watkins (1978) and Scruton (1979), by the art historian Wolfflin, demonstrated and emphasized by Giedion (1978) interpreted by Watkins (1978:7):

"... *Zeitgeist*-inspired belief that human nature has changed radically that a new man has been born who either must learn to express himself in a radically new way which is externally dictated by economic and political conditions, or must himself be changed radically in order to conform to these new conditions."

Giedion (1978) demonstrated the influence of the *Zeitgeist* upon, architecture. He indicated that historical philosophy of the modern movement was based upon a conscious abandonment of historical styles. Consequently, architecture should be devoted to deal rationally with contemporary social and technical problems.

Such a view that close, if not ties, the *Zeitgeist* with the rational and technological (functionalism) approach, which is the third interpretation of Watkins (1978). He indicated that functionalism, also, escaped from historical ties and architecture should be the "natural outcome of a rational intellectual discipline" applied to the solutions of measurable practical or technological problems. Therefore, the *Zeitgeist* and functionalism are two faces to the same coin; both appear to share the same view towards history; both challenged and accepted the risks of rupture with past architecture and both were aspects of modern architecture.

Such challenge demonstrated by Giedion (1978), *Space Time And Architecture* where he regarded past (history) as an "integral part of existence"; "absolute points of reference" or/and "a useful dictionary" for selecting forms as in the case of the nineteenth century architecture (eclecticism).

Unlike modern architecture which was based upon the concept of "fitness for purpose" as a criterion which has no precedent use and it took its power from a moral demand. In a similar way Gropius (1976), *The New Architecture And The Bauhaus*, argued that the new architecture (modern architecture) was based upon an anti-traditional obsession. As a founder-

practicing architect Gropius (1956), *The Scope Of Total Architecture*, demonstrated the application of this historical attitude to architecture by emphasizing that past architecture maintained no place for “original” and “creative” practices which is what modern architecture endeavors to achieve. Yet modern architecture should adopt a new historical attitude.

But such anti-historical attitudes that endeavor to suppress past experience in favor of originality and creativity had brought a dispute to architecture. For instance, Allsopp (1970), argued that history offers a sense of direction and without this sense architecture “cannot be successfully practiced”. In a similar manner Collins (1971a) argued that history is the source of precedence, discloses “truths” and highlights “higher” truths. These truths are the “only” guide of making architectural judgment. Therefore, he concluded that the *Zeitgeist* through its break with history is incapable of making a “reliable” judgment. According to an ideological ground, Tafuri (1980), indicated that modern architecture in its denial to history has discovered and created its own history. Consequently he disputed its attitude which based upon “looking for”⁽¹⁴⁾ (original and creative work) rather than “finding” (traditional work), despite the fact that Tafuri argued that “history cannot offer solutions”.

A final view based upon artistic belief was put forward by Watkins (1978). He argued that architectural ideology couldn't replace history nor is it capable of escape architecture from “involvement with image-making”. Therefore, Watkins argued that modern architecture adopts an image that closes it from Marxist ideology.

In the sequence of events opposers of the historical attitude of modern movement (where they are more than this paper has a place to enumerate) have demonstrated its: “failure”, Brolin (1976); “crises”, McEwen (1974); “fiasco”, Blake (1977) and “death”, Jencks (1977a). As a result of this debate a switch to other alternatives took and is taking place through approaches like New

Brutalism, Post-Modern, The New York Five and Deconstruction. In fact, these alternatives were coined by historians, critics and architects like Banham (1966), Jencks (1977a) and Eisenman (1976); anticipated and suggested established approaches and “rules” for judgments before each approach (beginning) tested itself through its historical process, as will be highlighted later in the concept beginning.

Having so far reviewed the historical interpretations of the antiquity, revivalists, anti-revivalists, eclecticism, religious, *Zeitgeist*, functionalism (rational and technological) and modern architecture, the following discussion will be devoted to highlight the nature and purpose of history.

Nature of history

As indicated earlier that the nature of history is inquiry, therefore in each of the previous interpretations, inquiry has been demonstrated in different techniques. For instance, evaluation of form - depiction of its features and description to its construction as indicated earlier - was the first technique to be used. The nature of this technique was inquiry about aesthetic and technical achievements and its purpose was to extract a valid body of values and roles, Collins (1971 b). Such a technique proceeded in the same manner until the French architect and historian J. D. Leroy, distinguished between history of architecture and theory of architecture. Where Leroy according to Collins (1971b), was the first to introduce the concept theory to architecture, consequently, a split in the profession between historians and architects also occurred, Pevsner (1961). The former is concerned according to Collins (1971b), with architecture as an end product, whilst the latter is concerned with architecture as “philosophical problems.” More to the point, Gropius (1956), emphasized such a split, he argued that the task of historian is rediscovery of the past, whilst, that of the architect is to create a need “order.” As a result of this split, together with the awareness of history,

according to Allsopp (1970) and Collins (1971b), the scope of originality increased and as a consequence the purposes of historical studies had also changed. For instance, historians like Moholy-Nagy (1976), Allsopp (1970) and the architect Gropius (1956), argued that historical studies creates a kind of “acute self-consciousness” on the one hand and offers knowledge about architecture on the other. This knowledge was partly attained from the concept of “precedence”, where architectural precedence, according to Collins (1971a), serves to illustrate principles. And partly from Allsopp (1970), he argued that historical studies participate in “giving form to unorganized experience.” But historians like Tafuri (1980), argued for a more ideological purpose, therefore historical studies should be devoted to free the meaning of architecture from its limited functional one and to suppress the value of architectural precedence.

Themes of historical studies

Nevertheless, despite the Marxist interpretation, it seems that all historical studies endeavor to offer knowledge about architecture. However, contemporary historical studies appear to be operated in three different themes: firstly, ideological as in the case of Marxist historians like Tafuri (1980). Secondly, artistic and classical interpretations, as the case of Watkins (1978), Benham (1966) and Jencks (1977 a & b). And thirdly, philosophical as the studies of Allsopp (1970) and Collins (1971 b).

However, in the course of discussion it has been emphasized that whenever objectives were measured against established historical interpretation, a change in focus occurred, a new interpretation introduced and all this process has been manipulated by criticism. The point at issue, here, is that criticism and history are inseparable. Thus the notion of history should not misinterpreted in architecture as to refer only to classical architecture. It should operate in a more wider sense as I tried to demonstrate in the

course of the previous discussions. In fact it is the endeavor of this paper to free the notion history from the abuse use and limited interpretation and to consider it as a record for the conceptual world of architecture and source for disseminating knowledge about architecture. Where in the following discussion I shall be highlighting another source of knowledge namely the notion theory.

Theory

Two sources of architectural interpretation have been discussed, criticism and history where both are concerned with analysis and inquiry into causes undertaken to formulate architectural thought. A third source is theory of architecture; the following discussions will be devoted to highlight the sequence that characterizes its interpretation, development, status and types.

Williams (1980), in his general interpretation to the notion theory, identified it as “a scheme of ideas which explains practice.” He indicated that “theory is always an active interrelation between explanation and things happening or made to happen in controlled conditions.” In this sense theory is a means of explaining, observing and making practice. Therefore, theory requires remaining open to objections in order to proceed as a theory and not to be ceased and become a “law”, Oakley (1970) and Williams (1980).

