

CENTRE FOR  
**ARCHITECTURE | THEORY | CRITICISM | HISTORY**  
**ATCH**



Author	Leach, Andrew
Title	'Everything we do is but the larvae of our intentions': Manfredo Tafuri and Storia Dell'Architettura Italiana, 1944-1985'
Date	2002
Source	<i>Additions to Architectural History: XIXth Annual Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand</i>
ISBN	1864996471

# **‘Everything we do is but the larva of our intentions’: Manfredi Tafuri and *Storia dell’architettura italiana 1944-1985***

ANDREW LEACH

Wellington Institute of Technology

This paper offers a critical reading of the Manfredi Tafuri’s *Storia dell’architettura italiana 1944-1985*. Besides a small body of monographic writing, *Storia dell’architettura italiana* remains Tafuri’s single broad assessment of the polemics of post-War Italian architectural culture. Given its contemporaneity with Tafuri’s own life and career, this paper questions the text’s ‘operative’ dimension. It likewise identifies and questions Tafuri’s absence as ‘actor’ within the text in terms of his ‘authority’ as a writer. Does absence play an active role in the text? Responding to these questions involves an emerging body of ideas attending to Tafuri’s positions on the tasks of history and criticism. Post-War Italian intellectual history sheds further light on a dialectic of knowledge and action significant to Tafuri’s historiographic programme from the late 1960s onwards. The relationship of *Storia dell’architettura italiana* to *Teorie e storia dell’architettura* and *Progetto e utopia* is consequently questioned. The relationship of Tafuri to his various contexts offers a productive basis on which to assess the history he writes of contemporaneous architectural activity. It suggests, in conclusion, that *Storia dell’architettura italiana* reflects on two pressing issues: architecture’s status as an institution and the ‘active’ tasks of history.

~

Recent scholarship on the oeuvre of the Roman architectural scholar Manfredi Tafuri (1935-1994) has sought to resolve a perceived rift between the two personae of his career: an ‘early’ theoretician of modern architecture and its institutions and a ‘later’ historian of the Renaissance. For many commentators, Tafuri’s research demonstrates a ‘retreat’ from

architectural theory to architectural history as evidenced by a general shift in both writing and seminar topics at the Instituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia, away from discussions of modernity and avant-garde practices towards the cinquecento. A range of commentaries on his *œuvre* published in special issues of *Casabella* (1995) and *Architecture New York* (1999) reinforce this tendency.<sup>1</sup> In this 'retreat' to philological methodologies, *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* (1968), *Progetto e utopia* (1973, 1969), and *La sfera e il labirinto* (1980)<sup>2</sup>—the 'bestsellers' in English translation—dislocate from a body of 'historical' writings emerging in the early 1980s, as *L'Armonia e il conflitti* (1983), *Raffaello architetto* (1984), *Venezia e il rinascimento* (1985), and *Giulio Romano* (1989) culminate in what Rafael Moneo has described as Tafuri's "true spiritual legacy",<sup>3</sup> *Ricerca del rinascimento* (1992).<sup>4</sup> However, close to two dozen books and scores of articles disarm the clarity of this simplistic evolution.<sup>5</sup> A body of work yet to be translated from Italian into English is one complicating factor in this historiographic abstraction, particularly as Anglophone scholars, and those within American architectural discourse in particular, grapple with the complexities of this *œuvre*.<sup>6</sup>

*Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* (1986, 1982) contains vital clues not only for those pursuing the 'resolution' of Tafuri's multiple personae, but for anyone seeking a 'proper' attitude towards producing and documenting critical histories of contemporaneous milieus.<sup>7</sup> An early form appeared as 'Architettura italiana, 1944-1981' in the series *Storia dell'arte italiana* within the volume *Il novecento*, alongside Giorgio Ciucci's article 'Il dibattito sull'architettura e le città fasciste'.<sup>8</sup> This initial version of the *Storia dell'architettura italiana* comprised approximately the first ten chapters of the final publication, these chapters being slightly modified between 1982 and 1986. These changes, claimed by Carlo Olmo not to be insignificant for close readings,<sup>9</sup> do not interrupt the basic tenor of the analyses Tafuri constructs in the book's first part. Part Two deals with new forms of architectural culture and discourse emerging from the 1970s, fully manifest during the early to middle 1980s. For this essay, *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* assumes importance through the contemporaneity of Tafuri's history with the 'conclusion' of what is characterised as his 'theoretical' phase.