To delimit this discussion to architectural theory, one find, as has already been indicated, that the French architect J. D. Leroy, was the first to introduce the notion theory to architectural thought. It has also been indicated that one of the purposes of historical studies was to extract aesthetic values and technical rules or a valid body of principles. Therefore, historical studies were devoted to illustrate principles that may serve to establish theory/ies of architecture.

Nevertheless Oakley (1970), argued that the notion of a theory is a “practical

necessity if a body of knowledge is to pass beyond the natural history stage of recording and classifying.” But he emphasized that any theory of architectural design is work as a “semantic” rather than a “scientific” one. Such a theory that is concerned with “development, experience, meaning, direction, purpose, assessment and evaluation”; and these terms are “non-scientific.” Therefore, theory of architecture operates as guidance assumptions to the work of architecture rather than a fixed formula as in sciences’ theories. In the historical sense theory is concerned, according to Collins (1971b), with the way people actually build in the present. Therefore, theory is an active contemporary notion. On this view, it requires to be flexible in order to comprise the contributions of concern architects, critics, artists, scientists and perhaps historians.

Such contribution appears in the work of Scruton (1979) and Bonta (1980 a); the former indicated that architectural theory developed to formulate the maxims rules and precepts which govern or ought to govern practice; it also aims to solve problems and pre-empt solutions. Whilst the latter argued that theory can change practice, either by replacing previous theories or by developing “quasi-theories.” Thus both emphasized that theory and practice are interrelated. A similar view has been indicated by Norberg-Schulz (1967), where he argued that past theories were theories of means and the end were left to architects. On these views he maintains the need for theory with two aspects: external to deal with the task and internal which studies the means. Finally, Gropius (1976), indicated that theory is the “impersonal cumulative experience of successive generations” therefore, it is not a “ready-made” formula to guide practice, nor should it be instrumented as a preoccupation means against creativity and originality.

Creativity and originality

Creativity, according to Oakely (1970), Moholy-Nagy (1976) and Benett (1977), is the stage of exceeding the ultimate solutions to a new one and originality means uniqueness, inimitability or eccentricity. Benett argued that being original means being different and original practice is not necessarily a creative one.

On this view, creativity and originality may exceed the limits or discontinues, altogether with valid theory/ies. If the former occurred, theory may develop in a progressive manner according to Gropius, or it may lead to establish a quasi-theory according to Bonta (1980a). But if the latter occurred, that means a new beginning is underway and its endeavor, in my view, cannot be appropriately tested or judged until its formative stage is established, as will be discussed in the concept beginning, later in this paper.

However, having highlighted the notion theory and demonstrated its interrelation with practice, the following discussion will be devoted to highlight its status and types.

Status and types of theories

In so doing one finds that the notion of theory of architecture is a disputed one because it is a semantic one and consists of many theories of sciences and intellectual disciplines. Therefore, its status is an amalgam of the statuses of the many theories (of physical sciences, applied science human sciences and art) that constitute it, Oakley (1970). These statuses, Oakley argued, are varied from a wide measure of agreement in the theories of sciences to a disputed descriptive theories in human sciences and art, which “never reach agreed statuses”. On this view, theories of architecture cannot maintain definite agreed status. Consequently, it comprises in its life of discipline, according to Oakley, four basic types:

1- explanatory theories

2- basic concepts

3- generalization and

4- schemes of classification

1-Explanatory theories, as indicated earlier, are mainly historically oriented,

they seek to explain *why* and *how* certain architecture arrived into its established custom. These types of theories contribute towards the creation of knowledge about architecture and self-consciousness among architects.

2-The basic concepts are a body of ideas where “we” interpret our experience or use to demonstrate precedent concepts like the “rural home” or the “urban dwelling.” Concepts that demonstrate certain “happenings” and phenomena serve as brief descriptions to the phenomena involved and may help theorists and architects to organize new concepts. Basic concepts are what this paper is attempted to do so far, by defining and refining specific notions and concepts.

3-Generalization theories spring from the use of notions and concepts without distinctions, such as the phenomenon of “flat roofs” are found in the Mediterranean regions and “pitched roofs” are found in regions of moderate to high rainfall.

4-The schemes of classification theories are based upon “philosophies attitudes, concepts and needs.” Classification is meant to help to organize bodies of data, which enables and facilitates one to find his way through knowledge. Oakley emphasized that no classification system is perfect, but he maintains the need to organize anybody of ideas in different ways aiming to arrive at “new truths.” For instance, structural system is one of these classifications, which enables architects to select the appropriate structure for their design.

However, in the course of discussions, one may conclude that the notion of theory was partly a consequence of historical studies and partly of an intellectual need. It has no specific status but is capable of development and progress. Yet one should bear in mind that the status of theory is not a fixed formula, it rather an open organized body of ideas that work as a guidance assumption to the work of architecture. Therefore, it may be substituted with other original thought and practice; if that

happens, then, a new beginning ought to take place in architecture and that is the subject matter of the following discussions.

Beginning

Having gone so far as to interpret criticism history and theory, I shall take the time here to highlight the concept beginning and its place in architectural thought. Since beginning is a new concept that I shall try to introduce to architectural criticism. Therefore, it is necessary, first to indicate and highlight its origin, interpretation, status and establishment.

As indicated earlier architectural criticism is almost always influenced by literary criticism. The concept beginning coined and used to serve literature and arts criticism, according to Said (1978), *Beginnings Intention And Method*, where he devoted all the book to highlight the concept beginning. He indicated that beginnings are something one “does” and something one “thinks” about. He argued that the two sometimes go together; consequently they are connected when “language is being used.”

Such particular vocabulary, Said indicated, employed terms like: “beginning and starting out, origins and originality, initiation, inauguration, revolution, authority, point of departure, radicalism” - when a beginning is being outlined or indicated. Therefore, Said indicated that thinking *about* beginning is tied to initiating a beginning, he argued that beginning is not only “a kind of action, but it is also a frame of mind, a type of work, an attitude and a consciousness.” Beginning, Said indicated, is not always evident; it is basically an activity which “ultimately implies return and repetition rather than simple linear accomplishment.” Thus beginning and “beginning-again” as activities are making or producing difference. For although a beginning in its beginning establishes relationships with works already existing, but relationships according to Said’s of either continuity or discontinuity or a “mixture” of both, Said (1978:5) indicated:

“...the concept beginning designates a moment in time, a place, a principle, or an action ... thus the concept beginning is associated in each case with an idea of precedence and/or priority. Finally most important, in each case a beginning is designated in order to indicate clarify, or define a later time, place or action. In short, the designation of a beginning generally involves also the designation of a consequent intention ... the beginning is the first point (in time, space, or action) of an accomplishment or process that has duration and meaning. The beginning, then, is the first step in the intentional production of meaning[my underlining].”

The previous interpretation indicates and gives rise to different concepts. I shall try to show how these concepts existed and implied in architecture, after highlighting its aspects.

Beginning as an idea, according to Said, “is a creative and a critical activity”; it has an active meaning, unlike origin that has a “passive” one. It seems that it is for this reason that Said places origin before beginning and considers the former as a latent state from which the beginning of action takes place and moves forward, thus origin serves, according to Said as a “condition of state” that permits beginning. Therefore, beginning (as the first point in a given continuity together with its initiated course of discontinuity with established courses) is an undergoing process or a problem to be studied which needs time to be established, so it is “more a structure than a history.” In other words the concept beginning serves to coin and create principles, this is not paradoxical with precedence which serves to illustrate principles, as indicated earlier. Because beginning in its both aspects intentional and “circumstantial” has the desire and will to accept the risks of rupture with established courses, therefore, it is a project underway; whilst precedence is, already, an established course. Said argued that once beginning made the “focus of attention” and occupies the “foreground is no longer beginning” but

it has the status of actuality similar as precedence. As a result of this, Said distinguished between “thought that is beginning (established courses) and thought about beginning that is between the status of subject and object.”

Kinds of beginning

Finally, Said indicated two kinds of beginnings: “transitive and temporal” one, which anticipates, implies or implicates the end and expected continuity, which occurred when the search for it “pursued within moral and imaginative framework.” The other kind is “intransitive and conceptual” one, which has no object but retains for the beginning its identity as a radical starting point which occurred when the search is modest and less urgent. The two kinds of beginnings, according to Said, entail two styles of thought and of imagination: one projective and descriptive, the other tautological and endless by self-mimetic. Similar conclusion has, already, been indicated earlier in this study, therefore, one may conclude that beginning and criticism are interrelated and the former is a means for generating the latter.

I have so far tried to view the status of the concept beginning, as a starting point and as an idea, which entails a formative process that projects or endeavors to project an end. And how this concept propagates two tendencies of thought, as already indicated earlier, in criticism and history. In much the same way, the following discussion will be devoted to highlight the place of the concept beginning in architecture.

Beginning in architecture.

In what setting? and by what instruments architectural beginnings are formed? and what ends such beginning project? In the previous discussion, different historical interpretation of architecture has already been indicated each of which one may view it as a new beginning that projects a style as an end. Since modern architecture was the only approach that challenged the continuity of past architectural thought and practices as

already indicated. Therefore, one may interpret it as a conscious intentional beginning that accepts the risks and rupture with history or past architecture which endeavors as a “new architecture” (beginning) to designate its place in time and independent identity outside the stylistic interpretation, Gropius (1976). But it seems necessary, first, to point out the place of the concept beginning in architectural thought.

Beginning has been introduced to architecture in different terms. For instance, Wolfflin (1968), *Principles of Architectural History*, attempted in his book to find a starting point in architecture; Giedion (1964), *The Eternal Present, The Beginning Of Architecture*, indicated a starting point to architecture when he considered Mesopotamia is the birthplace of architecture. In a quick survey to the bibliography of this paper one finds many titles with the prefix “New” or “Neo”, which indicates a starting point. Other titles like: *Crises In Architecture, Failure Of Modern Architecture; “Death” of and “Retreat” from modern architecture; “Post” and “Late” modern architecture* maintain the need for a new beginning. Nevertheless, a more conscious interpretation to the concept beginning appears to have its place in architecture. For instance, the American architect Louis Kahn argued that “it is good for the mind to go back to the beginning because the beginning of any established activity of man is its most wonderful moment.”⁽¹⁵⁾ Such argument may appear modest but demonstrates and maintains consciousness of the concept beginning. Another conscious and imaginative interpretation demonstrated by Scully (1975), he argued that historians in their attempt to define the beginning of modern architecture, should return back in time until they reach a chronological point in which the image of architecture no longer bears a modern world image. Such interpretation indicates conditions and aspects of the concept beginning. In a Hegelian dialectic⁽¹⁶⁾, Bonta (1980 a)

considered beginning as a reinterpretation of architecture and argued that for such reinterpretation to occur it would have to consider a valid interpretation, then to ignore it, then challenge it. As a result of this process a work “departs” from an established one, “a change in focus [and] a switch to a new area of interest” ought to take place. Consequently, a collective effort needs to be maintained in order to form, establish and constitute a new course in architectural thought and practice.

Therefore a new beginning in architecture is not a modest personal choice - like the views of Venturi (1977) and the interpretation of Post-Modern, Jencks (1977a) so much so the interpretation of Deconstruction, Eisenman (1988) - but perhaps a cultural necessity which stems and performs within a moral framework. Gropius (1956) and Le Corbusier (1960) argued that modern architecture initiated a new beginning. The former in his book, *The New Architecture And The Bauhaus*, indicated a “breach” with past architecture in favor of “honesty of thought and feeling.” In achieving this, Gropius (1956) indicated that “a new scope for architecture had to be outlined.” Consequently, he argued that a modest individual architect cannot achieve such an attempt, but he maintained the need for the contribution of a well-trained generation of architects that would contribute, creatively, according to moral basis and social commitments. Gropius (1961), demonstrated his contribution to the concept beginning by indicating that “at the beginning of our movement [modern architecture] stood an idea”, not preoccupation of certain forms. In a similar way Le Corbusier (1960), *Towards A New Architecture*, interpreted the beginning of modern architecture as a revolution. He argued that for such a revolution to take place it must challenge the continuity of the past (history). Consequently, he indicated that such a challenge was underway and “architecture today [1923] is no longer conscious of its own beginnings.” Both were

consciously endeavored to arrive into an anti-stylistic end.

Having highlighted the concept beginning and indicating its role and place in the practice and interpretation of architecture, in the following discussion, I shall be highlighting the concept approach but after highlighting the label style.

Style

As indicated earlier that the division of architecture into styles was a result of the periodicity of history. But the term style according to Collins (1971 b), originated in literary studies; it meant or referred to a specific “feature of literary composition which belongs to the form and expression rather than to the substance of the thought or matter expressed.” He also indicated that architecture was practiced, before the awareness of history, as a straightforward matter and relied upon established “principles”, whereby architects imagination should be maintained within the limits of acknowledged rules (styles). Moholy-Nagy (1976), also indicated a similar attitude, she argued that architects of the past were unchallenged nor confused (like today’s architects) with technology, economy and “cultural aesthetic values.” Therefore, one may conclude that style, originality and creativity were in-conflict. Such conflict led to the beginning of modern architecture.

Ever since this conflict occurred⁽¹⁷⁾ advocates of the new beginning were faced with a dilemma as to whether they interpret its end product in accordance with stylistic establishment or outside such one. Those in favor of stylistic interpretation, Hitchcock and Johnson (1966), *The International Style*, argued that although modern architecture suppressed the “prestige of the styles, but it did not remove the implication that there was a possibility of choice between one aesthetic conception of design and another.” They argued that style has developed from a fixed mould to a frame of potential growth. Consequently, it reciprocates “new principles” such as “volume”, “regularity”

and “order” as alternatives to “mass”, “symmetry” and “rhythm.”