*Storia dell'architettura italiana* is Tafuri's only monograph dealing explicitly with the subject of his own context beyond writing on some specific individuals: Ludovico Quaroni, Vittorio Gregotti, Carlo Scarpa, and Massimo Scolari.<sup>10</sup> The impact of Tafuri's perceptive critique of contemporary architectural culture on the development of his own research and teaching curriculum—the trajectory, to borrow Carla Keyvanian's phraseology, "from the critique of ideology to Microhistories"<sup>11</sup>—provides another line of inquiry into the contents of that work. A number of questions may therefore be posed. What bearing does *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* have on our understanding of Tafuri's ideological writings from the late-1960s and the 1970s? What issues surrounding the historian's contemporaneity with his subject matter are raised by an inspection of both the

author's role in the production of history and of his complicity with the 'facts' of that very history as an 'actor'? Moreover, to what extent may conclusions be drawn from this example of Tafuri's history writing in addressing the fundamental tasks of architectural history and in the influence an historian may legitimately hold over the future development of architectural production?

This latter question clearly invokes the domain of 'operative history'. However, in this case the ideological dimension of his work and the political and economic problems faced by post-War reconstruction activities throughout Italy reduces to nothing the critical distance between 'the problems' and this specific historian. Sigfried Giedion, Bruno Zevi and the exponents of typological criticism could not invoke such immediacy in defence of Tafuri's negative assessment of their historiography.<sup>12</sup> Tafuri experienced the Second World War as a child in Rome, hiding from the occupying Nazi forces; he studied architecture in Rome in an environment still dominated by fascist professors, and addressed the problems of the suburbs as a young graduate through leftist political activity. He took part in the 60-day occupation of the Faculty of Architecture in 1963 that resulted in Zevi, Quaroni and Luigi Piccinato being called to Rome as new professors (although this was an inadequate result in his eyes). He established the Associazione Urbanisti e Architettura in opposition to the dominant Società di Architettura e Urbanistica of Leonardo Benevolo and his contemporaries. From the late 1960s, and particularly following his concurrent appointment as professor at the IUAV and publication of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, he was a significant critic, curator and educator.<sup>13</sup> In other words, he understood from unmediated experience the particular events addressed by *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985*.

For Tafuri, writing a history of post-War Italian architecture therefore constitutes a task situated somewhere between a multiplication of architectural biographies (of the numerous 'actors' in *Storia dell'architettura italiana*) and Tafuri's own intellectual autobiography, narrated with Tafuri *in absentia* as an actor while completely present as the author of this history. In fact, the only reference to himself—"this writer"—in the book is significantly as the recipient of Aldo Rossi's 1975 watercolour 'L'Architecture assassinée [à Manfredo Tafuri]'.<sup>14</sup> This critical dislocation of subject from history occurs with the very figure of Tafuri, who is at once an historian and a figure absent from his own story.

With these prefaces in mind, we may read *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* in order to better understand this mechanism: an authorship exerted with overriding authority, allowing that authority to determine a critical distance between author and subject that, while suggesting the author's neutrality towards the same subject, more accurately proposed his falsified absence in its construction. This reading is some distance from one geared towards better understanding post-War Italian architecture. From the beginning, Tafuri implies that the reader seeking an introduction to this territory will be

disappointed, instead providing comprehensive notes and a bibliographical appendix for the student of Italian architecture.<sup>15</sup> Treating *Storia dell'architettura italiana* as a document therefore negotiating the territory between architectural polemics in post-War Italy and Tafuri's place within them brings us back to the questions earlier posed involving the relationship between this text and Tafuri's *œuvre*, the issue of contemporaneity, and an identification of the historians' tasks. Within this framework, some specific reflections in Tafuri's *Storia* emerge as particularly helpful clues for reading the text. Among these, the opening words are particularly important.