The others argued, together with founders⁽¹⁸⁾ of the new beginning, that the limited scopes and acknowledged rules of style stifle rather than stimulate creativity and bear limited consciousness. Therefore, they introduced two *labels*: namely school and movement to clarify and define their conscious beginning, Gropius (1956, 1961, 1976), Le Corbusier (1960) and Giedion (1978), as I shall be reviewing after indicating definitions of style.

Types of definitions

In so doing one is caught between two types of definitions, what one may call explanatory and the other conceptual. The former seems to be prone to indicate the process of working within a style, whilst the latter attempts to emphasize the meaning of style. The former appears to be adopted by founders and advocates of modern architecture. For instance, Le Corbusier (1960) has defined style on one occasion as a “lie” and on another as “the unity of principles animating all the work of an epoch.” In a similar manner Gropius (1956) indicated that “a style is a successive repetition of an expression which has become settled already on a common denominator for a whole period.” Giedion (1978) argued that style is a formalistic approach. Finally, Wolfflin (1950), argued that the style of closed composition is an architectural one.

The conceptual definition appears to be the corpus of art historians rather than both architects and architectural historians. For instance, Coomaraswamy (1956), indicated that the artist is innocent from the sequences of styles. Yet “styles are the accident and by no means the essence of art.” Scruton (1979), argued that style is “the natural crystallization of aesthetic endeavors”; it serves to grasp meaning that suggested to the aesthetic understanding of style’s characteristics. Another approach to the interpretation and definition of style was put forward by Pevsner (1975), he attempted to detach the term style from its

traditional meaning as indicated earlier and argued that contemporary style “must” be inclusive. Norberg Schulz (1967) and Jencks (1980 a) interpreted similar views.

Nevertheless, as indicated earlier a consequence of stylistic interpretation led to substitute the label of style with new terms such as: school and movement in order to label the endeavor end of the new beginning. For although none of the two terms has been directly interpreted like the label style or the concept beginning. But indirectly as in the attempts of introducing the phrase “international style” and the concept “approach” to substitute the term style. However the following discussions will be devoted to the concept approach.

Approach

The use of the adjective international, perhaps, meant to widen the limited scope of traditional style/s as indicated by Hitchcock and Johnson (1966). Whilst the literal meaning of the term approach as a proposal appears to be less formal than any of the terms that have been so far interpreted. It is for this reason, perhaps, that the term approach is used indiscriminately to interpret and cover individual practice, as well as established ones. For instance, a series of articles had been published in the *RIBA Journal* (1967), under the rubric “Architects Approach To Architecture”, emphasized individuals contributions to architecture. Gropius (1956), highlighted the established aspect of the concept approach, when he indicated that the endeavors of the Bauhaus⁽¹⁹⁾ were to find “a new approach.” Therefore, the term approach does not reveal a formal architectural characteristics or practice; nor does limited to a specific architectural discipline or interpretation. It is, in my view, a wide concept, neutral in its meaning, perhaps, like beginning and not just a specific label like school, which I shall be interpreting, in the following discussion.

School

The term school used in architectural interpretation in its abstract meaning as it has already been used and is used in many

other intellectual disciplines like literature, psychology and philosophy. Despite the wide range use of this term outside the architectural realm, but there has been no direct or specific interpretation to its concept, except short definitions in dictionaries and encyclopedias. In which the term appears to have wide usage in painting and philosophy. According to the many dictionaries I consulted, the term school applied to a body of intellectuals who share the belief in a system of views, principles and methods or are actuated by the same spirit and opinions, like the “Scotch school of philosophy.” Baldwin (1902), *Dictionary Of Philosophy And Psychology*, recorded two types of schools: one that is bounded and motivated with locality of opinion and allied by race and geography, like the “various groups of Greek thinkers.”⁽²⁰⁾ And the other is a more organized group connected with personal relationships, preoccupied by the ideas of a recognized founder, like Plato, and devoted to elaborate and defend these ideas. In much the same way, *The Penguin Dictionary of Art And Artists*, indicated that the term school applied to the collective work of artists of a province or nation at some particular time like the “Italian school of painting.” The term, according to the same dictionary, bears more sense when it is applied to a smaller territory. Consequently the term will be easily defined if it is referred to a painter rather than a place, *The Dictionary* indicated that the National Gallery Catalogues⁽²¹⁾, suggested “that school is best reserved for a geographical designation, while style of ... should be used to indicate the relationship to a particular painter.” The point at issue, therefore, is that the term school is, perhaps, wider than style. Such interpretation appears to imply the endeavor of modern architecture, despite the unconscious use of the term by historians Jencks (1980 a), but Gropius (1956), attempts to bring to bear a specific interpretation. He indicated that modern architecture includes different schools of design and each of which has its own representative. For although Gropius did

not nominate these schools, nor did he nominate their representatives but his analysis seems to offer a conscious place to the term school within architectural thought. Yet according to Gropius, each new approach to modern design (architecture) is a school, consequently, the Bauhaus was a school in both senses, as a professional institution and as an intellectual discipline. On this view, school is a label that covers specific contributions to architectural thought and practice initiates and reflects consciousness within the architectural realm. But in trying to unify the contribution of schools of design under an inclusive label that bears wide consciousness, one is introduced to the label movement that I shall be highlighting in the following discussions.

Movement

Similarly as school, the term movement covers the course of actions and endeavors of many intellectual disciplines like music and painting. It has been defined, according to the many dictionaries I consulted, as a course or series of actions and endeavors on the part of a body of persons tending more or less continuously towards some special end. In philosophy, movement is interpreted as the process or course of thought in reasoning. In painting movement is the quality of suggesting that the objects represented are moving. In architecture Murray (1980), *A New English Dictionary Of Historical Principles*, went on to define movement as the “harmonious variety in the lines and ornamentation of a building; freedom alike from monotony and incongruity.” The point at issue, here, is not as to whether one is to agree or not with this interpretation, but the fact that architecture is for the first time, categorized in a dictionary, side by side, with other intellectual disciplines and outside stylistic interpretation.

Gropius (1956) indicated that the endeavor of the Bauhaus was not to create a new style but a “movement” that “promotes a creative state of mind.” He agreed that a movement is a sequence of ideas

continuous actions and collective efforts that contribute towards a proposed endeavor. It is not by any means an obsession with specific forms and techniques. Bonta (1980 a) emphasized that the movement of modern architecture was not a “mishap” but a result of elaborated activities and collective efforts of clarification to its endeavors. He argued that “any” movement that tries to overlook these principles is condemned to be “short-lived.” Consequently, contributions to a movement should be maintained and followers should be encouraged to air their views rather than be described as formalistic imitators to the work of founders of such a movement. Thus, the term movement, (as in the case of modern movement - modern architecture) applies to a variety of approaches of architecture that contribute almost, to the same endeavor each in its own way. It is similar as in the case of the Bauhaus, organic⁽²²⁾ architecture and functionalism, so to speak, that modern movement is an inclusive one that includes different schools of design. Thus a movement as a label bears and reflects more consciousness than any of the preceding notions, concepts and labels.

Finally, in the course of discussions in this paper I tried to show that architectural key terms are vital part of the conscious process of architectural interpretation. I emphasized the need for appropriate employment of each notion, concept and label in this process.

Summary and conclusion

Discussions in this paper were devoted to clear the abuse use of key terms in architectural interpretation. It covered the notions: criticism, history and theory; concepts: beginning and approach; and labels: style, school and movement. Discussions also covered many topics in architectural thought like the concepts: precedence, generality, creativity and the label eclecticism.

In the course of discussions an attempt was made to define each key term, refine its meaning, explore its role and outline its

scope and place within architectural interpretation.

In the beginning discussions highlighted the notion of criticism, its literal meaning, origin and development from the spoken stage to the intellectual one. It proceeded to include the two tendencies of architectural criticism, restorative and supportive, and indicated the teleological theme of the former and the ideological one of the latter. Discussions highlighted the concept of generality together with the descriptive and prescriptive techniques of criticism. It recorded the types of criticism and drew the relation between criticism and history. Discussions concluded that the role of the notion of criticism in architecture is a means of interpretation and refinement of knowledge.

The discussions that followed extended to highlight the notion of history as a research or inquiry that attempts to extract self-knowledge about actions of human beings that have been done in the past. It reviewed the interpretation of antiquity, revivalist ... and modern architecture. Discussions proceeded to indicate the explanatory role of historical studies and emphasized its relation with criticism and influence upon the theory of architecture, so much so upon the concepts of creativity and originality. Discussions developed to highlight the purpose of historical studies in architecture that was viewed to be as an acute self-consciousness, knowledge about architecture and sense of direction. It concluded that the notion of history should not be limited to the classical architecture, but to operate in a wider sense as a record for the conceptual world of architecture and source for disseminating its knowledge.

Discussions turned to highlight the notion of theory as a means of explaining and doing practice; it proceeded to mark the contrast between history and theory on the one hand, creativity and originality on the other hand. Discussions also highlighted its status and types and concluded that the status of theory is not a fixed formula it rather an open organized body of ideas that

work as a guidance assumption to the work of architecture.

Discussions proceeded, to highlight the concept beginning as the first point in time that has duration and meaning; and delineated the active meaning of beginning (as a creative process) and the passive meaning of origin. Discussions went on to record the two kinds of beginning: the transitive one that implicates its end and the intransitive one as a radical starting point. Discussions extended to indicate the concept beginning in architecture, by delineating the elaborated beginning of modern architecture that challenged the continuity of past architecture (taught and practice) and accept the risks and rupture with it.

Discussion then turned to highlight the label of style its literary origin, limited scope as a successive repetition and limited consciousness. The discussion that followed centered upon the concept approach interpreting it as a wide one that does not reveal a formal architecture. Discussions turned to highlight the labels school and movement. The former was interpreted as a group of persons who share the same belief in any intellectual discipline, whilst the latter was interpreted as a wide label that included more than one school.

In conclusion discussions emphasized that architectural interpretation is not interplay with words as "self-appointed critics" believed, Gropius (1956). It is rather an elaborated conscious process, as this paper attempt to demonstrate in the course of discussions via emphasizing the role and place of each notion, concept and label in this process. Discussions concluded that criticism is a means for refinement of knowledge about architecture; history is a record for the conceptual world of architecture and source for disseminating of knowledge about it; and theory is an open organized body of ideas, work as guidance assumption to the work of architecture. The concept beginning is the first stage in any conscious architectural process. And when beginning occupies the foreground, it enters

its formative stage, therefore, it loses its status (as the first point in the conscious process) and endeavors to an establishment. The result of this intellectual process may be labeled as an approach, a school or a movement. Finally this paper maintains the need to clear the indiscrimination and abuse use of the previous architectural key terms in architectural interpretation via instrumenting and employing them appropriately on the light of their interpretation in this paper.

Notes:

1-The definition deduced after consulting the following dictionaries and Encyclopedias:

Al-B`alabki, M. (1981). *Al-Mawrid English Arabic Dictionary*, Dar al-`Alem Lilmalaiyyin, Beirut.

Burchfield, E.W. (1972). *A Supplement Of The Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, U.K.

Baldwin, J. M. (1902). *Dictionary Of Philosophy & Psychology*, Vol. 2, The Macmillan Co. London.

Edwards, P.(1967). *The Encyclopedia Of Philosophy*, The Macmillan Co.,Vol. 5, London.

Fleming, J. Honour, H., Pevsner, N. (1976). *The Penguin Dictionary of architecture*, Penguin Books, England.

Guralnik, D. B. (1977). *Webster's New World Dictionary*, Collins World Publishing Co.

Little, W. (1934). *Shorter Oxford Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, U.K.

Morris, W. (1978). *The American Heritage Dictionary Of The English Language*, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, USA.

Murray, A. H. (1980). *A New English Dictionary Of Historical Principles*, London.

Murray, P. & L. (1979). *The Penguin Dictionary Of Art & Artists*, Penguin Books, England.

Sills, D. L. (1968). *International Encyclopedia Of The Social Sciences*, Vol.7, The Macmillan Co., The Free Press USA.

William, B. (1974). *The New Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 16.

Williams, R. (1980). *Keywords*, Fontana / Croom Helm, Glasgow, U.K.

2-Alexander, C., *Notes On The Synthesis Of form*, (1979:36) indicated:

"In the unself-conscious culture the same form is made over and over again; in order to learn form-making, people need only learn to repeat a single familiar physical pattern. In the self-conscious culture required to deal with problems that are either entirely new or at best modifications of old problems. Under these circumstances, it is not enough to copy old physical patterns. So that people will be able to make innovations and modifications as required, ideas about how and why things get their shape must be introduced. Teaching must be based on explicit general principles of function, rather than unmentioned and specific principles."

3-Said, E., *Beginnings Intention And Method*, (1978:199), introduced two terms: restorative and supportive to literature criticism as follows: "Outside the Judeo-Christian textual tradition in the Arab-Islamic for instance rather different conditions prevail. One of them is *Cidjaz*, a concept. Which describes the uniqueness of the Koran as rendering all other texts impotent by comparison. Thus since the central text is in Arabic and since, unlike the Gospels or even the Torah, it is given as unitary and complete, textual traditions are essentially supportive not restorative. All texts are secondary to the Koran, which is inimitable. (Note the absence of the problems of the formal imperfections of scripture of mixed styles of incomplete or partially transmitted texts, and so an all of which obtain in Christian Europe that Vico described)."

4-Hatje, G.(1975). *Encyclopedia Of Modern Architecture*, indicated the entry of functionalism:

"Functionalism. 'Form follows function' is the catchphrase that spells modern architecture to most laymen.... It grew directly out of this credo that form must reflect function-or 'express' function, as architects like to say. This was paraphrased to mean that all the different elements in a building should be separately 'expressed': for example, visible in-side and out, and separated from nonstructural wall panels and partitions, so that the structural frame would clearly 'express' its function of holding up the floors and the roof."

See also:

Fleming, J. (1976). *The Penguin Dictionary of architecture*. Jordy, W. (1972). *American Buildings And Their Architects*, Vol. 3 pp. 83-180.