After the end of the Second World War, architects who were obliged to respond to the new Italian reality were faced with a difficult dialectic between knowledge and action—difficult because of the contradictory foundations underlying the tradition of the discipline, but also because of the many levels imposed on such knowledge. This was all the more true given that the most competent members of the profession took it for granted that there could be no knowledge divorced from action: an encounter with active politics seemed imperative.<sup>16</sup>

This passage announces a theme to which the remainder of the text is addressed: the relationship between knowledge and action. This theme is essential to debates, not simply within architecture, but also across the spectrum of left-wing intellectual activity in Italy during the 1960s and 1970s. Massimo Cacciari, exemplary of Italian Marxist thinkers, alerts us to this in *Metropolis* (1973), a collection of readings used by Tafuri in his IUAV seminars on the modern German city: “In a metropolitan situation, the revolution process itself is totally intellectual.”<sup>17</sup> The review *Contropiano*, edited by Cacciari among others, sought a discourse on the relation of “mass movements to institutions and institutions to mass movements.”<sup>18</sup> In this setting, extreme action was violent. Intellectual settings, far from setting direct engagement aside, investigated the mechanisms by which institutional constraints were manufactured. For Carlo Ginzburg, examining sixteenth-century Inquisition records of Menocchio the miller's two heresy trials does not specifically lead to history of the subordinate class's popular culture, but rather allows an understanding of the relationships between worker classes and the institutions imposed upon them through religion, education, language, politics, etc. Such readings are complex, and deliberately oppose histories of the “great deeds of kings”.<sup>19</sup> Tafuri likewise intellectualises mechanisms of historical change as an issue of institutional boundaries and their evolution or deconstruction. He interrogates the limits of architectural knowledge in specific settings, testing those limits to better understand how they are activated or undermined.

Tafuri's *Storia* identifies two dominating strategies towards this examination of architecture as an institution in post-War Italy. Monuments to the Fosse Ardeatine (Mario Fiorentino, Giuseppe Perugini, Nello Aprile, Cino Calcaprina, and Aldo Cardelli; 1944-47)

(“an impenetrable mass in suspension, a mute testimony to the site of the massacre”) and to the dead in German concentration camps (Ludovico Belgiojoso, Enrico Peressutti, and Ernesto Nathan Rogers [BPR]; 1946) (a “too rational” lattice containing an urn filled with soil from the camps) propose a dialectic in post-War Italian architectural culture operating between weighty rhetoric (“a conclusive reflection on the past”) and open continuity (a “search for the specific tools that could contribute to the problem of reconstruction”).<sup>20</sup> Effectively, Tafuri saves his condemnation of the first example for the second part of the book, the early eighties’ “mute testimony” there to architecture’s incapacity to enact change beyond its own discourse. The BPR project describes a more poignant picture. The urn filled with dirt corresponds with an allegorical figure of Architecture for the post-War years, primarily operating as a mnemonic device against which architects measured their efforts as they moved gradually from the locus of ‘real’ development. Several episodes illustrate these tendencies.

The Roman building industry, for example, became subordinate to economically ‘sluggish sectors’, manipulated as a mechanism for controlling a fluctuating and disorganised ‘worker class’ by politicians and municipal administrators. Planning was similarly disabled as a technique, control wrested from the discipline’s ranks. The myths of such modern movement heroes as Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe were vigorously reassessed with the knowledge that architects’ capacity to control the built environment had been disabled by pressing economic and political circumstances: “The common thread linking the efforts of this generation was a revolt against the ‘father’, who were guilty of having transmitted illusions now harshly exposed and whose ‘continuity’ was still operatively celebrated.”<sup>21</sup> Tafuri also drew attention to his own ‘fathers’: Zevi, Giuseppe Samonà, and Giulio Carlo Argan. In each case, good intentions within their respective techniques resulted in a rhetorical discourse incapable of direct action. Zevi’s organic architecture did not take root; Argan’s legacy was “an elite group of young historians”; and Samonà’s hopes for the IUAV (once a “stronghold of progressive activity”) resulted in the “happy island” being “left to flourish on its own”.<sup>22</sup>