Giedion, S. (1978). *Space, Time And Architecture*.
5-Giedion (1964:499-526) interpreted the spatial doctrine as follows:

“Consideration of space as a material for artistic representation arose in the Renaissance, the moment rationally scientific perspective drawing made it possible to bring space onto two-dimensional picture plane. Although this posse consideration had the task of submitting the reception of perspective to a subtly intuitive refinement, it always dealt in perspective in depth. In a University lecture Hans Jantzen followed this development through four hundred years (1936) throughout which interest centered upon the representation of space in painting. But in (1890) a strong impetus arose to bring architectural space into consideration. Leading art historians Alois Riegl (1856-1905), Heinrich Wofflin (1864-1946) and August Schmarsow (1858- 1936) began to find the analysis of formal shapes insufficient and too coarse. They recognized Plato’s space as a receptacle of all becoming, to be an essential ingredient of architectural expression.”

Consequently, Giedion categorized architectural space conception in three stages. The first space conception, was concerned with emphasizing the relations between volumes and restricted the earlier freedom of individual objects in space. The second space conception, was concerned with relating the symbolic of interior space to the cosmos. The third space conception is concerned with transparency and dematerialization of the solid volume to allow fluidity of space.

Giedion (1978), *Space Time And Architecture*, went on to consider the previous space conception of the Renaissance as Euclidean geometry and put forward a fourth dimension, namely, Space -Time. He argued that Space-Time achieved via extensive transparency to allow maximum fluidity of space. As in the case of Villa Savoi, where maximum transparency achieved via the continuous horizontal windows and from down and up through the hollowed body of the villa (the ramp and the stairway).

See: Giedion, S. (1964: 499 - 526). *The Eternal Present: The Beginning Of Architecture*,

Wofflin, H. (1950). *Principles Of Art History*.

_____ (1968). *Principles Of Architectural History*.

Collins, P. (1971b: 285-93). *Changing Ideals In Modern Architecture*.

6-According to *The Penguin Dictionary Of Art & Artists* (1979) proportion is:

“The relation of one part to a whole or to the other parts. In the arts it usually means a will-o'-the-wisp search for significant mathematical relationships between the parts of the human body. Such a search certainly began in classical times evidence is in much Greek sculpture-and the codified rules given in Vitruvius’ Treatise on Architectural (early in the 1st century A.D.) led to much theorizing in the Renaissance. Leonard da Vinci and Durer were the two artists who devoted the most energy to these studies (There is no excellent beauty that hath not some strangeness in the proportion. A man cannot tell whether Apelles or Albert Durer were the more trifler; where of the one would make a personage by geometrical proportions: the other by taking the best parts out of diverse faces to make one excellent: Bacon, ‘of Beauty’). In practice, the normal human body is about (7or7.5) times as tall as the height of its own head, and the total height is also roughly equal to the width of the outstretched arms. In IDEAL ART, therefore, its usual to make the height equal to the full width of the arms; and further to gain mathematical harmony by elongating the body so that the total height becomes (8) heads. This gives a body which can be inscribed in squares and circles and also the Convenient divisions so beloved of classically minded artists - e.g. the groin becomes the exact halt the legs can be again halved at the knees, and so on.”

7-John Ruskin, according to *The Penguin Dictionary Of Art & Artists*, (1979), was the most influential art critic of the nineteenth century. He also a draughtsman in architecture. The following prose was his contribution to architectural criticism as it was quoted in Collins (1971b: 259), *Changing Ideals In Modern Architecture*:

“A multitude of pillars and white domes, clustered into a long low pyramid of Colored light; a treasure heap, it seems, partly of gold, and partly of opal and mother-of-pearl hollowed beneath into five great vaulted porches, ceiled with fair mosaic, and beset with sculpture of alabaster, clear as *amber* and, delicate ivory-sculpture fantastic and involve, of palm leaves and lilies, and grapes and pomegranates, and birds clinging and fluttering

among the branches, all twined together into an endless network of buds and plumes; and in the midst of it, the solemn form of angels sceptred and, robed to the feet, and leaning to each other across the gates, their figures indistinct among the gleaming of the golden ground through the leaves beside them, interrupted and dim like the morning light as it faded back among the branches of Eden, when first its gates were angel-guarded long ago. And round the walls of the porches there are set pillars of variegated stones, jasper and porphyry, and deep-green serpentine spotted with flakes of snow, and marbles, that half refuse and half yield to the sunshine, Cleopatra-like, "their, bluest veins to kiss"-the shadow as it steals back from them, revealing line after line of azure undulation, as a receding tide leaves the waved sand; their capitals rich with interwoven tracery, rooted knots of herbage, and drifting leaves of acanthus and vine, and mystical signs, all beginning and ending in the Cross and above them, in the broad archivolt, a continuous chain of language and of life-angels, and the signs of heaven, and the labors of men, each in its appointed season upon earth; and above these, another range of glittering pinnacles, mixed with white are edged with scarlet flowers, a confusion of delight, amidst which the breasts of the Greek horses are seen blazing in their breadth of golden strength, and the St. Mark's Lion, lifted on a blue field covered with stars, until at last, as if in ecstasy, the crests of the arches break into a marble foam, and toss themselves far into the blue sky in flashes and wreathes of sculptured spray, as if the breakers on the Lido shore had been frost-bound before they felt and the sea-nymphs had inlaid them with coral and amethyst."

8-Leicester Engineering Building, was designed in 1964, by the English architects James Sterling and James Gowan, for Leicester University, England,

See: Bonta (1980a:15).

9-According to *Chamber's Encyclopedia*, (1968). Vol.13, James Stuart (1713-88), was an English architect, who together with the architect Revett, N. were measured and drew the architectural remains of Athens; and their work was published in a book, namely, *Antiquities of Athens*, 1762.

10-According to *Chamber's Encyclopedia*, (1968). Vol. 13, J. G. Saufflot (1713-80), was

remarkable French architect and historian in the classical revival of French architecture.

11-According to Collins (1971b: 30), *Changing Ideals In Modern Architecture*, Medieval scholars were introduced two concepts into historiography, those are:

"... the notion of historical periods, the other was the idea that the past and the future both form some intelligible sequential pattern of events. These historical periods were based on religious foundations.... But once history was divided into periods, these led the way to a division of architecture into styles."

12-Baroque style, according to *The Penguin Dictionary Of Architecture* (1976), was dominated in the seventeenth century and part of the eighteenth century.

"It is characterized by exuberant decoration, expansive curvaceous forms, a sense of mass, a delight in large-scale and sweeping vistas, and preference for spatially complex compositions."

13-Rococo style, according to *The Penguin Dictionary of architecture*, (1976), was the late style of the Baroque It recognized from the Baroque style by its light and colors and great spatial complexity.

14-Tafuri, (1980: 104), quoted the Spanish painter Picasso as follows: "I don't look for, I find."

15-Quoted in Collins, (1971 a: 32), *Architectural Judgment*.