Younger architects of the late 1950s—Tafuri’s own generation—again appealed to planning as a mechanism for challenging the “ruling ethical laxity” of an older, institutionalised, generation. Yet the impulse for total planning as an antidote to “the impact of divisive forces” resulted in a number of immature proposals for complex sites.<sup>23</sup> Among these, the 1954 plan for Rome—moving tertiary structures outside the historical city centre—stands out. Quaroni’s response is equally noteworthy, including an active response in the production of an alternative plan under the auspices of the Committee for Technical Execution (which also involved Piccinato) and a critical essay titled ‘Una città eterna: Quattro lezioni da 27 secoli’.<sup>24</sup> During the mid-1960s, a general cultural reconfiguration—taking place in political arenas but concerning the city above all—fed a broad reconsideration of technical limitations that shook the foundations of institutions

associated with architectural culture. By 1968, the younger generation was “aware that ancient and recent myths were worn out.”<sup>25</sup> The profession received fewer commissions; graduates all but ceased moving into the profession, according to a survey by the Politecnico di Milano.<sup>26</sup> Even the important contributions of Quaroni and Samonà were not their projects but their ideas, “which those projects only rarely succeeded in translating.”<sup>27</sup> Their influence—like that of Scarpa and Rossi—“remained an issue of beginnings that these, like Socrates, would never go beyond.”<sup>28</sup>

As architecture “struggled with incompatible duties”, a new form of practice emerged, based on old techniques of watercolour and sketching—leading, with institutional compliance, to a series of exhibitions culminating in the 1977-78 *Roma interotta*. This competition “invited the new international of the imaginary to measure its own fantastic disseminations against places preserved on Nolli’s plan,” resulting in a game where the “ruins of architecture” are played by the young in an effort to “make ‘new techniques’ concrete”. By attempting, primarily by formal means, an historical synthesis, they set aside the “ruins of certainties that had sustained modes of intervention capable only of self-reproduction.”<sup>29</sup> For Tafuri, two logical outcomes emerge from the uncertainties of the sixties and seventies: architecture becomes a technique practiced in artificial contexts and develops an irreverent, hypermodern, attitude towards history. For example, in the 1985 Architecture Biennale of Venice the city became a ‘pre-text’ where “love of the ancient” and a “rediscovered continuity” were exercised against hypothetical design problems. Venice became “devoid of identity, or identified with the reign of the mask and of frivolous discourse.” As a consequence the competition was, in Tafuri’s estimation, a dismal failure: “The result of what was intended to be a ‘festival of architecture’ was a kind of banquet around a city treated like a cadaver.”<sup>30</sup> Likewise, a “hedonistic urge and a taste for citation” characterise Paolo Portoghesi’s brand of postmodernism. Seeking a liberation from ideas—analogue to the Venice Biennale’s liberation from ‘real’ issues—Portoghesi was critical of a linear view of history, reflecting upon memory, truth and identity through a renewed and careless historicism: “the need for *solutions* predominates.”<sup>31</sup> These reductions and misapplications of a new vocabulary appropriated as architectural language result in a poorly conceived and haphazardly constructed discourse: “the obvious love of history is resolved, in practice, in the game of repeatedly ‘putting the moustache on the Mona Lisa,’ now a mass joke thanks to a visual culture more influenced by Disneyland than Duchamp.”<sup>32</sup> Tafuri poses questions of enduring poignancy: “How could that which is true for collective behaviour . . . not hold true for architectural culture as well?”<sup>33</sup> In the context of a culture—generally and architecturally—in flux, the identification of “symptom-architectures” as distinct from “pioneering work” is fraught with complications.<sup>34</sup>

On one hand, architecture is seen as a discipline with a continuous and rich history, with ideas established and challenged constantly, though ‘internally’, through practices of

theoretical and formal criticism. This architectural culture is impenetrable from outside its technical borders. On the other hand, architecture perpetuates a discourse that has slowly lost its footing in the conditions of any 'real world' since the renaissance, to the extent that any ideas based in architectural discourse rely on the activation of other factors for their survival. Specifically, economics, class and governing politics emerge as essential to this debate. In this context, the death of architecture and its theories abstractly predicted in Tafuri's writing of the late-1960s takes on a specific flavour, and we can begin to understand that the contents of *Teorie e storia dell'architettura* and *Progetto e utopia* are 'explained' by *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985*.

The difficulty of balancing knowledge and action, the consequences of pursuing a closed architectural discourse rather than engaging immediate problems: these themes are central to *Teorie e storia dell'architettura's* discussion of modern architecture. Introducing the book's second edition, Tafuri describes the text as an "acknowledgement of what architecture, as an *institution*, has meant up to now." Implicated in "modern production processes and the development of the capitalist society," architecture is subject to class critique. The identification of those "*obstacles* contained in the discipline" is here the primary vehicle for that critique. In its withdrawal from 'action'—from a directly interventionist role in development—Tafuri identifies "the fall of architecture towards silence, towards the negation (also artificial) of itself." The "urgent second 'political' reading of the entire history of modern architecture" he subsequently proposes is not (he claims) "in the least apocalyptic"; it is a necessary fundamental revision of architectural knowledge in terms of the institutions and 'values' through which that institution is perpetuated. This relationship is the essential subject of *Teorie e storia*: "the confirmation of the *availability* of institutions."<sup>35</sup> As their relevance to building and development diminishes, the gestures within them are increasingly empty. Tafuri poignantly observes while introducing the fourth (1976) edition: "What seems most valid [. . .] is the effort to show how ineffectual are the brilliant gymnastics carried out in the yard of the model prison, in which architects are left free to move about on temporary reprieve."<sup>36</sup>

Likewise, his 1969 *Contropiano* essay 'Per una critica dell'ideologica architettonica' emphasises the "simple truth that, just as there can be no such thing as a political economics of class, but only a class critique of political economics, likewise there can never be an aesthetics, art or architecture of class, but only a class critique of aesthetics, art, architecture and the city."<sup>37</sup> Critical history is, in this sense, political, drawing together the intellectualisation of revolution invoked by Cacciari and the active examination of knowledge leading to class criticism exercised by Ginzburg. It is necessary, therefore, to avoid the isolation of architecture from its theoretical contexts, considering rather 'knowledge' in terms of its consequences for building and planning as actions historiographically dislocated from their adherent institutions. In this setting, the hypotheses proposed in *Teorie e storia*, and again in 'Per una critica dell'ideologica

architettonica' and its expansion as *Progetto e utopia*, remain valid in Tafuri's eyes: "Architecture as the *ideology of the Plan* is swept away by the *reality of the Plan* the moment the plan came down from the utopian level and became an operant mechanism."<sup>38</sup> In isolating this mechanism, Tafuri proposes "the precise identification of those tasks which capitalist development has taken away from architecture."<sup>39</sup> This identification does not have direct consequences for the everyday practice of architecture. Rather, Tafuri's 'revolution' is played out on a field where knowledge and institutions are at stake. Architecture becomes an example in that setting of an institution that has cloaked the gradual loss of its authority in a rhetorical metanarrative reinforcing the power of hypothetical action to implement change:

The systematic criticism of the ideologies accompanying the history of capitalist development is therefore but one chapter of such political action. Today, indeed, the principal task of ideological criticism is to do away with impotent and ineffectual myths, which so often serve as illusions that permit the survival of achronistic 'hopes in design'.<sup>40</sup>

When seen in this way, *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* is a transitional text demonstrating Tafuri's tactical shift from the study of institutions and discourses to an examination of precise conditions within clearly defined operational limits. When those limits define Tafuri's own historical, intellectual and architectural contexts—in which he lived, studied, and 'practiced'—the events, figures and documents of those contexts become a yardstick against which he may be measured. The complex relationship in this case of author, text and subject raises a fundamental historiographic issue: what is the nature of Tafuri's 'authorship' in writing a history within which he is involved subjectively, as an 'actor', albeit in absence? When *Storia dell'architettura italiana* is read with an eye consciously assessing Tafuri's relationship to, quite literally, the history of Italian architecture from 1944 to 1985, the absence of his figure and a web of relationships involving him and his colleagues at the IUAV does not leave the history incomplete. In a sense determined by themes within Tafuri's oeuvre, this absence is 'acceptable' as part of the whole. It functions to engage the very dialectic of knowledge and action with which the book is introduced. If, as Tafuri proposes, architecture has become so internalised and rhetorical by the 1980s as to be ineffectual as an institution faced by planning, housing, industry, historical fabric—in other words, political fields—and is subsequently superseded by more directly engaged institutions—in particular, capitalist society—what is the active value of intellectual work?