16-Hegel's dialectic was viewed by Collingwood, R. G. (1976: 118), *The Idea Of History* as follows:

"... Hegel in his theory of dialectic, which describes the way in which any concepts stands in a necessary relation to its own opposite, generating it at first and then negating it, so that the way in which the concept lives is by creating and overcoming oppositions. But individuals things which are instance of concepts are never related to each other by way of opposition, only by way of distinction: consequently the relations between them are not dialectical and in history which is history of individual actions and persons and civilizations, there is consequently no dialectic, whereas Hegel's whole philosophy of History turns on the principle that every historical process is a dialectical process in which one form of life, for example Greece, generates its own opposite, in the case Rome...."

See also: Sabin, G.H. (1973: 570-508), *A History Of Political Theory*, Brydin Press, U.S.A.

17-The remarkable advocates according to their writings are: Giedion, Pevsner and Scully.

See: Giedion, S. (1978), *Space, Time And Architecture*.

Pevsner, N. (1975), *Pioneers of modern Design*.

Scully, V. (1975), *Modern Architecture*.

18-The remarkable founders according to the advocates are: Gropius, Le Corbusier, Mies, and Wright.

See: Gropius, W. (1956). *The Scope of Total Architecture*.

_____ (1976). *The New Architecture And The Bauhaus*.

Le Corbusier (1960). *Towards A New Architecture*.(1978),

_____ (1978 a). *The City Of Tomorrow*.

Wright, F. L. (1954). *The Natural House*.

_____ (1974). *Frank Lloyd Wright Writings And Buildings*.

Blake, P. (1976). *The Master Builders*.

Hoag, E & J. (1977). *Masters Of Modern Architecture*.

19-Bauhaus was a school of design, building and craftsmanship founded 1919 in Germany by Gropius and closed in 1933. The Bauhaus played a remarkable role in architectural practice and thought of the 20th century. Its profound endeavor was to unite arts and crafts and to create a new architecture. Its original and creative theme was a major contribution to modern architecture. It was the first school of architecture in the world, according to Gropius (1956), to embody a definite curriculum that integrated with the industrial society at the time. Gropius was the founder and ideologist of the Bauhaus, he published many books as mentioned in note 18.

See also: Gropius, W. & Mayer, H. (1979), *Bauhaus, 1919-1928*.

20-The three leading figures of Greek thinkers are: Socrates (469-399), Plato (429-348) and Aristotle. The three of them were philosophers, all their work was categorized in the *Dictionary Of Philosophy And Psychology* and *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Vols. 1, 6 and 8.

21-The *Penguin Dictionary* did not indicate which National Gallery who marked the differences.

22-According to Hatje, (1975), *Encyclopedia Of Modern Architecture*, organic architecture interpreted and conceived in different ways. One view claimed that the theory originated in ancient Greek and Roman architecture and developed during the Renaissance. Its

theme is based upon the relation between human body and architecture. Therefore, architecture should have natural characteristics in its appearance similar to a natural organism as in the work of the architects Henry van de Velde and Erich Mendelsohn. The other view adopted a theme based upon the "notion of organic unity." It argued that building should be a unity with its surroundings, especially with the site and the earth on which it stands. Frank Lloyd Wright was the spokesman of this view. He argued that buildings should grow from inside to outside and buildings should integrate with nature. See also: Wright's books in note 18

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akin, O. (1979). A Style Named Post - Modern, *Architectural Design*, Aug.\ Sept., pp. 224-226.

Alexander, C. (1979). *Notes On The Synthesis Of Form*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. USA.

Allsopp, B. (1970). *The Study Of Architectural History*, Studio Vista, London, UK.

Baldwin, J. M. (1902). *Dictionary Of Philosophy And Psychology*, The Macmillan Co., London.

Banham, R. (1966). *The New Brutalism Ethic Or Aesthetic*, The Architectural Press, London.

_____ (1969). *The Architecture Of The Well-Tempered Environment*, The Architectural Press, London.

_____ (1976). *Meagastucture*, Thames & Hudson Ltd., UK. (1978 a). *Age Of The Masters*, The Architectural Press, London.

_____ (1978 b). Modern Architecture Is Undecorated, in *The Rationalists, Theory & Design Of Modern Movement*, (Sharp, D. edit.), Architectural Press, London, pp.27-33.

_____ (1980). *Theory And Design In The First Machine Age*, The Architectural Press, London.

Bennett, C. (1977). *Space For People, Human Factors In Design*, Prentice-Hall, NJ., USA..

Blake, P. (1974). The Rise Of Modern Architecture, *Dialogue*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 22-33.

_____ (1976). *The Master Builders*, The Norton Library, USA.

_____ (1977). *Form Follows Fiasco*, The Atlantic Monthly Press Books, USA.

Bonta, J. P. (1980 a). *Architecture And Its Interpretation*, Lund Humphries, London.

- _____ (1980 b). Notes For A Theory Of Meaning, in *Signs, Symbol & Architecture*, (Broadbent, Bunt & Jencks eds.), John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., pp. 275-311.
- Boyd, R. (1967). The Sad End Of New Brutalism, *Architectural Review*, July, pp. 9-11.
- Brewer, M. (1978). Where Do We Stand, in *The Rationalist, Theory & Design Of The Modern Movement*, (Sharp, D. edit.), The Architectural Press, London, pp. 84-90.
- Broline, B. C. (1976). *The Failure Of Modern Architecture*, Van Nostard Reinhold Co. N.Y.
- Butterfield, H. (1969). *Man On His Past*, Cambridge University Press, UK.
- Collins, P. (1968). The Philosophy Of Architectural Criticism, *AIA Journal*, Jan., pp. 46-49.
- _____ (1971 a). *Architectural Judgment*, McGill-Queens University Press, Montreal Canada.
- _____ (1971 b). *Changing Ideals In Modern Architecture*, Faber & Faber, London.
- Collingwood, R. G. (1976). *The Idea Of History*, Oxford University Press, N.Y.
- Cook, J. W. & Heinrich, K. (1976). *Conversation With Architects*, Praeger Publisher, N.Y.
- Coomaraswamy, A. K. (1956). *Christian & Oriental Philosophy Of Art*, Dover Publication, N.Y.
- Cowan, H. J. (1977). *An Historical Outline Of Architectural Science*, Applied Science Publishers Ltd. London.
- Eisenman, P. (1963). Towards An Understanding Of Form In Architecture, *AD*, Oct., pp. 436-58.
- _____ (1976). Post-Functionalism, *Opposition*, Fall, pp. 1-3.
- _____ (1989). En Terror Firma: In Trials Of Grotexes, *AD*, Vol. 58, 1\2, pp. 40-43.
- _____ (1988). The Blue Line Texts, *AD*, Vol. 58, No. 7/8, pp. 5-9.
- Frampton, K. (1974). Apropos Ulm: Curriculum And Critical Theory, *Opposition*, May, pp. 17-36.
- _____ (1975). Frontality Verses. Rotation, in *Five Architect*, (Eisenman & Others), Oxford University Press. N.Y.
- _____ (1980). *Modern Architecture A Critical History*, Thames & Hudson Ltd., London.
- Friedman, Y. (1980). *Towards A Scientific Architecture*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- Giedion, S (1963). Architecture In The 1960's, Hopes & Fear, *Zodiac*, No. 11, pp. 24-35.
- _____ (1964). *The Beginning Of Architecture*, Princeton University Press, NJ. USA.
- _____ (1978). *Space Time And Architecture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- Gloag, J. (1975). *The Architectural Interpretation Of History*, A & C Black Ltd., London.
- Goldberger, P. (1977). Post-Modernism: An Introduction, *AD*, April, pp. 256-260.
- Grillo, P. J. (1975). *Form Function And Design*, Dover Publication, N.Y.
- Gropius, W. (1956). *The Scope Of Total Architecture*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- _____ (1961). The Architect In Society, *RIBA Journal*, Sept., pp. 435-36.
- _____ (1976). *The New Architecture & The Bauhaus*, The MIT Press, Mass., USA.
- _____ & Mayer, H. (1979). *Bauhaus 1919-1928*, The Museum Of Modern Art, N.Y.
- Hatje, G. (1975). *Encyclopaedia of Modern Architecture*, Thames & Hudson, London.
- Hitchcock, H. R. & Johnson, P. (1966). *International Style*, The Norton Library, N.Y.
- Hoag, E. & J. (1977). *Masters Of Modern Architecture*. The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, N.Y.
- Jencks, C. (1977 a). *The Language Of Post-Modern Architecture*, Rizzoli, USA.
- _____ (1977b). A Genealogy Of Post-Modern Architecture, *AD*, April, London, pp. 269-274.
- _____ (1980 a). Introduction, *Architectural Design*, 5/6, London.
- _____ (1980 b). *Late-Modern Architecture*, Academy Edition, London.
- _____ (1980 c). *Modern Movement In Architecture*, Penguin Books, London.
- _____ (1982). *Current Architecture*, Academy Edition, London.
- _____ (1985). *Symbolic Architecture*, Academy Edition, London.
- _____ (1988). Deconstruction: The Pleasure Of Absence, *AD*, Vol. 58, No. 3/4, pp. 17-31.
- _____ (1990 a). Death For Rebirth, *AD Profile*, No. 88, pp. 6-9.
- _____ (1990 b). Post-Modernism Between Kitsch And Culture, *AD Profile*, No. 88, pp. 25-35.
- Jordy, W. (1972). *American Buildings And Their Architects*, Vol. 3, Anchor Books, N.Y.
- Le Corbusier, (1960). *Towards A New Architecture*, Prager Publishers Inc., N.Y.
- _____ (1978 a). *The City Of Tomorrow*, The Architectural Press, London.