Tafuri confronts, in *Teorie e storia*, Zevi and Giedion's operative criticism, yet he does so because in their programmatic writing he identifies those factors contributing to the institutional demise of architecture. Their writings present architecture as capable of fixing immediate problems. Yet the promise of democratic society inherent to organic architecture and the culmination of cultural evolution marked by Giedion's modern

movement reinforce nothing other than Tafuri's image of the mute memorial: visible and referential, but rhetorical and ineffectual. Uncritically attached to their histories, operative critics can do little beyond recommending architectural directions in which hope lies. In other words, operative criticism reinforces the image of architecture as a viable institution. Tafuri fundamentally disagrees with this assessment, and therefore of any methodology reliant on architecture's rhetorical value.

With this in mind, the historian's absence from his own context is significant both as a methodological decision and as an advancement of the tools of historical research and writing. James Ackerman writes of Tafuri's "special effort to achieve 'distance'."<sup>41</sup> Indeed, it is precisely in this device that Tafuri's historiography is 'activated' rather than 'operative'. Operative critique, following Benjamin, requires engagement and therefore complicity. Active critique, characterised by the studied examinations of microhistorical methodology, requires detachment, thereby freeing itself from institutions. This is an important distinction in determining the active value of intellectual work and its task to vigorously address the mechanisms by which institutional constraints are manufactured. Knowledge, used thus, facilitates mass movement resulting in change. Complicit history, on the other hand, relies on the self-activation of the subject. In *Teorie e storia*, Tafuri had already identified the critical capacity of history, and in *Storia dell'architettura italiana*, this specific task is pursued in a carefully constructed history of figures and relationships that generates a frail image of post-War Italian architecture. Tafuri's challenge is the illusion of critical distance from his subject, by extension from the shortcomings of the institution torn open by critical history.

The mechanisms of this relationship are approximated in Italo Calvino's *Le città invisibili* by an exchange between the Emperor, Kublai Khan and the intrepid explorer, Marco Polo: Dawn had broken when [Polo] said:

"Sire, now I have told you about all the cities I know."

"There is still one of which you never speak."

Marco Polo bowed his head.

"Venice," the Khan said.

Marco smiled. "What else do you believe I have been talking to you about?"

The emperor did not turn a hair. "And yet I have never heard you mention that name."

And Polo said: "Every time I describe a city I am saying something about Venice."<sup>42</sup>

If, in this analogy, Polo is the storyteller, Khan the audience, and each city a separate history, what is Venice? In Tafuri's history, Venice is the capacity to enact change through

a negotiation of the dialectic of knowledge and action, to be fundamentally active in the pursuit of intellectual work. Necessary to this task is the intellectual's illusion of distance. For Tafuri to remain an actor in the history of Italy's architecture is to disable his programme as a critical historian and intellectual. This strategy is most explicit in *Storia dell'architettura italiana 1944-1985* because Tafuri is missing; it raises questions that a detached description of Venice by Polo might also prompt. But Polo does not speak of Venice, or Tafuri of the necessity for action. The critical mechanisms in Tafuri's histories of his contemporary milieu, and indeed in his Renaissance studies, remind readers that this scholar pursues not an abstract 'death of architecture', but rather a set of conditions within which a critical examination of architecture's history—its institutions, histories, techniques, and codes—may productively and directly contribute to the formation and evolution of knowledge and its structures.

### *Acknowledgment*

In writing and revising this essay, I have received valuable advice from Maristella Casciato, Gevork Hartoonian, Vladimir Mako, John Macarthur, Ruth Stewart-Leach and Bart Verschaffel. AL.

*Andrew Leach is a Senior Lecturer in design at the Wellington Institute of Technology and Secretary of SAHANZ. His paper for the ADDITIONS conference draws on research he is conducting on Manfredo Tafuri's oeuvre for his doctorate at the University of Ghent. andrew.leach@weltec.ac.nz; aia@etoast.com*

---

<sup>1</sup> Casabella 'Il progetto storico di Manfredo Tafuri / The Historical Project of Manfredo Tafuri,' 59, 619-620 (February 1995) and *Architecture New York* 'Being Manfredo Tafuri,' 25-26 (2000). Representative of this tendency in Casabella are articles by Howard Burns, though he characterises the shift as 'return' rather than 'retreat' ('Tafuri e il Rinascimento / Tafuri and the Renaissance': 114-121), Francesco Paolo Fiore ('Autonomia della storia / The Autonomy of History': 102-111; in ANY, Paul Henniger's interview with Georges Teyssot ('One Portrait of Tafuri': 10-16) and articles by Mark Wigley ('Post-Operative History': 47-53) and Peter Eisenman ('The Wicked Critic': 66-70) are marked by similar characterisations.

<sup>2</sup> *Teorie e storia dell'architettura*, Bari: Laterza, 1968 (English 4<sup>th</sup> ed. trans. Giorgio Vercchia as *Theories and History of Architecture*, London: Granada, 1980); 'Per una critica dell'ideologica architettonica,' *Contropiano*, 1 (1969): 31-79 (English trans. Stephen Sartarelli as 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology' in K Michael Hays (ed), *Architecture Theory Since 1968*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1998), pp. 6-35; *Progetto e utopia. Architettura e sviluppo capitalistico*, Bari: Laterza, 1973 (English trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta as *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1976); *La sfera e il labirinto. Avanguardie e Architettura da Piranesi agli anni '70*, Turin: Einaudi, 1980 (English trans. Pellegrino d'Acierno and Robert Connolly as *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Guards and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1987). Given the difficulty Anglophone readers of

Tafuri experience in the lag between publication in Italian and subsequent English translation, I have made an effort to reference dates of Italian publication, while quoting from English translations.

<sup>3</sup> José Rafael Moneo, 'Architettura, critica, storia / Architecture, Critics, History', *Casabella*, 62, 653 (February 1998), pp. 47, 51. See also 'La Ricerca come lascito / The "Ricerca" as Legacy,' *Casabella*, 59, 619-620 (February 1995): 132-141.

<sup>4</sup> *Venezia e il Rinascimento. Religione, scienza, Architettura*, Turin: Einaudi, 1985 (English trans. Jessica Levine as *Venice and the Renaissance*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989); *Giulio Romano* (with Howard Burns, et al.), Milan: Electa, 1989 (English trans. *Giulio Romano*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); *Ricerca del Rinascimento. Principi, città, architetti*, Turin: Einaudi, 1992 (English trans. Daniel Shearer of preface and first chapter as 'A Search for Paradigms: Project, Truth, Artifice,' *Assemblage*, 28 (December 1995): 46-69.

<sup>5</sup> The most thorough bibliographies are by Anna Bedon, Guido Beltramini, and Pierre-Alain Croset in *Casabella*, 59, 619-620 (February 1995): 170-175 and by Victor Pérez Escolano with Oscar Naranjo in *Arquitectura*, 300 (1994): 90-94.

<sup>6</sup> On this matter, Joan Ockman's 'Venezia e New York / Venice and New York' makes some interesting assessments: *Casabella*, 59, 619-620 (February 1995), p. 56-71; a letter from M Tafuri to J Ockman reproduced at the end of that article offers some useful insights into Tafuri's views on the American reception of his work (pp. 66-67).

<sup>7</sup> *Storia dell'architettura italiana, 1944-1985*, Turin: Einaudi, 1986 (English trans. Levine as *History of Italian Architecture, 1944-1985*, Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1989).

<sup>8</sup> *Il Novecento*, vol. 3 of Giulio Bollati and Paolo Fossati (series eds), *Storia dell'arte italiana* (Turin: Einaudi, 1980).

<sup>9</sup> Carlo Olmo, 'Una storia, molti racconti / One History, Many Stories,' *Casabella*, 59, 619-620 (February 1995), pp. 83-84, f28.