- _____ (1978b). Personal View, in *The Rationalists, Theory & Design Of Modern Movement*, (Sharp, D. edit.), The Architectural Press, London.
- MacEwen, M. (1974). *Crises In Architecture*, RIBA publication, London.
- Martin, L. (1967). Architects' Approach To Architecture, *RIBA Journal*, May, pp. 191-200.
- Maxwell, R. (1977). Architectural Language & Process, *AD*, March, pp.190-198.
- Miller, J. H. (1971). George Poulet's "Criticism Of Identification", in *The Quest For Imagination*, (Hardison, O.B. edit.), The Press Of Case Western University, Cleveland, Ohio, USA, pp. 191-225.
- Moholy-Nagy, S. (1957). Architecture -Art Or Design, *Progressive Architecture*, Jan., Vol. 38, PP.13-16, 22-23.
- _____ (1976). *Native Genius In Anonymous Architecture*, Schecken Books, USA.
- Murray, A. H. (1960). *A New English Dictionary Of Historical Principles*, London
- Murray, P. L. (1979). *The Penguin Dictionary Of Architecture*, Penguin Books, England.
- Newman, O. (1961). *CIAM 59 In Otterlo*, Alec Tiranti Ltd., London.
- _____ (1980). *Defensible Space*, Architectural Press, London.
- Norberg-Schulz, C. (1967). Pluralism In Architecture, *RIBA Journal*, June, Vol. 74, pp. 244-246.
- _____ (1980). Spirit Of Place, Towards A Phenomenology Of Architecture, *AD*, July/August, PP. 85-88.
- _____ (1988). The Two Faces Of Post-Modernism, *AD*, Vol. 58, No. 7/8, pp.11-15.
- Oakley, D. (1970). *The Phenomenon Of Architecture In Culture In Change*, Pergamon Press, London.
- Pevsner, N. (1961). Modern Architecture & The Historian Or The Return Of Historicism, *RIBA Journal*, April, pp. 230-240.
- _____ (1967). The Anti-Pioneers, *The Architects Journal*, Feb., pp. 269-280.
- _____ (1975). *Pioneers Of Modern Design*, Penguin Books, London.
- Sabine, G. H. (1973). *A History Of Political Theory*, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Illinois.
- Said, E. (1978). *Beginnings Intention & Method*, The John Hopkins University Press, N. Y.
- Schulze, F. (1970). Chaos As Architecture, *Art In America*, Jan., pp.88-96.
- _____ (1974). Towards An "Impure" Architecture, *Dialogue*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 54-63.
- Scruton, R. (1979). *The Aesthetic Of Architecture*, Princeton University Press, NJ, USA.
- _____ (1981). Viewpoint, Recent Aesthetic Of Architecture In England And America, *Architectural Association Quarterly*, Oct., Vol. 113, No. 1, pp. 51- 54.
- Scully, V. (1975). *Modern Architecture*, G. Braziller, N.Y., USA.
- _____ (1977). Introduction, in *Complexity And Contradiction In Architecture*, (Venturi, R.). The Museum Of Modern Art, N.Y.
- Sharp, D. (1978). Introduction, *The Rationalists, Theory And Design Of Modern Movement*, Architectural Press, pp. 1-5.
- Smith, I. (1967). Architects' Approach To Architecture, *RIBA Journal*, July, pp. 271-280.
- Stern, R. (1977a). *New Direction In Contemporary Architecture*, G. Braziller, N.Y.
- _____ (1977b). At The Edge Of Post-Modernism, *AD*, April, pp.275-79.
- Tafari, M. (1980). *Theories And History Of Architecture*, Granada Publishing, UK.
- Venturi, R. & Rauch, J. (1967). The Architecture Of Allusion, *Progressive Architecture*, Jan., 144 -154.
- Venturi, R. & Brown, D. S. (1971). Ugly And Ordinary Architecture Or The Decorated Shed, *Architectural Fourm*, Vol. 135, No. 5, Dec., pp. 48-53.
- Venturi, R. Brown, D. S. & Izenours, S. (1972). *Learning From Las-Vegas*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- Venturi, R. (1977). *Complexity & Contradiction In Architecture*, The Museum Of Modern Art, N.Y.
- Watkin, D. (1978). *Morality And Architecture*, Oxford University Press, UK.
- _____ (1983). *The Rise Of Architectural History*, The Architectural Press, London.
- Williams, R. (1980). *Keywords*, Fontana/Croom Helm, Glasgow, UK.
- Wolfflin, H. (1950). *Principles Of Art History*, Dover Publications Inc., USA.
- _____ (1968). *Principles Of Architectural History*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- Wright, F. L. (1954). *The Natural House*, Horizon Press, USA.
- _____ (1974). *Frank L. Wright Writings And Buildings*, New American Libraries, USA.