<sup>10</sup> 'Ludovico Quaroni e la cultura architettonica italiana,' *Zodiac*, 11 (1963): 130-145, expanded as *Ludovico Quaroni e lo sviluppo dell'architettura moderna in Italia*, Milan: Edizione di Comunità, 1946; 'The Watercolours of Massimo Scolari,' *Massimo Scolari: An Architecture Between Memory and Hope*, New York: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, 1980, pp. 2-15; *Vittorio Gregotti: Progetti e architetture*, Milan: Electa, 1982; 'Il frammento, la "figura", il gioco: Carlo Scarpa e la cultura architettonica italiana,' Francesco Dal Co and Giuseppe Mazzariol (eds), *Carlo Scarpa: Opera completa*, Milan: Electa, 1984, pp. 73-95 (English trans. 'Carlo Scarpa and Italian Architecture' in *Carlo Scarpa: Complete Works*, New York: Rizzoli, 1984).

<sup>11</sup> Carla Keyvanian, 'Manfredo Tafuri: From the Critique of Ideology to Microhistories,' *Design Issues*, 16, 1 (Spring 2000): 3-15.

<sup>12</sup> See 'Operative Criticism' in *Theories and History of Architecture*, pp. 141-170.

<sup>13</sup> The most accessible account of Tafuri's intellectual and architectural development in English is published as 'History as Project: An Interview with Manfredo Tafuri [by Luisa Passerini, Rome, February-March 1992],' trans. Denise L Bratton, *Architecture New York*, 25-26 (2000): 10-70. The specific instances I refer to are identified, respectively, on pp. 18-19, 21 (on the late-1940s); 16-17, 20 (on studies in Rome); 12-13, 17-18, 22-23, 26 (on suburban issues); 23-24 (on 1960); 24-25, 29 (on particular forms of 'action'). On Tafuri's influence as teacher and critic, see Andrea Guerra and Christiano Tessari, 'L'Insegnamento / The Teaching,' *Casabella*, 59, 619-620 (February 1995), pp. 124-129.

<sup>14</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 139.

<sup>15</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 251-261.

<sup>16</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 3.

<sup>17</sup> Cited in Patrizia Lombardo, 'Introduction: The Philosophy of the City,' Massimo Cacciari, *Architecture and Nihilism: On the Philosophy of Modern Architecture*, trans. Stephen Sartarelli, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993, p. xiv.

<sup>18</sup> Lombardo. 'Introduction,' p. xvii.

<sup>19</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, *Il formaggio e i vermin: il cosmo di un mugnaio del '500*, Turin: Einaudi, 1976 (English trans. John and Anne Tedeschi as *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980), p. xiii.

- 
- <sup>20</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 4-5.
- <sup>21</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 55-57.
- <sup>22</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 20-22.
- <sup>23</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 60, 62.
- <sup>24</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 64. Original publication *Urbanistica*, 27 (June 1959).
- <sup>25</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 95.
- <sup>26</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 97.
- <sup>27</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 88.
- <sup>28</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 118.
- <sup>29</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 145-146.
- <sup>30</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, pp. 185-186.
- <sup>31</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 189.
- <sup>32</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 191.
- <sup>33</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 197.
- <sup>34</sup> Tafuri, *History of Italian Architecture*, p. 200.
- <sup>35</sup> Tafuri, 'Note to the second (Italian) edition,' *Theories and History of Architecture*, unpaginated.
- <sup>36</sup> Tafuri, 'Note to the fourth (Italian) edition,' *Theories and History of Architecture*, unpaginated.
- <sup>37</sup> Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' p. 32.
- <sup>38</sup> Tafuri, 'Towards a Critique of Architectural Ideology,' p. 28.
- <sup>39</sup> Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, p. ix.
- <sup>40</sup> Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia*, p. 182.
- <sup>41</sup> James Ackerman, 'In Memoriam,' *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 53, 2 (June 1994), p. 137.
- <sup>42</sup> Italo Calvino, *Invisible Cities*, Orlando: Harcourt Brace, 1974 (trans. William Weaver from *Le città invisibili*, Turin: Einaudi, 1972), p. 86.